

Allocations (Options) consultation January - March 2010

ID	Name	Organisation Details	Summary	SDC Response
31 -37 Park Lane, Kemsing				
A073	Mr Adam Single Archaeological Officer	KCC Heritage Conservation Group Environment and Waste	Significant archaeology could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. The condition could require the preservation of important archaeological remains.	Noted Site no longer promoted.
A0451	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	- No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply.	
57 Top Dartford Road, Hextable				
A074	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0190	Ms Tracy Lane	Parish Clerk Hextable Parish Council	Gateway site of importance to the village No high rise building to go on the plot -consideration to historic contamination.	Noted – prominent position of site has been identified in the potential allocation and the importance of appropriate design has been emphasised.
A0264	Cllr Dee Morris		- Good design - Limited height - Land contamination concerns	Land contamination is not an absolute constraint and can be adequately mitigated through the planning process.
A0403	Mr & Mrs E & JS Richardson		Object - Loss of views - Traffic	Impact on views is not a planning consideration SDC sought detailed comments from Kent Highways through the consultation process. KCC Highways advised that traffic concerns could be adequately mitigated and would not prohibit redevelopment of the site. The prominent position of site has been identified in the potential allocation and the importance of appropriate design has been emphasised. Greenfield land or the presence of biodiversity is not an absolute constraint and can be adequately mitigated through the planning process. The planning process will ensure that sufficient study work is carried out to ensure any biodiversity concerns are adequately mitigated. No infrastructure concerns have been raised by local providers through the consultation.
A046	Mr J P Lovett		- Biodiversity	
A0319	Mr Roy Hunt		- Overshadowing - Infrastructure	

A0452	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply.	Noted
A0583	A Winchester and Sons		Support inclusion by landowner but at a lower density	Noted – site capacity has been considered through the consultation process and in light of representations received. The original capacity remains appropriate.
A0649	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -request that some neutral grassland habitat is provided on site	Noted – the need for appropriate open space / GI will be considered as part of any planning application, in line with policy SP10 of the Core Strategy.
Allotment Gardens adjacent to Churchill School, Westerham				
A04	Angela Howells	Clerk to the Parish Council Westerham parish council	Support WPC continues to promote site for development. Alternative allotment land can be provided - Access to be through old Churchill School site	Noted. The Council has considered alternative allotment provision put forward by WPC and consider that the proposed replacement, in the field immediately to the north of the site, is equivalent quality provision, in terms of its size, location, accessibility and quality, and thus a portion of the existing allotment can be relocated to this field. The field is currently leased to Churchill School. The school is aware of this proposal and has confirmed that it can accommodate the loss of the field without prejudicing its activities. The Council accept that access cannot be achieved from Rysted Lane and that any access should come via the Churchill School site. However the small scale development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused.
A0115	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Observations Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0168	Mr and Mrs Howes		Objections Infrastructure issues - Proximity to Junior School	Proximity to school concern noted.
A0180	Mr P Kembery		- noise pollution, land contamination and air quality	The site is within an AONB. Existing tree screening should be maintained and enhanced to avoid impact on the AONB. Development site reduced to lower field to limit impact on AONB.
A0182	Beth Mullings		- sustainability and design cost implications	
A0189	Mr and Mrs Howes		- Infrastructure Provision / Overloaded services	
A0193	Mr Andrew McCormick		- Increase traffic and congestion - Safety issues regarding London Road	Greenfield land status or the presence of biodiversity is not an

A0199	Mr Martin Stevens		- Access issues / Sight Lines	<p>absolute constraint and can be adequately mitigated through the planning process. The planning process will ensure that sufficient study work is carried out to ensure any biodiversity concerns are adequately mitigated. Equivalent replacement allotments will be re-provided.</p> <p>Noted. The Council has considered alternative allotment provision put forward by WPC and consider that the proposed replacement, in the field immediately to the north of the site, is equivalent quality provision, in terms of its size, location, accessibility and quality, and thus a portion of the existing allotment can be relocated to this field. The field is currently leased to Churchill School. The school is aware of this proposal and has confirmed that it can accommodate the loss of the field without prejudicing its activities.</p> <p>AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it. Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB to be built into allocation. Development site reduced to lower field to limit impact on AONB.</p> <p>The site is considered to be sustainably located with good access to the main town centre.</p> <p>The Council accept that access cannot be achieved from Rysted Lane and that any access should come via the Churchill School site. However the small scale development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused.</p> <p>No infrastructure concerns have been raised by local providers through the consultation.</p> <p>Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such would not be sufficient basis to stop new development.</p> <p>The Council does not propose Gypsy or Traveller accommodation at this site.</p>
A0202	Mrs E M Kembery		- Power supply problems	
A0203	Ms Janice Stent		- Lack of amenities, transport problems, parking and accessibility	
A0218	K and P Whalley		- Ecological and Aborigicultural issues	
A0219	Ms Sarah Cullom		- Greenfield Site	
A0220	A Wells		- Site should be returned to the Green Belt and allotments retained	
A0221	Denis Bulford		- Loss of allotment/high grade soil	
A0222	Mrs Janet Young		- Loss of wildlife	
A0231	Mr Peter Corfield		- AONB	
A0257	Ms Elaine Kibblewhite		- Visual impact, light and noise pollution	
A0258	Mr and Mrs C Davies		- Impact on Green Belt	
A0261	E.M Freeman		- Allotments are well used by community	
A0299	Mr and Mrs Whitney		- Shortage of Allotments	
A0300	M.W Penfold		- important to retain for community	
A0301	A Wells		- Allotment environmentally friendly and an important community use	
A0315	Mr and Mrs R Fenn		- Would not provide any community benefits	
A0316	Nicola Wolfenden		- Alternate allotment site not accessible	
A0322	Mr Michael Grimes		- Alternative sites should be sought	
A0324	MJ Turner		- Land not required to meet the SE Plan Target	
A0337	Clare Moran and William Hayes		- Housing Supply issues	
A0338	Mrs Dorothy Oram		- No gypsy development	
A0345	Mr David		- Sufficient housing in Westerham	

	Taylor-Smith		- woods, hedgerows and grassland could provide both conditions suitable for setts and foraging habitat for badgers.	<p>Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such would not be sufficient basis to stop new development.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated to return site to the Green Belt. These circumstances have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the basis by which affordable housing contributions will be sought and to which level.</p> <p>The site is not located within the Green belt.</p> <p>The small scale development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused.</p> <p>The planning process will ensure that sufficient study work is carried out to ensure any biodiversity concerns are adequately mitigated.</p>
A0350	Don Pickett			
A0354	Denise Stevens			
A0408	Mr and Mrs Tidy			
A0459	Mrs Hicks			
A0460	Sally-Anne Nowell			
A0547	Ms Carol Parker			
A0653	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust		
Bevan Place, Swanley (Local Plan Allocation and adjacent land)				
A063	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0121	Mr and Mrs Marilyn and Philip Ball		Object - Heritage	The Council do not consider that there are any historic assets that would be lost or impacted upon as a result of this allocation. The majority of the site is made up by an underutilised car park, whilst the remaining section relates to a working mans club and low aesthetic quality apartments.
A0441	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply	Noted
Bus Garage, London Road, Swanley				
A064	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted

		Conservation Group		
A0122	Mr and Mrs Ball		Object - Heritage	The Council do not consider that there are historic assets that would be lost or impacted upon as a result of this allocation, the site is a disused and unattractive former garage building unworthy of protection. One low-level building of some merit as a example of industrial architecture, with a distinctive curved window feature. However, we do not feel that it is of sufficient merit to warrant insisting on its retention within a housing allocation on the site. It is already negatively affected by the proximity to the adjoining housing. It is not a listed building. However, we are likely to be supportive if a future scheme for the site proposed to include all or part of this building within the scheme.
A0442	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply	
Car Park, Hitchen Hatch Lane, Sevenoaks				
A010	Ms Anne Warburton		Objection	The Council acknowledges that equal or greater provision of alternative car parking will need to be provided to serve station commuters as part of any formal allocation. Initially this has been identified as to be provided at the nearby Bradbourne Car park and would involve decking a portion of the existing car park. Noted concerns regarding the capacity of the existing sewerage network in the area and the impact of proposed development. A sewer flood alleviation scheme would be required, potentially involving a sewer diversion and provision of additional storage capacity and this has been noted in the allocation.
A09	Ms Angelina Chapman		Loss of Car Parking	
A023	Mr and Mrs Clary			
A029	John Moulton			
A0150	Barbara Smith			
A0514	Marian Verkerk			
A0156	J M Bamforth			
A0236	Riverhead Parish Council	Riverhead Parish Council		
A0266	Mr Mark Lowth			
A0305	Ms Elwyn Jones			
A0318	Mrs Lorna Talbot	Parish Clerk Seal Parish Council		
A0389	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council		
A0407	Mr A.J Henley			
A0432	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property		

			Outside water supply boundary Sewerage network unlikely to support development	
A054	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
Corner of Birchwood Park Avenue & Bartholomew Way, Swanley				
A032	O G Mahoney		Object	Noted The site has now not been allocated for residential development as it is not considered to be sufficiently deliverable, as not being promoted for development. Recent McCarthy & Stone sheltered housing schemes refused and dismissed at appeal on grounds of overdevelopment.
A042	Mr Iain Chalmers		- Pollution - Access - Design - Invasion of privacy and safety	
A065	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	
A0209	Mr Derek Caplan		Object - Too close to St Barts Laundry Site - Highway safety concerns	
A0262	Ms Helen Oakley		Support - no objection in principle	
A0265	Mr Gian Bendinelli	The Planning Bureau Limited	Object - Density too low - Site suitable for sheltered accommodation	
A0443	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply	Noted
Cramptons Road Water Works, Sevenoaks				
A07	Mrs J Johnston		Support with conditions: - Only concern is the congestion on local roads	
A055	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted. KCC Highways consulted regarding access and highway safety issues. They advised that the existing access and arrangements are adequate for the quantum of development proposed. The importance of high quality design and amenity protection will be emphasised through the emerging DM Policies, however the Council do not feel that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the area.
A0141	Mr Terry Payne		Objection	
A0164	Mr Trevor Dann		- WKCS and Fort Halstead cover housing requirement	
A0235	Mr A Wickens		- Excess Pollution - Highways requirements	
A0276	Mr Clay		- School capacity	

A0390	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	- Water contamination and security - Area disruption - Traffic	<p>Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such previous completions would not be sufficient basis to stop new development. Notwithstanding the above, Fort Halstead has not been identified for housing development during the Core Strategy period.</p> <p>The scale development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused.</p> <p>The Developer Contributions policy in the Core Strategy will allow contributions to be sought towards school places and other social infrastructure required as a result of a proposal. SDC is also developing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</p> <p>Land contamination is not an absolute constraint and can be adequately mitigated through the planning process. Notwithstanding this, the waterworks deals with drinking water not foul water and as such minimal contamination is expected.</p> <p>The scale development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused.</p> <p>KCC Highways were consulted regarding access and highway safety issues. They advised that the existing access was adequate to serve a housing redevelopment.</p> <p>The density proposed is considered appropriate within a location of this nature.</p> <p>Request for open space provision is noted.</p> <p>Exiting property locations are not absolute constraints and if tenancy agreements cannot be reached by the landowner a scheme could be designed in a way so as to maintain existing dwelling locations.</p>
A0404	D Beatty		Observations	
A0433	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	- properties should be low in height - Traffic-calming measures to be installed - Density too high - Mixed use	
A0515	Mr & Mrs Simmons		- include open space Objection - Eviction from property. Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development - Congestion/Traffic on Cramptons Road	
A0493	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations: - Site lies in source protection zone 1 and underlain by principle aquifers. - pollution and contamination risk - incorporate sustainable drainage techniques	
A0351	Mr Tim Brooks		- Air Quality - No social housing, ok to part buy, part rent	
A0645	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation - Recommend protected species surveys	
A0355 A0358	South East Water	South East Water	Support with Conditions: - All site constraints can be overcome - Site area is 1.8ha, giving 90units	

				Site area and capacity revised as a result of further work carried out by promoter.
Field south of Moat Cottage, Station Road, Otford				
A015	Mr Colin Parks		<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pond is natural spring - Proximity to scheduled ancient monument - Groundwater and flooding issues - Access - Arboricultural issues - Development of this site should be avoided - Protected by English Heritage Monument Sites - Spring running through site - Ecological issues - Access - Otford has had enough recent development - Conservation Area - Increased traffic <p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Watercourse adjoining site with narrow area of Flood Zone 3 	Noted. The site has been removed and is no longer being considered for allocation due to the constraints at the site.
A075	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group		
A0211	Mr and Mrs JC Peacock			
A0334	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Otford Parish Council		
A0217	Mrs Lyndsey Edwards			
A0497	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency		
A0453	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property		
A0651	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust		
A0260		Jarvis Homes	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site available for development - Site lies close to Otford and a short walking distance of the mainline railway station. - Excellent Infrastructure - High priority The enhancement of the character and appearance of the locality will have the highest priority - Development will also need to respect the 	Noted. The site has been removed and is no longer being considered for allocation due to the constraints at the site.

			Scheduled Ancient Monument - the access will need to give the highest priority to the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area. - Development of the site would make a modest but nevertheless important contribution to the provision of affordable housing within Otford	
Former Déjà vu Site and land to the north, Swanley				
A017	Gillian Fittich		Support - Need hotel	Hotel development now completed on part of identified site. No allocation for the remainder of the site.
A018	Mr and Mrs Lundberg		Support with conditions - Design should be in keeping - Access should not be via Pucknells Close	
A0184	Mr P Doherty		Support with conditions - Design should be in keeping - Access should not be via Pucknells Close	
A041	Mr and Mrs David and Marie Collett		Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	
A066	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group		
A0123	Mr and Mrs Ball		Object - Heritage	
A0444	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply	
A0295	Mr Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Observations - Density should be higher	
Foxes Garage, London Road, Badgers Mount				
A01		Consultant Claverton Ltd	Support residential development. Current use is under used and unviable.	Lower density development proposed over combined site. Site to be accessed from the Old London Road, which is slower (40mph) than the Orpington By-Pass and parking to be accommodated within the scheme. Address error noted - London Road changed to Orpington By Pass. Previous planning refusal has been considered, but focused around sustainability issues for a mixed use development.
A014	Mr and Mrs Earl		Support with conditions - Support in principle but concerned too many units proposed - Parking and road safety issues could also be a concern	
A076	Mr Adam	Archaeological	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be	

	Single	Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	The site is not identified as an important employment site worth of protection.
A0454	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply	
A0513	Mr Gordon Plumb	Badgers Mount Residents Association	Objection -Wrong Address -Previous Planning Refusal -Loss of Employment	
Greatness Mills, Mill Lane, Sevenoaks				
A056	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Significant archaeology could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. The condition could require the preservation of important archaeological remains.	Noted.
A0434	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply	
A0477	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy	The site is within 500 metres of a SSSI . Consideration to be given to space for biodiversity in any development.	
A0494	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Site lies within SPZ1 and highly sensitive - Contamination issues, site investigation required - Surface water run off risk	
Johnsons (School Land) at Oak Lane & Hopgarden Lane, Sevenoaks				
A0363	Mr David Wigg		Support with conditions -Lower density -Improved infrastructure -No provision of affordable- to be directed to other areas	Noted
A0487	Sevenoaks School Foundation		Support - Part of planned management of the school estate.	
A030	Mr Geoffery Dalton		Support with conditions subject to - Retention of existing building - No dense flat development	Noted. Allocation recommends retention of existing building or replacement on a similar scale and footprint.

A061	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A026	Ms Lisa Stewart		Object - Congestion - Excessive Density - Housing target too high	SDC sought detailed comments from Kent Highways through the consultation process. KCC Highways advised that access and visibility is acceptable for both the upper and lower portions of the site.
A028	Mr Graham Stewart		- water shortages - Infrastructure Provision	The consultation suggested a low density development (25dph) which at the time of consultation was below the Governments minimum density.
A0128	Mr John Crowe		- Character of Area	
A0130	Mr Graham Boon		- Traffic and air quality issues - Retain existing house	Following the consultation the proposed allocation for the site has been amended and the number of units to be created reduced in order to reflect the site constraints.
A0132	Mr David Glennie		- Affordable percentage unattainable - Water supply/sewage	
A0134	Ms Paula Burns		- Not in keeping with character of area	No service provider has identified a water shortage.
A0136	PB Dravers		- Aboricultural issues - Education provision	
A0138	Mr and Mrs Miller		-Sports/play areas -Transport to London	No Kent County Council drainage concerns have been raised regarding the proposal.
A0140	Ms Jane Affleck		- Loss of area character - mixing low and high density	
A0147	Dr and Mrs Stuart and Linda Simpson		- Safety risk due to absence of pavements - Biodiversity - Pollution needs to be mitigated	Open space catered for within the School's main campus. Development on the site to maintain the existing broad balance between built development and open space.
A0148	Ms Sheila Reynolds		- How long the Affordable Housing will be retained - fields could be designated for allotments	Tree concerns are noted. The proposed allocation will ensure that the development does not result in the loss or harm to any of these TPO trees.
A0167	Mr and Mrs AB Vowles		- should prevent schools from selling off playing fields for housing	Any restrictive covenant is an issue to be resolved by the land owner and not a matter that can be taken into consideration by the Council.
A0188	Mr and Mrs B.E and T.E.A Horton		- Safety and transport - Greenfield not brownfield - Environmental harm - topography	
A0215	Mr Graham Boon		- green infrastructure - Outside water supply boundary	
A0227	Mrs Barbara Gibbs		- Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development	
A0239	Mr Mike John			
A0241	Patrick FitzGerald	Committee The White Hart Residents	- Loss of playing fields - Surface Water drainage	

		Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waste Water Drainage - Electricity problems - Drainage and flooding issues - Proposal contrary to EN1 and PPS3 - Noise and Pollution - Loss of Green Space - Appeal decision (Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/A/09/2112850) - Appeal in Downsview Road <p>Observation</p> <p>-recommends a corridor of tree and grass habitat be retained and enhanced through the centre of the site</p>	
A0243	Ms Sheila Campbell			
A0245	Sir Michael Harrison	Chairman Sevenoaks Conservation Council		
A0275	Ms Sheila Campbell			
A0282	Mr & Mrs Ian Webb			
A0397	Mr Julian Scott			
A0400	Mr & Mrs Williams			
A0406	Mr Geoffery Dalton			
A0410	Mr Derek Crofton			
A0424	Cllr Mrs Avril Hunter			
A0439	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property		
A0507	Becky Penty	Planning Manager - South East Region Sport England		
A0520	Mr D Richardson	Vice Chairman Hop Garden lane residents Association		
A0525	Ms Jane Affleck			
A0538	Mr and Mrs Jackson			
A0545	Mr S J Valiant			
A0554	Mr David Glennie			
A0556	David and			

	Violaine Townsend			
A0559	FA and PC Catterall			
A0564	Mr Nick Osler			
A0569	Dr and Mrs Simpson			
A0570	Ms Paula Burns			
A0591	Mr Alan Senior			
A0593	Mr and Mrs Richardson			
A0594	Mr Graham Footitt			
A0604	Mr and Mrs C Penney			
A0605	Mr David Perry			
A0607	Mr and Mrs A P Dowding			
A0609	Oak Lane Residents Association			
A0612	Mr and Mrs Cobban			
A0614	Mr and Mrs Iain and Frances Smith			
A0617	Mr Daron Pearce			
A0619	Mr and Mrs O'Sullivan			
A0623	WP and SA Sellers			
A0626	Mr and Mrs Kieron and Julia Brennan			
A0628	Peter Kernan and Maria Lemos			

A0630	Mr Vincent Geake			
A0633	Mr and Mrs Maxwell			
A0635	Philip and Sarah Brown			
A0637	Mr Paul Nash			
A0641	Mr & Mrs D Wheatley			
A0642	Mr & Mrs Gillett			
A0647	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust		
Land adjacent to London Road, Westerham				
A077	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0143	Mr and Mrs D.W.R. Hobbs		Object	SDC sought detailed comments from Kent Highways through the consultation process. KCC Highways advised access to London Road is acceptable for the proposed level of development. The scale of development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused. The consultation suggested a low density development (25dph) which at the time of consultation was below the Governments minimum density. However the Council feel that anything below this density would not be prudent use of the land. The site is sustainably located within the settlement of Westerham which has access to good services and facilities. The key features and characteristics of the site and area have been considered and within the potential allocation the importance of
A0144	Mr and Mrs K Whalley		- AONB	
A0159	Jo Connah		- Traffic	
A0179	Mrs C Goodall		- Aboricultural issues	
A0181	E.M Freeman		- Infrastructure	
A0192	Mr Andrew McCormick		- Drainage	
A0200	Mr Martin Stevens		- Character of Area	
A0229	Beth Mullings		- Prefer a nursing home	
A0230	Mr Peter Corfield		- Ecological issues	
A0252	Mr, Mrs and Master Mason		- Air Quality	
A0253	Mr Matthew Pullen		- Infrastructure Provision	
A0256	Ms Elaine Kibblewhite		- Privacy	
			- Density	
			- Trees and loss of allotments	
			- Loss of Green Belt;	
			- If developed should be small bungalows for elderly/retired	
			- Highway safety	
			- Would not provide an community benefits	
			- noise pollution, land contamination and air quality	

A0293	Ms Gillian Burmester		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustainability and - design cost implications - Land not required to meet the SE Plan Target - No gypsy development - Prefer sheltered housing - No more social housing needed - Alternative sites should be sought 	<p>appropriate design has been emphasised. In this respect the Council feel that the site can be developed without an adverse impact upon surrounding residents or on Court Lodge.</p> <p>No infrastructure service provider has identified a concern regarding the proposal.</p> <p>Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such this would not be sufficient basis to stop new development.</p> <p>AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it. Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB built into allocation.</p> <p>Tree concerns are noted. There are Tree Preservation Orders on the site which should be respected. The trees provide an attractive avenue into the site and line both the pedestrian and vehicular access from London Road. No protected trees to be removed.</p> <p>The site is not located within the Green Belt and was previously safeguarded for development.</p> <p>Unless a sheltered housing scheme was proposed the occupants of any proposed dwellings would be outside of the control of the Council.</p> <p>The occupants of any proposed dwellings would be outside of the control of the Council.</p> <p>The site was previously identified as a potential Alzheimer's Care home however the scheme was not delivered due to the lack of identified need for such a facility.</p> <p>The land owner has expressed confirmation that the site remains viable within the Core Strategy period.</p>	
A0314	Mr and Mrs R Fenn				
A0317	Nicola Wolfenden				
A0336	Clare Moran and William Hayes				
A0339	Mrs Dorothy Oram				
A0340	Mr Simon Burmester				
A0343	Mr David Taylor-Smith				
A0348	Denise Stevens				
A0349	Mrs Deborah Mills				
A0353	Ms Sally Pratt				
A0359	Mr Clive Jenkins				
A0455	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - No infrastructure concerns regarding waste water supply
A0458	Sally-Anne Nowell				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support -Re-use of site.

A0639	KCC Property		Comprehensive support for site.	Noted, although Allotments located outside of this parcel of land. The presence of biodiversity is not an absolute constraint and can be adequately mitigated through the planning process. The planning process will ensure that sufficient study work is carried out to ensure any biodiversity concerns are adequately mitigated.
A0652	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -Allotments provide rich habitat for reptiles and amphibians. -likely to harbour reptiles and provide terrestrial habitat for amphibians. -likely to provide foraging habitat -Bats hibernate within Westerham Mines SSSI evidence that bats use the mines within the summer months. -woods, hedgerows and grassland could provide both conditions suitable for setts and foraging habitat for badgers. full surveys are to be undertaken	
Land at Cedar Drive, Edenbridge				
A021	Ms Rachel Chatwin		Objection - Overlooking - Loss of light/Overshadowing - Arboricultural issues - Drainage concerns - Open space provision - Access - Congestion - Infrastructure Support with condition; - Subject to additional parking for the Stangrove Estate Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Following detailed consideration of comments received the Council considers that the open space is of value and worthy of continued protection.
A034	Mr Stephen Lewzey			
A045	Mr Philip Blackman			
A047	Mr and Mrs Miriam and Jason Chatten			
A051	Mr and Mrs T Anderson			
A071	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group		
A0120	C Arter			
A0153	Mr and Mrs Blake			
A0177	Ms C Lane	Edenbridge Town Council		
A0183	Mrs N Dodd			
A0204	Ms Poor			
A0205	Mrs LA Reynolds and			

	Mr SB Seymour			
A0206	Miss Claire Bennett			
A0402	Mr Andrew Ramsey			
A0449	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property		
A0542	Mrs Brachet-Smith			
A0558	Mr and Mrs Chatten			
Land at Croft Road Westerham (Reserve Site for Housing)				
A033	Mr R C Woodward		<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -additional housing will be out of keeping - will not be in keeping with band G tax paying properties - reduce the value of the surrounding housing -wildlife -impact on our privacy -the proposed development is in the “shadow” of a mobile telecoms mast - danger and congestion due to narrow roads and lack of pavement. -additional housing will be out of keeping - will not be in keeping with band G tax paying properties - reduce the value of the surrounding housing - wildlife - impact on our privacy - the proposed development is in the “shadow” of a mobile telecoms mast - danger and congestion due to narrow roads and lack of pavement. <p>Observation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommend that woodland and hedgerow 	<p>The site was removed from the Green belt and safeguarded for future development needs.</p> <p>Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such this would not be sufficient basis to stop new development.</p> <p>AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it. Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB built into allocation.</p> <p>The Greenfield designation is not an absolute constraint to prohibit development.</p> <p>The site meets the allocation threshold of being greater than 0.2ha.</p> <p>No concerns have been raised by statutory consultees with regards to flooding. Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>SDC sought detailed comments from Kent Highways through the consultation process. KCC Highways advised that access via Croft Road would be acceptable and that there were not highway constraints that would prohibit development.</p>
A0126	Mrs Y Tullett			
A0127	Mr & Mrs Hilliard			
A0186	Mr Mark Waterman			
A0195	Mrs R Pearson			
A0196	Mr Richard Essex			
A0232	Mr Richard Howard			
A0248	Mr Laurence Booshard			
A0249	Mr Mark Waterman			
A0250	Karen Waterman			
A0251	Mr Nigel Leadbetter			
A0312	Mr and Mrs Howe			
A0326	Mr Kevin			

	Rogers		boundaries and a corridor of adjacent rough grassland be retained	The presence of biodiversity is not an absolute constraint and can be adequately mitigated through the planning process. Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such this would not be sufficient basis to stop new development. Privacy and amenity issues will be considered at the detailed planning stage.
A0327	Ms S Warnes			
A0346	Mr David Taylor-Smith			
A0411	Jeremy Wilson/Kristine Mitchell			
A0659	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust		
A0114	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
Land rear of Garden Cottages, Leigh				
A078	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group		Noted
A0308	D.S. Whitehall		Object - Biodiversity - Conversion back to allotments - Not previously developed land - Parking and Traffic - Overshadowing and loss of privacy - Impact on character of area - No need to develop site soon - Building would disrupt community - Carbon Footprint - Increase in population - Infrastructure pressures	This site now has planning permission.
A0309	Mr and Mrs Truzzi-Franconi			
A0320	Mr Keogh Caisley	Court Royal Developments		
			Support; - Promote 18 Extra Care Retirement Units - Land available in short term - Sustainable Location - PPS7 Justification - Need for extra care accommodation	
A0456	Ms Carmelle	Planning	Observations:	

	Bell	Administrator Thames Water Property	- Outside water supply boundary - Outside waste water supply boundary	
A0650	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation Consideration should be given to the ecological impacts of development in this location.	
Land West of Bligh's Meadow, Sevenoaks				
A057	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Significant archaeology could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. The condition could require the preservation of important archaeological remains.	Noted
A024	Mr and Mrs D & R Clary		Observations - Require the retention or increase of existing car parking	The site now has planning permission subject to a legal agreement.
A0391	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support with Conditions - replacement car parking	
A0435	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development	
A0160	J M Bamforth		Observations - Car Parking Provision	
A0208	Mr Peter Stevens		Object -Loss of parking and congestion -If building goes ahead, to be limited to 2 storey	
Land West of Cherry Avenue, Swanley				
A067	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0445	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development	Noted. The Council feel that the provision of 80% of the land as open space does not constitute prudent use of the land. However 0.5 ha (approx 1/3rd) is recommended for open space provision within any development. Form of open space to be agreed in conjunction with the local community.
A0294	Mr Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Observations - 80% should be open space	

A0648	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that the open space provided be enhanced for biodiversity.	
Land west of Station Road and Enterprise Way, Edenbridge (Core Strategy Reserve Site for Housing)				
A050	Mr and Mrs T Anderson		Object - Overlooking - Infrastructure provision	Core Strategy considered the inclusion of this land as a strategic reserve site to come forward in the latter part of the Core Strategy period, and only in the event that the Council cannot demonstrate a clear supply of housing land. The decision and approach was found sound by the independent Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. The ADM Plan seeks to define the detailed boundary only. Noted
A052	Mr Paul Glenister	Easistore Self Storage	Support	
A070	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	
A0176	Ms C Lane	Edenbridge Town Council	Supports with condition; - Recommends that the word 'main' be included to the allocation criteria, which states Access will be from Enterprise Way.	
A0448	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - Outside waste water supply boundary	
A0479	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy	Does the site map exclude the area in Flood Zone 3?	
A0490	Galiford Try Strategic Lane	Galiford Try Strategic Land	Object - Client's land should be released before Reserve Land - 20% of site Land west of Station Road and Enterprise Way is in level 3 flood zone - Hilders Lane more suitable for development	
A0567	Cooper Estates Limited		Support with Conditions - Delete "Access will be from Enterprise Way" - Should be released "when required"	
New Ash Green Village Centre, New Ash Green				
A016		Gableholt Ltd	Support with Conditions - Regeneration must be commercially Viable - Will require public funding	Noted. Allocation references housing enabling regeneration scheme.
A035	Mr Cameron Clark	Chairman Chapel Wood Residents' Society	Support with Conditions - Sufficient car parking to be maintained	Noted. Parking to be incorporated in redevelopment scheme.

		Limited		
A044	Mr A Dari		Object - current business leaseholder	Land ownership and agreements outside the scope of the Council's control.
A079	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	
A0149	K Kpinar		Object No regeneration	
A0197	Mrs Stella Kemp		Support - Overhaul and clean up all of the village centre - improve bus services - Reconsider residential element	
A0313	Mr S Richardson	Friends of the New Ash Green Centre	Object - Density too high - Alternative sites for development - No housing in centre - Parking	Residential element seen as a key enabler to make regeneration proposal viable. Boundary extended to enable greater flexibility in the development of proposals for the site, but this does not mean that all the buildings will be included in the redevelopment scheme.
A0375	Mr S Richardson	Friends of the New Ash Green Centre	Object - Further housing in central area - reduction of commercial/employment - parking	
A0376	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council	Observation -Badger Pub and Village hall unlikely to be available so density should be decreased.	
A0457	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - Outside waste water supply boundary	Noted Noted
Police Station, Morewood Close, Sevenoaks				
A058	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted Site now has planning permission and therefore has been removed from the allocations document.
A0436	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development	The sites historic use as allotments was lost to development many years ago. Not appropriate to return an urban edge of centre site back to allotments.

A0495	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observation - Site requires FRA	Noted
A0536	Mr Tom Brown		Support - Greater Density due to location to infrastructure and facilities	
A0272	Ms Sheila Campbell		Object - Land should be returned to allotments	
A0655	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -Site to be surveyed for protected species	
Post Office/BT Exchange, South Park, Sevenoaks				
A0112	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0394	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object -map is inaccurate as part of car park is leased to Sevenoaks Town Council	Noted. Boundary revised to exclude car park area.
A0578	Royal Mail Properties		Support - designation of the Post Office/BT Exchange as an area of opportunity - Clarification of replacement car parking - Request frontage to be designated a secondary retail frontage	London Road is designated as secondary retail frontage. South Park is not considered to have sufficient existing A1 (retail) uses to be designated as a secondary retail frontage. Post office section no longer promoted.
Sevenoaks Gasholder Station, Cramptons Road, Sevenoaks				
A06	Julie White		Support with conditions: - Access to be via Otford Road due to congestion on Cramptons Road	SDC sought detailed comments from Kent Highways through the consultation process. KCC Highways advised that access via Cramptons Road would be acceptable for a development of the quantum proposed.
A012	Mrs K.M.F Reeves		Object - Already too much development in area - Congestion problems	
A022	Mr David Knight		Support the redevelopment	Noted
A059	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning	Noted

		KCC Heritage Conservation Group	approval.	
A0125	Mrs Ludlow		Object	Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit and as such this would not be sufficient basis to stop new development. The Developer Contributions policy in the Core Strategy will allow contributions to be sought towards education provision and other social infrastructure if required. Gas storage facility is not in operation and is being promoted for redevelopment. The Core Strategy has an adopted policy with regards to affordable housing provision. Noted. The Council consider the site unsuitable for open space provision. Housing to be prioritised on brownfield, previously developed land. Observations noted.
A0142	Mr Terry Payne		- infrastructure provision - Traffic and Pollution	
A0163	Mr Trevor Dann		- WKCS and Fort Halstead cover housing requirement	
A0259	Mr W Codling		- Excess Pollution	
A0268	Mrs A Earthrowl		- Highways requirements - School capacity	
A0283	Mr Clay		- Storm-water drainage	
A0352	Mr Tim Brooks		- Traffic - Loss of Gas Storage	
A0357	South East Water	South East Water	- Properties should be low in height - Traffic-calming measures to be installed - Air Quality - No social housing, ok to part buy, part rent Observations - Support use of former employment sites for residential development	
A0392	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object - Land should be used as open space	
A0401	Mr & Mrs Galvin		Observation - keep existing conifers - parking is problematic - keep social housing to 10%.	
A0437	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations: - Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development	
A0478	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy	The site is within 500 metres of a SSSI . Consideration to be given to space for biodiversity in any development.	
A0516	Mr & Mrs Simmons		Support with conditions - preferable over Cramptons Road Waterworks Site - Site to be accessed via Otford Road not Cramptons Road.	
Sevenoaks School, Land at Oak Lane & Hoptarden Lane, Sevenoaks				

A025	Ms Lisa Stewart		Support with conditions subject to - Retention of existing building - Density being consistent with area	SDC sought detailed comments from Kent Highways through the consultation process. KCC Highways advised that existing access to the Sevenoaks School site on Oak Lane has low visibility and that an improved access is required. It was also confirmed that access to the southern part of the site onto Grassy Lane could be achieved.
A027	Mr Graham Stewart			
A031	Mr Geoffery alton		Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. - Object	The conversion of the existing building into apartments or a replacement block of similar size and nature is proposed.
A060	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group		
A0129	Mr Graham Boon		- Too many dwellings - Housing target too high - water shortages - High Density - Infrastructure - Congestion	Core Strategy housing provision is adopted and is not an upper limit and as such this would not be sufficient basis to stop new development.
A0131	Mr David Glennie			
A0133	Ms Paula Burns		- Drainage and surface water runoff - land borders conservation area - loss of playing field - retain houses if possible - Aboricultural issues - Education provision - Access - Sports/play areas - Transport to London - Safety risk due to absence of pavements - Drainage impact - Biodiversity - Pollution needs to be mitigated	The key features and characteristics of the site and area have been considered and within the potential allocation the importance of appropriate design has been emphasised.
A0135	PB Dravers			
A0137	Mr and Mrs Miller		- How long the Affordable Housing will be retained - fields could be designated for allotments - should prevent schools from selling off playing fields for housing - Used as Community Playing Fields -Greenfield not brownfield - green infrastructure - Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any	The scale of development proposed is unlikely to cause demonstrable harm in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution or any other adverse environmental impact that would warrant a planning application being refused.
A0139	Ms Jane Affleck			
A0146	Dr and Mrs Stuart and Linda Simpson		- Safety risk due to absence of pavements - Drainage impact - Biodiversity - Pollution needs to be mitigated	The green space is for private and restricted use of the School and can be adequately catered for within the School's main campus. Development on the site to maintain the existing broad balance between built development and open space.
A0161	Mrs Catherine Chan			
A0166	Mr and Mrs AB Vowles		- How long the Affordable Housing will be retained - fields could be designated for allotments - should prevent schools from selling off playing fields for housing - Used as Community Playing Fields -Greenfield not brownfield - green infrastructure - Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any	The consultation suggested a low density development (25dph) which at the time of consultation was below the Governments minimum density. Following the consultation the proposed allocation for the site has been amended and the number of units to be created reduced in order to reflect the site constraints. The Council do not therefore consider the allocation to be overdevelopment.
A0187	Mr and Mrs Horton			
A0216	Mr Graham Boon		- Outside water supply boundary - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any	No infrastructure service provider has identified a concern regarding the proposal.
A0228	Mrs Barbara Gibbs			
A0237	Mr Mike John			
A0240	Patrick FitzGerald			
A0242	Ms Sheila Campbell			
A0244	Sir Michael Harrison	Chairman Sevenoaks		

		Conservation Council	development Observation -Trees be retained and grassland and tree corridor created..	No Kent County Council drainage concerns have been raised regarding the proposal. Tree concerns are noted. The proposed allocation will ensure TPO trees are retained and protected. The Developer Contributions policy in the Core Strategy will allow contributions to be sought towards education provision and other social infrastructure if required. Desire for allotments is noted. The green space is for private and restricted use of the School and can be adequately catered for within the School's main campus. Development on the site to maintain the existing broad balance between built development and open space. The Core Strategy has an adopted policy with regards to affordable housing provision. Greenfield land status is not an absolute constraint. Notwithstanding this the Council has prioritised the majority of its new housing provision on brownfield sites. The appeal decision referred to relates to redevelopment of single residential unit and is not directly relevant to this site.
A0247	Sir Michael Harrison	Chairman Sevenoaks Conservation Council		
A0274	Ms Sheila Campbell			
A0281	Mr & Mrs Ian Webb			
A0298	Mrs Helen Plestis			
A0361	Mr David Wigg			
A0379	Mr Julian Scott			
A0393	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council		
A0399	Mr & Mrs Williams			
A0405	Mr Geoffery Dalton			
A0423	Cllr Mrs Avril Hunter			
A0438	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property		
A0506	Becky Penty	South East Region Sport England		
A0519	Mr D Richardson	Vice Chairman Hop Garden lane residents Association		
A0524	Ms Jane Affleck			
A0539	Mr and Mrs Jackson			
A0543	Ashley and Amanda Mackenzie		No concerns have been raised by statutory consultees with regards to flooding. Flood Zone 1.	

A0544	Mr and Mrs Henderson			
A0546	Mr S J Valiant			
A0553	Mr David Glennie			
A0555	David and Violaine Townsend			
A0561	Ellen and Tamim Saleh	Grassy Lane Residents Action Group		
A0562	Mr Alan Senior			
A0563	Mr Nick Osler			
A0568	Dr and Mrs Simpson			
A0571	Ms Paula Burns			
A0592	Mr and Mrs Richardson			
A0595	Mr Graham Footitt			
A0601	Mr and Mrs Langford			
A0602	Mr and Mrs Saleh			
A0603	Mr and Mrs C Penney			
A0606	Mr and Mrs P Dowding			
A0608	Oak Lane Residents Association			
A0610	Mr and Mrs Lewis-Davies			
A0611	Mr and Mrs Cobban			
A0613	Mr T W Craddock			

A0616	Mr Daron Pearce			
A0618	Mr and Mrs O'Sullivan			
A0620	WP and SA Sellers			
A0627	Peter Kernan and Maria Lemos			
A0629	Mr Vincent Geake			
A0631	FA and PC Catterall			
A0632	Mr and Mrs Maxwell			
A0634	Philip and Sarah Brown			
A0636	Mr Paul Nash			
A0640	Mr & Mrs D Wheatley			
A0643	Mr & Mrs T Gillett			
A0646	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust		
A0483	Sevenoaks School Foundation		Support Part of planned management of the school estate	Noted.
St Bartholomew's Hospital Laundry, Bonney Way, Swanley				
A068	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which has been dealt with in the past through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted. Site now redeveloped.
A0446	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - Water supply: a mains extension will probably be required - Thames Water does not have any waste water infrastructure serving this site	

Swanley Centre, Nightingale Way, Swanley				
A069	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
A0447	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - No infrastructure concerns regarding water supply - May be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine impact of development	
A0657	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation - recommends that the design contains a fully integrated Green Infrastructure.	
Swanley Town Centre Regeneration Area				
A0113	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group Environment and Waste	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0234	Mr Nigel Sivyer		Support with Conditions - Inclusion of Bathstore Building in Town Centre regeneration	Noted. The Bathstore building is a recent redevelopment and is outside of the ownership of the main regeneration area.
A0297	Mr Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Object - Town centre should not include a Hotel - Potential for no development to take place	No hotel is proposed through the existing allocation. Hotel has recently been developed on the former Déjà vu site. The Council considers that the current centre is under-performing and requires a positive regeneration proposal, in line with the communities desire for better town centre facilities and shopping.
United House, Goldsel Rd, Swanley				
A03	Mr Francis Patrick		- Flood risk to neighbours due to surface water run off	Noted.
A040	Mr Kevin Searles		Support with Conditions - Object to any retail provision being included - No direct access to High Firs estate	Site now proposed for mixed use including residential development Main access can not be re-routed due to site constraints. Development to consider potential for pedestrian/bicycle access along alternative routes.
A062	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	
A0310	A F		Support with conditions:	

	Webb		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current use unpleasant for neighbours - Re-route access - Time limited operations - Consideration of building height 	<p>Building heights to be considered at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Capacity increased as a result of evidence presented by the land owner to show how key constraints have been overcome.</p> <p>Noted</p>
A0440	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	<p>Observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thames Water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development 	
A0596 A0599 A0600	United House		<p>Support with conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - net capacity should be increased to at least 300 <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Density of 75dph Object - site area should be 3.45ha 	
A0656	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	<p>Observation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommend retention of the tree lines along the boundary - constrained land could be used as semi natural open space 	
West Kent Cold Store, Rye Lane, Dunton Green				
A053	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which has been dealt with in the past through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	The site is now under construction and as such allocation no longer required.
A0422		Berkeley Homes (Captial) Plc	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Subject to clarity on affordable housing viability - Subject to phasing of the site 	
A0431	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	<p>Observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outside water supply boundary - May be necessary to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development 	
A0492	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flood Zone 3 adjoins site - risk of surface water flooding - risk of contamination 	
A0654	Miss Debbie	Conservation Officer,	Supports following negotiations	

	Salmon	Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust		
A05	Mr B Mellstrom	Glen House Estates Ltd	- Continue to promote site.	

ID	Name	Organisation Details	Summary	SDC Response
Bat & Ball Enterprise Centre, Sevenoaks				
A081	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted
A0499	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Site lies within SPZ1 for Cramptons Road abstraction - Possible contamination issues	Noted
A0662	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that a buffer strip be recreated along the corridor.	Noted
A0481	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy	The site is within 500 metres of a SSSI . Consideration to be given to space for biodiversity in any development.	Noted.
Chaucer Business Park, Kemsing				
A0116	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
Edenbridge Trading Centre/Warsop Trading Centre and Leigh Builder's yard, Edenbridge				
A0103	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0191	Mr B Parker		Objection;	Noted.
A0207	Mr		-Unsuitable for employment use;	The Former Leigh's Builders Yard part of the site has planning

	Malcolm Hardy		-Small scale residential development is more appropriate	permission for residential development
A0212 A0213	Mr Lawrence Neil Barry		- Site not connected to Edenbridge Trading Estate, separate road access	
A0223	Ms Lane	Edenbridge Town Council	- Surrounded by residential properties. - Frontage in Edenbridge Conservation Area - traffic and noise	
A0224	Mr and Mrs D Parker		- Unlikely to attract new business - Should be allocated for residential use, supported by Edenbridge Town Council	
A0225 A0226	Mr and Mrs Pecksen			
Erskine House, Oakhill Road, Sevenoaks				
A083	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted
A0664	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that a buffer of trees be incorporated into the design to safeguard the woodland adjacent to the railway corridor.	
Fort Halstead				
A0119	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Pre-determination assessment should be carried out to clarify whether development of any part of the site is possible.	Noted
A0512	Mr Gordon Plumb	Badgers Mount Residents Association	Observation -No mention of Fort Halstead's ability to provide housing	
A0690	Armstrong (Kent) LLP		Observation - Propose Fort Halstead be allocated for housing/mixed use	
Glaxo Smith Kline, Powder Mills, Leigh				
A0117	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted.

		Conservation Group		
A0482	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy	This site is within 500 metres of a Local Wildlife Site . Consideration to be given inclusion of natural and semi-natural green space within any development to allow for biodiversity.	
Goldsel Road, Swanley				
A092	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
Hardy's Yard, Riverhead				
A084	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
A0501	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Large part of site is in FZ3a - Flood mitigation measures part of any development	
A0665	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation - recommend that a buffer of trees be incorporated into the design to safeguard the tree belt adjacent to the railway corridor	
High Street, Sevenoaks				
A085	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted
A0395	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object - Map needs to be amended to remove properties from employment site	The objection was based on the inclusion of The Old Library, Manor Villa and The Old Courthouse all of which are in the Conservation Area and The Old Courthouse which is residential. However these buildings represent an important part of the towns employment area, which should be protected. The inclusion of these properties within an employment status would not weaken or undermine their importance in
A0502	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Part of site in Source Protection Zone 3 - Detailed FRA required - Any development must seek to reduce flood risk	

				conservation terms.
Horizon House, Swanley				
A093	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0194		Lenta Properties	Object; -Proposed allocation is too restrictive being solely for B class uses	Noted. The Council feel that sites in existing B Class uses should be protected. Core Strategy Policy SP8 sets out the approach to considering alternative uses.
A0668	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	
Horton Kirby Trading Estate, South Darent				
A0107	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted.
A0508	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Site within Flood Zone 3 - Risk of contamination	Noted.
A0675	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	Noted.
Land at Broom Hill, Swanley				
A013	Mr and Mrs Ball		Object - Only a suitable site for development of single storey residence for single, elderly or disabled, but preference to see conserved as is. - Increased congestion - develop other sites - noise and intrusion - Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning	Noted. Site previously allocated for employment use in the Sevenoaks District Local Plan and established for future allocation through the adopted Core Strategy. The allocation relates to the detail of the allocation over the principle, which is established. The site area is 8.1ha but the Council's draft Development Brief for Broom Hill (1996) proposed that only 4.1ha of the site be developed. The Council's Employment Land Review (2007)
A043	Mr and Mrs Elsdon			
A094	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group		

A0124	Mr and Mrs Ball		approval. - don't need warehouses	<p>found that only this 4.1ha of the site needed to be developed to meet the District's need for employment land to 2026. The Inspector's Report on the Core Strategy supports this conclusion.</p> <p>The characteristics of the site have been reviewed, and the south-eastern side of the site is considered to be the most appropriate location for employment uses, adjacent to the existing commercial uses and the M25 road corridor. The western side of the site is not considered to be suitable for employment uses, due to the proximity of the residential uses on Beechenlea Lane. The topography of the site includes a ridge of higher land which in visual terms is best kept open, and therefore is not suitable for development. The Council has recently commissioned an ELR update (2011), which outlines a different forecast from that presented in the 2007 ELR. Looking at the medium scenario to 2026, there is no requirement for additional office space. In relation to warehousing, there is likely to be a 5.2 ha requirement (which could be largely met by the development of the 4.1ha on this employment allocation) and a reduction in the need for factory space (-2.3ha). Therefore, the allocation has been revised to seek to address what other uses are appropriate on the remainder of the site (4ha). The allocation now includes retention of open space, including the brow of the hill which curves through the site.</p> <p>Detailed design issues to be considered via any planning application.</p> <p>The site is not within the Green Belt.</p>
A0151	Mr J A Manning		- Topography issues	
A0165	Mr and Mrs Bentley		- Increased Congestion and Pollution - Noise and loss of Privacy	
A0210	Mr & Mrs Miles		- Green Belt	
A0263	Mr and Mrs Clements		- Wildlife - Amenity	
A0347	The Wood Family Trust		-Traffic and congestion - Pollution - Overlooking and Privacy - Parking	
A0461	Cooper Estates Limited		Support with Conditions - Plan in document differs from the Local Plan - Original boundary should be retained	
A0572	Mr John Fullagar		Object - The site can be developed for a limited amount of residential development, including affordable social housing.	
A0669	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	-Biodiversity site	
Land east of High Street, Sevenoaks				
A08	Ms Katharine Kendell		Enquiry as to what Interchange facilities meant Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. Car Parking Provision	Noted. This site is no longer proposed for allocation.
A0110	Mr Adam	Archaeological		

	Single	Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
A0155	J M Bamforth		Car parking provision	Noted. This site is no longer proposed for allocation.
London Road, Sevenoaks				
A086	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	On the edge of the Medieval and post-medieval core of Sevenoaks	Noted
A0396	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object - Map needs to be amended to remove some properties from employment site Remove properties from employment area	The highlighted buildings represent an important part of the towns employment area, which should be protected. The inclusion of residential properties within an employment status would not weaken or undermine their importance in conservation terms.
Media House, Swanley				
A095	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
Moreton Industrial Estate, Swanley				
A096	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0670	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -that a corridor of acidic grassland or heathland is recreated	
Morewood Close (outside housing area)				
A087	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted.

A0503	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Site adjacent to area of FZ3a - Detailed FRA required - Development must seek to reduce flood risk	
A0666	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation - recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	
North Downs Business Park, Dunton Green				
A0118	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
Park Road Industrial Estate, Swanley				
A097	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted.
A0671	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	Noted.
Southern Cross Industrial Estate, Swanley				
A098	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. Observation	Noted.
A0672	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	-Recommend a buffer of natural habitat	Noted
South Park, Sevenoaks				
A088	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage	On the edge of the Medieval and post-medieval core of Sevenoaks	Noted.

		Conservation Group		
Station Approach, Edenbridge				
A0104	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval. Observation	Noted. Site now proposed for mixed use development. The Council's Employment Land Review highlighted this as a poor quality employment site. The Council considers a mixed use development would be a more efficient use of the land.
A0674	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	-recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	
Station Road, Edenbridge				
A048	Cllr J Scholey	Edenbridge and District Community Link	- Access for full size HGVs - Current tenants vacating site Object	Noted Protection recommended in Council's Employment Land Review. Council does not see this as an appropriate site for residential development.
A049	Mr Tom Burton		- Mixed use including residential should be encouraged/prioritised	
A0102	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	- Overestimation of current jobs on site - Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	
A0178	Ms C Lane	Edenbridge Town Council	Support with condition - recommends improvements to the Railway bridge over the B2026	
A0505	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Part of site within FZ3 - Mitigation of flood risk - Protection and enhancement of biodiversity Low level archaeology anticipated which has been dealt with in the past through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	
Swanley Library and Information Centre, Swanley				
A099	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted. This site is not considered to be a B class employment site and is no longer proposed for allocation for employment land.
A0296	Mr Christopher	Assistant Town	Observations	Noted. This site is not considered to be a B class employment

	Drake	Clerk Swanley Town Council	- Little Heath development is mixed use	site and is no longer proposed for allocation for employment land.
Swanley Town Centre Regeneration Area				
A0113	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group Environment and Waste	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0234	Mr Nigel Sivyer		Support with Conditions - Inclusion of Bathstore Building in Town Centre regeneration	Noted. The Bathstore building is a recent redevelopment and is outside of the ownership of the main regeneration area.
A0297	Mr Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Object - Town centre should not include a Hotel - Potential for no development to take place	No hotel is proposed through the existing allocation. Hotel has recently been developed on the former Déjà vu site. The Council considers that the current centre is under-performing and requires a positive regeneration proposal, in line with the communities desire for better town centre facilities and shopping.
Swanley Town Council Offices, Swanley				
A091	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted
Teardrop Industrial Estate, Swanley				
A0100	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted
A0504	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Potential for contamination - Site within SPZ3	Noted.
A0673	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning	Observation -recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	

		Kent Wildlife Trust		
The Technology Centre, Swanley				
A0101	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted.
Tubs Hill House, Tubs Hill, Sevenoaks				
A089	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
Vestry Road, Sevenoaks				
A080	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
A0335	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Otford Parish Council	Vestry Cottages have been incorrectly included on the employment site map	Noted and boundary amended.
A0480	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy	The site is within 500 metres of a SSSI . Consideration to be given to space for biodiversity in any development.	Noted.
A0498	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Site over historic landfill, contamination issues - FRA required	Noted
A0577	Royal Mail Properties		Support identification of Vestry Industrial Estate	Noted.
A0661	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation - recommend that a buffer strip be recreated along the corridor	Noted.
Waitrose, High Street, Sevenoaks				
A0109	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted. Site built out.

		Conservation Group		
Warren Court, Halstead				
A0108	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted. This site is now proposed for a residential redevelopment (in policy H1). Woodland buffer included in allocation.
A0510	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental Agency	Observations - Site close to historic landfill, contamination issues	
A0676	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation - If redevelopment is planned for this site the Trust would recommend that a buffer of woodland be incorporated into the design of the development to buffer and extend Deerleap wood.	
Wested Lane Industrial Estate, Swanley				
A090	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.
A0667	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust	Observation -recommend that a buffer of natural habitat	Noted.
Westerham Trading Centre, Westerham				
A0105	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.	Noted.
West Kingsdown Industrial Estate, West Kingsdown				
A072	Mr Adam Single	Archaeological Officer KCC Heritage Conservation Group	Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval	Noted.

A0450	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property	Observations - Outside water supply boundary - Thames water may need to undertake investigations to determine impact of any development proposed	
-------	------------------	---	--	--

ID	Name	Organisation Details	Agent	Organisation Details	Title	Para No	Summary	SDC Response
Comments on Chapters by paragraph numbers								
A02	Mr Richard Evans	Surrey County Council			The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		Support. Note that allocated sites are small scale.	Noted and support welcomed.
A019	Mrs GM Saunders				The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		Observations - Query on Infrastructure provision to support development	The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule (Appendix 4) which is a live document. SDC developing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule.
A039	Miss Rachael Bust	Coal Authority			The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		No comments	Noted.
A0284		Mccarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	Mr Matthew Shellum	Senior Planning Associate The Planning Bureau Ltd.	Residential Sites		Objection - Allocations document should identify sites which are suitable for extra care provision	Noted. The revised allocations document highlights specific sites that are particularly suitable for extra care provision.
A0360	Mr David Sims	Development Analyst Southern Water			The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		No Comments as majority of sites fall outside of Southern Water's operational area in Sevenoaks.	Noted.
A0491	Hannah Mears	Kent Area Office Environmental			The Allocations Development Plan Document:		Observations - Flood Risk: all sites over 1ha or at risk of flooding need a Flood Risk	Comments noted regarding flood risk, water quality and biodiversity.

		Agency			February 2010		Assessment, development must not increase and preferably reduce risk of flooding elsewhere - Water Quality: seek improvements in all allocations to enable ecological status of affected water bodies to be maintained or improved. Particular water quality issue in Edenbridge - Biodiversity: each allocations should protect and enhance biodiversity	
A0430	Ms Carmelle Bell	Planning Administrator Thames Water Property			The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		Support - No objection to allocations - some sites may have capacity issues - local upgrades of water supply/ or sewerage networks may be required	Noted and support welcomed.
A0560	Ms Angela Parkes	South East England Partnership Board			The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		No substantive comments	Noted.
A0580	Royal Mail Properties		Emma Andrews	Senior Director BNP Paribas Real Estate	Swanley Town Centre - Regeneration Site		Support with Conditions - Amend allocation criteria to acknowledge Delivery Office could be brought forward independently - clarify replacement medical and community facilities	Noted and support welcomed. Allocation has been amended to reference potential phasing of delivery of site and replacement medical facilities.
A0638	CARE Fund Operated by Self Unlimited		Mr Richard Newsome	Principal Planner GVA Grimley	The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		Proposed New Allocations for 1 Phillippines Close Edenbridge. Proposing sheltered or extra care housing.	The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.

A0683	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust			The Allocations Development Plan Document: February 2010		The Trust is concerned that there appears to have been no consideration regarding information needed to create the Green Infrastructure or delivery mechanisms identified to achieve such delivery	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM Plan.
A0621		Lakeview Developments Ltd.	Mr Guy Dixon	Savills (L&P) Ltd.	Paragraph	1.15	Object - Should allocate site for tourism	Noted. Tourism sites have not been allocated although rural tourism is supported in Core Strategy Policy L08.
A0277	Mr Paul Dawson	Ward Homes	Ms Nicky Parsons	DPP	Paragraph	1.21	Object - No village boundary maps - Maps to be included in next version of document - Removal of Halstead Place School site from Green Belt	<p>The updated proposals map will include settlement boundaries for towns and villages, which were previously defined in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Major Developed Sites (MDS) have been identified in the Core Strategy and Halstead Place School is not considered to be an MDS.</p> <p>The list of MDS was reviewed at the time of the last Local Plan, adopted in 2000, and there are no proposals to change this list.</p> <p>This is now a residential site of 29 dwellings on the site of a former school. Residential development is different in character to the examples given of the type of development that could be designated as MDS. Additionally the scale of</p>

								development is not considered sufficient to justify designation.
A0145	Sir John Greenway Bt		Mr T.M.M. Raikes	RH & RW Clutton LLP	Housing	2.	Observations - More development in rural areas	Noted. Core Strategy policy is to direct development to existing settlements and maintain the greenbelt. Limited development of small scale sites for affordable housing in rural areas may be permitted.
A0152	Mr Karl Reynolds				Housing	2.	Observations - Housing built to high standard	Noted and supported.
A0269		Albert Vision Ltd/ AV Produce Ltd	Mrs Jo Tasker		Housing	2.	Observations - Submission of additional site: Riddings Field, Hockenden, Swanley	The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy. The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate.
A0270	Mr Jeremy Butterworth	Open Planning			Housing	2.	Observations - Submission of additional site: Land rear of Pound Cottage, Knockholt	The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green

								<p>belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate. Amendment of the boundary as proposed would allow the principle of development within the currently open garden area altering the character significantly. Would not want to set a precedent for inclusion of adjacent garden land into GB – gradual encroachment of GB.</p>
A0271	Ms Sheila Campbell				Housing	2.	Object: - Sevenoaks has already had too much development	Noted. Core Strategy policy is to direct development to sustainable locations on previously developed land, within existing settlements and maintain the greenbelt.
A0306	Ms Elwyn Jones				Housing	2.	Object - Industrial sites should be retained for future use	Noted. The protection of sites in employment use were recommended through the Council's Employment Land Review. The ADM Plan allocates ELR identified employment/industrial sites

								for retention in employment use (see Core Strategy policy SP8).
A0307	Ms Elwyn Jones				Housing	2.	Object: - affordable housing should be part of existing stock	Noted. Core Strategy Policy SP3 sets the criteria for provision of affordable housing within new housing developments.
A0344	Mr David Taylor-Smith				Housing	2.	Observation -Request involvement in the future process - AONB/Historic Character to be preserved - Must be matched with amenities and infrastructure appropriately	Noted and confirmed on consultation list. Comments noted regarding protection of heritage features and natural environment and this is noted in individual site allocation pro-forma. Comments noted regarding provision of infrastructure.
A0517	Mr Mark Batchelor	Robinson Escott Planning			Housing	2.	Observations - Submission of site for allocation: Warren Court Farm, Knockholt Road, Halstead	This site was previously allocated for employment use in the Sevenoaks District Local Plan (2000) and was carried forward in the 2010 Allocations consultation, which proposed the continued allocation of this site for employment use, as recommended by the Council's ELR. Warren Court Farm is an unusual site in planning policy terms, in that it is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, but it is also an identified employment site with an allocation that allows

								<p>for further employment development. It is the only identified employment site in the district (other than the Major Developed Sites) that is within the Green Belt, and is therefore a historic anomaly.</p> <p>The site is one of five identified in the ELR as being of poor/very poor quality. Warren Court is the only one of the five poor/very poor quality employment sites that has not been redeveloped or re-allocated for residential/mixed-use. The Council's recent ELR update (2011) indicates that there is no requirement for additional office space and a reduction in the need for industrial space (-2.3ha). Therefore, there is not now considered to be a need to continue to safeguard this remaining poor quality employment site.</p> <p>The Council has proposed that this site be reallocated for residential development, with a concurrent amendment of the green belt boundary to bring this site within the village envelope. The recommendation is based on the fact that the revised allocation would result in the regeneration of an existing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

								<p>poor quality commercial site without having an adverse impact upon the character and openness of the Green belt. The level of built development on the site, its location adjacent to the village envelope and its poor environmental quality, combined with the fact that the site is an anomaly being the only allocated employment site in the greenbelt (except for designated Major Developed Sites), all contribute to the exceptional circumstances that justify an amendment to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The land to the north at Deer Leap Stud Farm is a separate site where there is no apparent justification for an amendment to the Green belt boundary or for development for housing.</p>
A0521	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council	Ms Andrews	Ibbett Mosely Surveyors LLP	Housing	2.	<p>Observations - Submission of site for allocation: Land at Greatness Park Cemetery, Seal Road, Sevenoaks</p>	<p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the</p>

								<p>NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate. Cemeteries are also considered to be an important part of the wider Green Infrastructure Network.</p>
A0523		Albert Vision Ltd/ AV Produce Ltd	Mrs Jo Tasker		Housing	2.	Submission of allocation site: Riddings Field, Swanley	<p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate.</p>
A0532	Mr C Baker		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Housing	2.	Site for allocation: Cherry Tree Nurseries, Otford Road	
A0535	Mr Brian Chandler		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Proposed green belt amendment	2.	Site for Allocations: College Road Nurseries, College Road, Hextable	
A0549	St Clere Family Partnership	St Clere Family Partnership	Lee Scott	Smiths Gore	Housing	2.	Submission of site for allocation: Land adjacent to Orchard Cottage, Heaverham	
A0557	Barclay Simpson				Housing	2.	Site put forward for Care Community: Shlaa site 78 (Blackhall lane)	<p>Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for housing</p> <p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core</p>

								<p>Strategy sets out that Green Belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is approx 6.75 hectares. The release from Green belt would result in an urban extension and therefore consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate.</p>
A0377	Ramac Holdings Ltd	Ramac Holdings Ltd	Mr Simon Flisher	The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Proposed green belt amendment		Submission of site: Land at Pedham Place	<p>Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy SP8) identifies new provision for business in Swanley on Greenfield land outside the Green Belt</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.</p> <p>The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly</p>
A0311	Mr Patrick Wharton				Housing - Proposed green belt amendment	2.	Object - Removal of site from Green Belt: Former Orchard at Bradbourne Farmhouse	Whilst surrounded by a degree of existing development, the land in question continues to play a

								<p>role in fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The existing Green belt boundary is clear and well defined along Bradbourne Vale Road and no exception circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.</p> <p>The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
A0518	Mr Mark Batchelor	Robinson Escott Planning			Housing	2.	Observations - Submission of site for allocation: Land West of 5 Mill Lane, Shoreham	The site lies within the village of Shoreham within AONB and CA (although not MGB). Recent appeal refusals related to impact on CA and neighbouring residential amenity. Site to be considered via development control process.
A0467	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy			Housing	2.	Observations - Make clearer which allocations are new and which have planning permission	Noted – this is now clarified in the ADM Plan
A0529	Mr and Mrs K Vizard		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Proposed green belt amendment		Submission of new site allocation: Bartram Farm, Old Otford Road, Sevenoaks	The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to

								the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.
A0534	Mr P Cruickshank		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Housing	2.	Submission of Housing allocation: Land at Park Lane Kemsing	<p>Land to east of Park Lane Kemsing benefits from an outline planning permission SE/08/02245/OUT (<i>expiry April 2012</i>)</p> <p>Land to south of Park Lane Kemsing is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for housing. There is a clearly and well defined Green belt boundary to Park Lane Kemsing and this site does not contain any development that reduces openness or implies that that this site does not uphold the purposes of including land in the Green belt. A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in this instance.</p>
A0550	St Clere Family Partnership	St Clere Family Partnership	Lee Scott	Smiths Gore	Housing	2.	Submission of site for allocation: Land adjacent to the Carpenters Yard, Heaverham	<p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>Heaverham is washed over by</p>
A0551	St Clere Family Partnership	St Clere Family Partnership	Lee Scott	Smiths Gore	Housing	2.	Submission of site for allocation: Land adjacent walnut tree cottages, Heaverham	
A0552	St Clere Family Partnership	St Clere Family Partnership	Lee Scott	Smiths Gore	Housing	2.	Submission of site for allocation: Land adjacent Forge, Heaverham	

								Green Belt and does not have a defined settlement boundary therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate.
A0565	Cooper Estates Limited		Mr Paul Watson	Phillips Planning Services Ltd	Housing	2.	Object - SHLAA 2009 update is not a robust and credible piece of evidence	The SHLAA 2009 update formed part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which was adopted in Feb 2011 and for the ADM Plan.
A0582	Mr Christopher Coomber	Montreal Park Properties Ltd			Housing	2.	Submission of new site for allocation: Land north of Montreal Park Farm, Sevenoaks	<p>Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for housing</p> <p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is of a large and significant size and scale and plays an important role in the separation of settlements between Bessels Green and Sevenoaks. The release from Green belt would result in an urban extension as therefore the consideration as a minor</p>

								GB amendment would not be appropriate.
A0615	Trustees of the Chevening Estate	Trustees of the Chevening Estate	George Back	RH & RW Clutton LLP	Housing	2.	Submission of site for allocation: Land at Chipstead between Westerham Road and A21 slip road.	<p>Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for housing</p> <p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green Belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is approx 4.5 hectares. The release from Green belt would result in an urban extension and therefore consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate.</p>
A0687	Armstrong (Kent) LLP		Mr Christopher Hill	GVA Grimley London Office	Housing	2.	Objection -Fort Halstead should be allocated for housing/mixed use development	<p>Fort Halstead is a Major Developed Site (MDS) in the Green Belt and is covered by Core Strategy policy L08. Core Strategy considered and rejected the inclusion of Fort Halstead as a strategic mixed use development. The decision and approach was found sound by the independent Inspector.</p>

								The Core Strategy notes that MDS form a significant part of the Council's employment land supply and their retention as employment sites will be subject to Core Strategy policy SP8.
A0302	Ms Elwyn Jones				Paragraph	2.1	Object - 3300 is too high	The Core Strategy and SHLAA confirm that the housing provision figure of 3,300 (2006-2026) can be met within existing built up areas Core Strategy housing provision is not an upper limit
A0303	Ms Elwyn Jones				Paragraph	2.2	Object - Too many people	Noted
A0285	Mr David Gamble	Chairman The Sevenoaks Society			Paragraph	2.3	Support preservation of the Green Belt	Noted and support welcomed
A0304	Ms Elwyn Jones				Paragraph	2.4	Object - Infrastructure issues	The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule (Appendix 4) which is a live document. SDC developing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule
A0280	Mr Paul Dawson	Ward Homes	Ms Nicky Parsons	DPP	Paragraph	2.8	Object - Halstead Place School should be a MDS	Major Developed Sites (MDS) have been identified in the Core Strategy and Halstead Place School is not considered to be an MDS The list of MDS was reviewed at the time of the last Local Plan, adopted in 2000, and

								there are no proposals to change this list. This is now a residential site of 29 dwellings on the site of a former school. Residential development is different in character to the examples given of the type of development that could be designated as MDS. Additionally the scale of development is not considered sufficient to justify designation.
A0286	Mr David Gamble	Chairman The Sevenoaks Society			Paragraph	2.8	Support with conditions - ensure that new development will integrate with local character	Noted and support welcomed
A0537	Mr Tom Brown				Paragraph	2.12	Observations - Based on these very low numbers, the ratio of number of units /planning officers in comparison to all LPA's in the UK these numbers seem very low. Fortunately planning is not all about statistics, but good planning specifically requires many new homes to assist in the country's wealth and health.	Comments noted regarding the demand for increased housing.
A0597	United House		Joanne Fox	Planning Potential Ltd	Paragraph	2.15	Object - criteria on site plans not justified	Noted. The criteria listed on the allocations pro forma are guidance to help inform development proposals that will then be considered via the formal planning application process.
A0288	Mr David	Chairman			Paragraph	2.16	Object	The policy on affordable

	Gamble	The Sevenoaks Society					- Target of 40% too high	housing has been set by Core Strategy policy SP3, adopted in February 2011.
A0325	Mr Keogh Caisley	Court Royal Developments	Mr Lee Newlyn	Barton Willmore	Paragraph	2.16	Object -Disagree with sliding scale approach	The policy on affordable housing has been set by Core Strategy policy SP3, adopted in February 2011.
A0329	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Otford Parish Council			Paragraph	2.16	It is not made clear whether the "affordable housing" is for rent or sale.	Affordable housing is defined in Core Strategy glossary and includes social rented and intermediate housing. The affordable housing SPD provides further details on Core Strategy policy SP3 .
A0382	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council			Paragraph	2.16	Support with Conditions - Affordable Housing should be focussed on key workers	Noted. The affordable housing SPD provides further details on Core Strategy policy SP3 on affordable housing.
A0530	Vizard ,Lewis,W Trust, Hills+ Kimble		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Safeguarded and Reserve Land	3.	Land to the east and west of Old Otford Road, Sevenoaks should be safeguarded.	Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for development. The Core Strategy DPD set out land to be 'reserved' for future development needs and established land at Enterprise Way Edenbridge as the most appropriate site.
A0486	Cooper Estates Limited		Mr Paul Watson	Phillips Planning Services Ltd	Safeguarded and Reserve Land	3.	Object - Broom Hill should be allocated as Reserve Land	Noted. Site previously allocated for employment use in the Sevenoaks District Local Plan and established for future allocation through the adopted Core Strategy. The allocation relates to the detail of the allocation over the principle, which is

							established.	
A0154	Jo Connah				Paragraph	3.1	Observations - Housing numbers	Noted
A0158	Jo Connah				Paragraph	3.4 London Rd, Westerham	Object - AONB - Low density	Noted concerns about AONB and density, which have been addressed in the detailed site pro forma.
A0412	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Paragraph		Object - Additional wording to be added regarding the conservation and enhancement of the AONB	The consultation suggested a low density development (25dph) which at the time of consultation was below the Governments minimum density. However the Council feel that anything below this density would not be prudent use of the land. AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it. Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB built into allocation.
A0420	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Paragraph	3.5 Allotments Westerham	Object - Additional wording to be added regarding the conservation and enhancement of the AONB	Noted concern about AONB and conservation, which has been addressed in the detailed site pro forma AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it.

								Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB built into allocation.
A0417	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Paragraph	3.6 Croft Road, Westerham	Object - Additional wording to be added regarding the conservation and enhancement of the AONB	Noted concern about AONB and conservation, which has been addressed in the detailed site pro forma. AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it. Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB built into allocation.
A0373	Mr S Richardson	Friends of the New Ash Green Centre			Employment	4.	Object - No mention of New Ash Green employment facilities	Noted - New Ash Green town centre has been allocated as a mixed use allocation, including employment facilities.
A0378	Ramac Holdings Ltd	Ramac Holdings Ltd	Mr Simon Flisher	Associate The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Employment	4.	Addition of Land East of Hardy's Yard	Land to the east of Hardy's Yard falls within the Green Belt and therefore would not be appropriate to include within an employment designation. The railway forms a clear and recognisable GB boundary. The employment land review demonstrated that employment land needs can be met within existing employment sites.
A0383	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council			Employment	4.	Support with conditions - More Local employment, emphasis on small units	Support noted for local employment sites.

							- disappointed at loss of employment sites to housing allocations	The employment land review demonstrated that employment land needs can be met within existing employment sites provided these are retained.
AO469	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy			Employment	4.	<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - supports sites identified - environmental issues should be defined - distinguish potential site areas available for development within existing employment sites - size of Broom Hill - Intention towards existing non B class uses should clear 	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>All the employment sites (with the exception of Broom Hill, Swanley) are existing employment sites and therefore they are identified for protection.</p> <p>Broom Hill- 4.1ha are identified for employment use in the Council's employment land review</p> <p>This policy is focused on retaining business (B) class uses. Existing uses that do not fall within B use classes will be considered in relation to their community / employment generating functions.</p>
AO688	Armstrong (Kent) LLP		Mr Christopher Hill	Associate GVA Grimley London Office	Employment	4.	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -approach to allocate Fort Halstead for employment uses is not justified/effective. -does not provide flexibility to respond to future changes. -mixed use development, to include additional housing more appropriate. 	<p>Fort Halstead is allocated as a Major Employment Site (MDS) within the Green Belt and is covered by Core Strategy policy LO8.</p> <p>Core Strategy considered and rejected the inclusion of Fort Halstead as a strategic mixed use development. The decision and approach was</p>

								found sound by the independent Inspector. The Core Strategy notes that MDS form a significant part of the Council's employment land supply and their retention as employment sites will be subject to Core Strategy policy SP8.
A0428	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Paragraph	4.7	Observations - For Halstead should not be developed - More focus on the AONB should be made regarding Fort Halstead	Noted Fort Halstead is designated as an Major Employment Site and employment uses will be retained (see above). Reference to AONB included. Core Strategy considered and rejected the inclusion of Fort Halstead as a strategic mixed use development. The decision and approach was found sound by the independent Inspector.
A0174	Ms C Lane	Edenbridge Town Council			Gypsies and Travellers	5.	Observation - recommends Gypsy and Travellers sites should be distributed across Sevenoaks.	Noted - SDC has undertaken a GT local needs assessment and will be consulting separately on provision for gypsies and travellers.
A0365	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council		Gypsies and Travellers	5.	Observation -Barnfield park not to be extended -Permanent sites limited to 8 pitches -Adequate provision of services		
A0471	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy		Gypsies and Travellers	5.	Observations - Disappointed that some site options have not been identified at this stage		
A0590	Mr A		Graham	Graham	Gypsies and	5.	Submission of site for Gypsy and	

	Beaney		Simpkin Planning	Simpkin Planning	Travellers		Traveller allocation: Land adjacent to Brands Hatch Cottages, Fawkham	
A036	Mr Cameron Clark	Chairman Chapel Wood Residents' Society Limited			Paragraph	5.5	Observations - unfair distribution of development - infrastructure provision	
A0172	Ms C Lane	Edenbridge Town Council			Town Centre Development and Regeneration Opportunities	6.	Observation; -Would like the Leathermarket site identified for redevelopment.	Noted. Edenbridge is allocated as a rural service centre. The Leathermarket site falls within the town centre boundary and will be subject to Policy LC3 on Edenbridge Town Centre, which seeks to maintain the balance of shops to other uses .
A0369	Mr James A Bacon	Design and Planning			Town Centre Development and Regeneration Opportunities	6.	Observations - Area around Sevenoaks Rail Station - Bligh's Meadow development - Sevenoaks high street by-pass	Comments noted regarding town centre development. Area around rail station is being improved by Network Rail to address railway station access. Bligh's meadow has been granted planning permission subject to a legal agreement. Responsibility for providing a new Sevenoaks High Street by-pass would rest with Kent County Council or the Highways Agency, as the local and strategic highway authorities. SDC is not aware of any proposal to develop such a

								<p>scheme. Neither Kent County Council or the Highways Agency has suggested that such a scheme is required to support the scale and distribution of development proposed in the Core Strategy. The provision of east facing slips on to the M26 at Sevenoaks would allow the A21 and M26 to be used to bypass Sevenoaks High Street when travelling between the east and the south. This is supported by SDC, subject to a study of the local impacts, as confirmed by Core Strategy Para 5.2.18. However, the Highways Agency's statements to the Core Strategy Examination confirmed that there are currently no plans to develop east facing slips and no likelihood of their development in the near future, given the likely cost and prevailing budget constraints.</p>
AO472	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy			Town Centre Development and Regeneration Opportunities	6.	<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further interpretation of "protected for future development" needed - Position of the library needs to be clear 	<p>Noted – further details provided in ADM Plan under mixed use developments.</p> <p>Land east of High Street, Sevenoaks (including Library) not currently included in allocation as this area considered more of a long-term opportunity.</p>

A0330	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Oxford Parish Council			Paragraph	6.1	Observations - Further explanation needs regarding designations in the Settlement Hierarchy	The settlement hierarchy is set out in Core Strategy policy LO1 – distribution of development.
A0398	Mr P H L Hills	Redleaf Estate Trust	Mrs Jo Tasker		Paragraph	6.1	Observation -Inconsistency between CS and Allocations with regards to the classification of Chiddingstone Causeway.	Chiddingstone Causeway is 'washed over' with the Green Belt and therefore is considered a 'smaller village or hamlet' within the Core Strategy. The settlement hierarchy in the ADM Plan is now consistent with the Core Strategy.
A0419	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Paragraph	6.2	Object - Definition of Village boundaries should be included	The updated proposals maps include settlement boundaries for towns and villages, which were previously defined in the Local Plan.
A037	Mr Cameron Clark	Chairman Chapel Wood Residents' Society Limited			Paragraph	6.9	Support with conditions - small scale employment facilities acceptable	Support noted and welcomed
A0496	Sainsburys	Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	Lucy Neal	WYG Planning and Design	Paragraph	6.10	Observation -Specific policy for existing local centres to promote investment and jobs -Acknowledge Sainsbury's is an existing local centre -Whole area should be re-allocated as a local or district centre -Should seek to make best use of existing land and buildings	The site was previously defined as a Local Centre in the Sevenoaks District Local Plan, however the parameters for defining village and neighbourhood centres has been redefined through the Development Management policy process. The ADM Plan includes policies on neighbourhood

								<p>centres and village centres (LC4). Sainsbury's is not allocated as a local centre as it does not meet the criteria for allocation set out in the policy.</p> <p>District centres are identified as usually comprising a supermarket or superstore and a range of non-retail services, such as banks, building societies and restaurants, as well as local public facilities such as a library. Local centres include 'a range of small shops of a local nature, serving a small catchment'. The Otford Road retail area does not include the range of non-retail uses associated with district centres, and therefore lacks the opportunities for linked trips, and does not fit comfortably with the reference to small shops of a local nature in the definition of local centres.</p> <p>The Council's approach, consistent with national policy, is that town centres should be the preferred location for significant retail developments. Applications for additional retail floorspace in out of town centre retail locations will be determined</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

								in accordance with the NPPF.
A0364	Mr Alan Sterling		Mr Simon Wallis	The London Planning Practice	Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Land North of Pilgrims Oast is considered to no longer provide visual amenity benefit.	Noted. EN9 sites reviewed – please see open space schedule of comments and responses.
A0372	Mr James A Bacon	Design and Planning			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Further sports provision should be provided	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM Plan
A0385	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Need for outdoor sports facilities, accessible open space and allotments - Retain Bradbourne School and Sevenoaks County Primary School for educational, recreational or community purposes.	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM Plan. Existing education sites have not been allocated, but will be protected in line with ADM Plan policy CF1 which clarifies the re-use of redundant school buildings. The Developer Contributions policy in the Core Strategy will allow contributions to be sought towards social infrastructure if required.
A0409	Cllr Keith Loney				Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Sites have EN9 designation - Playing fields should not be built on - should not be converted into allotments	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM Plan.
A0425	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Green Infrastructure is important - Importance of AONB	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on

		AONB Unit						green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM Plan.
A0473	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Must take account of projected growth	Noted
A0509	Becky Penty	Planning Manager - South East Region Sport England			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Support with conditions - Welcome green infrastructure network - request a playing pitch strategy be prepared	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM Plan. This includes outdoor sports facilities.
A0273	Ms Sheila Campbell				Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observations - Return environmental park to allotments	The Sevenoaks environmental park is designated in the Open Spaces Study as a 'park and garden'.
A0531	Mr and Mrs K Vizard		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Allocation of site for Leisure use: Land West of Otford Road	Noted - site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for development.
A0540	Mrs Allison Novell	Polhill Garden Centre	Malcolm Scott		Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Submission of site for allocation: Polhill Garden Centre	Noted – garden centres do not fall into the category of Green Infrastructure.
A0622		Lakeview Developments Ltd.	Mr Guy Dixon	Savills (L&P) Ltd.	Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Object - it should also consider the linked benefits which existing leisure and recreational sites can provide for inward tourism into the district	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM DPD. Tourism sites have not been allocated although rural tourism is supported in Core Strategy Policy L08.
A0644	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observation -Importance of Green Infrastructure	Noted – SDC has subsequently undertaken a separate consultation on

		Kent Wildlife Trust						green infrastructure and open space sites, which are now incorporated in the ADM DPD.
A0660	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observation Employment sites can provide important stepping stones within the Green Infrastructure Network by incorporating green corridors of natural space, green and brown roofs, green balconies and walls and enhancements such as bird and bat boxes.	Noted. The employment sites for protection are largely retained sites rather than new sites, except Broom Hill. GI / Open space provisions built into the Broom Hill allocation.
A0681	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust			Open Space, Sport and Recreation	7.	Observation -concerned that there is no suggested policy wording for the Green Infrastructure	The ADM Plan has been revised to incorporate policies on GI.
A0201	Ms C Allart	Horton Kirby & South Darenth Parish Council			Paragraph	7.2	Support - Need for more allotments	Noted. The Open Spaces Study highlights areas of deficiency in different typologies of open space, including allotments, which are to be addressed by new developments in areas of deficiency .
A0414	Cllr Keith Loney				Paragraph	7.3	Observations - Disagree with comments that the Environment Park should be converted in allotments	The Sevenoaks environmental park is designated in the Open Spaces Study as a 'park and garden'.
A0624		Lakeview Developments Ltd.	Mr Guy Dixon	Savills (L&P) Ltd.	Paragraph	7.3	Support with conditions - should be policy support for the diversification of these facilities to provide for local tourism where possible	Support welcomed. Tourism sites have not been allocated although rural tourism is supported in Core Strategy Policy L08.
A0470	Dr A Rowe	Commodore Chipstead Sailing Club			Paragraph	7.4	Observation -Proposed allocation of the sailing club -In accordance with PPG17 guidance	Tourism sites have not been allocated although rural tourism is supported in Core Strategy Policy L08.

A0625		Lakeview Developments Ltd.	Mr Guy Dixon	Savills (L&P) Ltd.	Paragraph	7.4	Object - we propose that the land at Longford Lake occupied by Chipstead Sailing Club should be identified as an important outdoor recreation, community and tourist resource	Tourism sites have not been allocated although rural tourism is supported in Core Strategy Policy L08.
A0362	Mr J.L Phillips	Planning Department, Council Offices Tandridge District Council			Transport and Traffic	8.	Observation - The installation of east facing slip roads at junction 5 of the M25 could provide considerable capacity relief for the A25.	The principle of east facing slips on to the M26 or M25 at or near M25 junction 5 is supported by SDC, subject to a study of the local impacts, as confirmed by Core Strategy Para 5.2.18. The Highways Agency's statements to the Core Strategy Examination confirmed that there are currently no plans to develop east facing slips and no likelihood of their development in the near future, given the likely cost and prevailing budget constraints.
A0367	Mr James A Bacon	Design and Planning			Transport and Traffic	8.	Observations - Cycling Provision - New road from Wrotham Heath to Westerham	Kent County Council have prepared a Cycling Strategy for Sevenoaks District, with support from SDC. This sets out proposals to improve cycling infrastructure in the District. Responsibility for providing a new road between Wrotham Heath and Westerham would rest with Kent County Council or the Highways Agency, as the local and strategic

								highway authorities. SDC is not aware of any proposal to develop such a scheme. Neither Kent County Council or the Highways Agency has suggested that such a scheme is required to support the scale and distribution of development proposed in the Core Strategy.
AO474	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy			Transport and Traffic	8.	Observations - possible local traffic issues relating to development of the West Kent Cold Store and Broom Hill site - no other transport related issues within the District which will require a land allocation.	West Kent Cold Store Site has planning permission and is now in construction. Para 4.3.13 of the Core Strategy refers to the need for a transport assessment to confirm that the development of the Broom Hill site is acceptable in transport terms. It also sets out potential mitigation measures.
AO427	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Transport and Traffic	8.	Support - Provision for cycling and pedestrians - Specific projects should be proposed through the DPD	Support noted and welcomed. Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's support for schemes to improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Kent County Council have prepared a Cycling Strategy for Sevenoaks District, with support from SDC. This sets out proposals to improve cycling infrastructure in the District. In the short term, SDC and KCC are working with Network Rail to increase cycling provision at

								<p>Sevenoaks and Swanley Stations.</p> <p>Specific transport improvement projects will be allocated in the Plan where there is a need for additional land to be allocated and where there is a realistic possibility of the scheme being implemented.</p>
A0386	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council			Transport and Traffic	8.	<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of reliable circular buses - Cycling provision - Additional parking at Station 	<p>Comments noted regarding public transport, cycling and station car parking.</p> <p>The provision of bus services are the responsibility of commercial operators and Kent County Council. Where necessary to make development acceptable, contributions towards improved bus services may be secured through developer contributions.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule (Appendix 4) which is a live document. Under transport, it notes improving walking and cycling routes, expanding the station car park (subject to a needs case). Kent County Council have prepared a Cycling Strategy for Sevenoaks District, with support from</p>

								SDC. This sets out proposals to improve cycling infrastructure in the District.
A0541	Mr Tom Brown				Transport and Traffic	8.	<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only towns with high population have sustainable bus and train services - Curtailing rural economies is counterproductive - More park and ride rather than town centre parking - Off road Cycleways - Strategic cycle maps are a must 	<p>Comment regarding public transport noted.</p> <p>Park and ride was previously considered for Sevenoaks, but the town does not currently have the critical mass of traffic to support such a scheme</p> <p>The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule (Appendix 4) which is a live document. Under transport, it notes improving cycling routes. Kent County Council are preparing a Cycling Strategy for Sevenoaks District, with support from SDC. This will set out proposals to improve cycling infrastructure in the District. It is hoped that this will lead to the production of cycle maps.</p>
A0682	Miss Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer, Policy and Planning Kent Wildlife Trust			Transport and Traffic	8.	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Habitat enhancement in the form of grassland verges or hedgerows should be incorporated 	Comments noted
A038	Mr Cameron Clark	Chairman Chapel Wood Residents' Society Limited			Paragraph	8.2	<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport routes and links to be considered. 	Comments noted

A0290	Mr David Gamble	Chairman The Sevenoaks Society			Paragraph	8.2	The requirement for east facing slip roads at Junction 5 on the M25 which would relieve traffic from the A25 should be included.	The principle of east facing slips on to the M26 or M25 at or near M25 junction 5 is supported by SDC, subject to a study of the local impacts, as confirmed by Core Strategy Para 5.2.18. The Highways Agency's statements to the Core Strategy Examination confirmed that there are currently no plans to develop east facing slips and no likelihood of their development in the near future, given the likely cost and prevailing budget constraints.
A0175	Ms C Lane	Edenbridge Town Council			Paragraph	8.3	Observation; -Would like improvements to Railway bridge over B2026	SDC would support any proposal to reduce the likelihood of HGVs getting stuck under the railway bridge over the B2026. However, Kent County Council, as the local transport authority, has not suggested that this improvement is required to support the scale of development proposed for Edenbridge in the Core Strategy. SDC are not aware of any current proposals from KCC and/or Network Rail to improve this bridge crossing.
A0387	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council			Other Issues	9.	The Town Council supports the retention of the Green Belt and the protection of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Support welcomed.
A0291	Mr David	Chairman			Paragraph	9.3	Support	Support welcomed.

	Gamble	The Sevenoaks Society						
A0331	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Oxford Parish Council			Paragraph	9.3	Support no change to Green Belt	Support welcomed.
A0370	Mr James A Bacon	Design and Planning			Paragraph	9.3	Observations - smallholdings and local food production should be encouraged - protect and preserve the Green Belt	Comments noted. Certain uses are not inappropriate in the green belt which includes buildings for the purposes of agriculture and forestry.
A0475	Katherine Dove	KCC Planning Policy			Paragraph	9.3	Support - Maintenance of Green Belt - Minor alterations to boundary may be necessary	Support welcomed.
A0511	Mr James Millard	Stratford Pears (Property Ltd)	Mr Mark Batchelor	Robinson Escott Planning	Paragraph	9.3	Observations - Alteration of Green Belt boundary in Brasted.	The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF. Whilst the existing Green belt boundary is not defined by physical features, it is clear where the built part of Brasted ends and the open Green Belt begins. Amendment of the boundary as proposed would allow the principle of development within the currently open area altering the character significantly. No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.

								The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.
A0522	Mr Thomas Rand		Ms J Andrews	Ibbett Mosely Surveyors LLP	Paragraph	9.3	Observations - Minor amendment to the Green Belt in Eynsford	<p>The proposed change has repeatedly been considered through Development Plan reviews and has been rejected by the Inspector.</p> <p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.</p> <p>The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
A0527	Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Limited			Paragraph	9.3	Support review of the anomalies which clearly exist with GB boundaries.	Comments noted
A0528	Mr and Mrs K Vizard		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Paragraph	9.3	Remove site from GB: Bartram Farm, Old Otford Road, Sevenoaks	The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.

A0533	Mr P Cruickshank		Mr Adrian Standing	Ark Projects Ltd	Paragraph	9.3	Amendment to GB Boundary: Land at Park Lane Kemsing	<p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>There is a clearly and well defined Green belt boundary to Park Lane Kemsing and this site does not contain any development that reduces openness or implies that that this site does not uphold the purposes of including land in the Green belt. A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in this instance.</p>
A0584	Mr A Lee and Ms Ackleton		Graham Simpkin Planning	Graham Simpkin Planning	Paragraph	9.3	Submission of site allocation: Five Ways Nursery, Swanley Lane, Swanley	<p>The site is a redundant nursery.</p> <p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in THE NPPF, providing a Green Wedge between Swanley and Hextable. The separation between the two settlements is narrow at this point.</p> <p>A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in</p>

								this instance.
A0585	Messrs Auston, Warman and Mrs Mofrat		Graham Simpkin Planning	Graham Simpkin Planning	Paragraph	9.3	Submission of site allocation: Land to the West of Manor Lane, Hartley	<p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The existing Green belt boundary is defined by physical features.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.</p> <p>The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
A0586	Beechcroft Farm Re'ment Benefit Fund		Graham Simpkin Planning	Graham Simpkin Planning	Paragraph	9.3	Submission of site allocation: Beechcroft Farm, New Ash Green	<p>The land in question is a commercial site located outside the confines of the built settlement. The site was promoted and rejected as a Major Developed Site in the Green belt through the Core Strategy Examination process.</p> <p>Whilst the site contains built development, it provides important rural business accommodation of a fairly small scale. If removed from the Green belt the site may become significantly redeveloped, which would have a demonstrable negative impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.</p>

A0587	PM Group		Graham Simpkin Planning	Graham Simpkin Planning	Paragraph	9.3	Submission of site allocation: Former Biffa landfill site - High Street Seal	<p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The existing Green belt boundary is defined by physical features as defined by the NPPF.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.</p> <p>The change is of a significant scale and the site forms an important separation between the settlements of Sevenoaks and Seal and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
A0588	Mr C Turvey		Graham Simpkin Planning	Graham Simpkin Planning	Paragraph	9.3	Submission of site allocation: Land at Fairby Lane, Hartley	<p>The properties proposed for removal from the Green belt are very large detached dwellings with long rear gardens of a type typically found in open countryside and that pre-date planning. The settlement boundary is drawn tightly around the more urban development form, which appears to be appropriate and well defined.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the land in question continues to play a role in</p>

								<p>fulfilling the objectives of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary.</p> <p>The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
A0426	Mrs Gill Bell	Office Manager Kent Downs AONB Unit			Paragraph	9.4	Object - Additional wording to be added regarding the conservation and enhancement of the AONB	<p>The wording states that any new development must enhance and protect the character of the AONB.</p> <p>AONB designation is an important consideration in respect to the design and form of redevelopment but does not act as an absolute constraint to preclude it. Protection against unacceptable impact on AONB built into allocation.</p>
A0267	Mrs A Earthrowl				Paragraph	9.5	Object - Need to provide sufficient infrastructure	<p>The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule (Appendix 4) which is a live document. SDC preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule.</p>
A0388	Mrs Ann White	Sevenoaks Town Council			Paragraph	9.5	The Town Council urges that the necessary improved infrastructure is provided prior to any large scale developments being granted planning permission	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>

								Schedule (Appendix 4) which is a live document. SDC preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule.
A0589	F.C. Stark Ltd		Graham Simpkin Planning	Graham Simpkin Planning	Paragraph	9.5	Submission of site allocations for social infrastructure: Park Farm, Otford Land at Downs Valley, Hartley	Sites have been proposed by consultee for extra care housing / nursing home / educational facilities. Sites are in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for housing / development.
A0292	Mr David Gamble	Chairman The Sevenoaks Society			Paragraph	9.6	New developments should be aiming for the highest level of sustainability that is currently possible.	Comments noted.
A0214	Ms T Godden	Dunton Green Parish Council			Summary of Allocations by Settlement	11.	Observations - Fort Halstead. The old fort itself and a large proportion of the site are located within the parish of Dunton Green.	Noted
A0332	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Otford Parish Council			Summary of Allocations by Settlement	11 Moat cottage Otford	Object - Ancient Monument site - Access	Noted. The site has been removed and is no longer being considered for allocation due to the constraints at the site.
A0371	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council			Summary of Allocations by Settlement	11.New Ash Green	Observation A footnote stating 50 units refers to regeneration.	Comments noted. Housing is seen as enabling development.
A0374	Mr S Richardson	Friends of the New Ash Green Centre		Summary of Allocations by Settlement	Observations - Insert footnote that 50 dwelling units in New Ash Green are only part of a regeneration scheme			
A0333	Parish Clerk Barbara Darby	Otford Parish Council			Glossary	12.	Add Ancient Monument sites to list	Noted, now included.

APPENDIX 9 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATIONS

Development Management Policies consultation May – August 2011 –

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
<u>GENERAL COMMENTS</u>					
DM187	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	Polices should be worded in a positive way to follow the Government's approach set out within the Draft National Planning Policy Framework	Noted. The document has been reviewed in light of the publication of the draft NPPF to further reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
DM211	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	There is a lack of specific measures regarding safeguarding air quality, development from flooding and the provision of cycle ways to Sevenoaks station.	<p>Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy already sets out the SDC policy approach to air quality.</p> <p>In relation to flooding, guidance is set out within the NPPF. Cycle routes are references in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan and SDC is currently consulting on a Cycle Strategy.</p>
DM272	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>Nothing about new technologies, such as masts, dishes, antennae, solar panels or wind turbines. These are specific enough to require individual consideration or retention of village amenities other than shops, e.g. car parks and community halls etc. which again require specific consideration.</p> <p>No general consideration of expansion of commercial activities in the GB.</p> <p>No policy reference to housing. For example, is the council looking at use of flats over high street business premises in urban areas?</p>	<p>New energy technologies are supported in Core Strategy Policy SP 2 (Sustainable Development/Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy Generation).</p> <p>Protection of services and facilities in rural settlements covered in Core Strategy policy LO7.</p> <p>The NPPF provides guidance in relation to commercial activities in the GB.</p> <p>Housing is covered in chapter three. The conversion of flats above retail is supported provided it does not prejudice the operation of the retail unit – see town and local centre policies LC1-4.</p>

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM281	James Tagg		Object to approach or wording	Criticism of the consultation process	Noted.
DM303	Philip Jameson	Thames Water Property	Object to approach or wording	Suggest new policy and supporting text dealing with water and sewerage infrastructure capacity.	Noted. Water/Sewage infrastructure issues to be considered through the planning application process. Core Strategy Policy SP9 'supports the development of infrastructure facilities required to resolve existing deficiencies or to support the scale and distribution of development proposed in the Core Strategy'. Utilities companies have been given the opportunity to consider the infrastructure needed to support potential allocations through the early consultation on the Allocations DPD (Options).
DM383	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Object to approach or wording	Greater importance to be placed on AONBs	Strategic policies related to protection on AONB located in Core Strategy – see policies L01 and L08.
DM402	Sarah Harrison	Southern Water	Object to approach or wording	Policy Omission Propose; Wastewater Infrastructure Provision New development will be permitted provided the wastewater infrastructure required to serve it is either available, or can be provided in time to serve it.	Noted. Water/Sewage infrastructure issues to be considered through the planning application process. Core Strategy Policy SP9 'supports the development of infrastructure facilities required to resolve existing deficiencies or to support the scale and distribution of development proposed in the Core Strategy'. Utilities companies have been given the opportunity to consider the infrastructure needed to support potential allocations through the early consultation on the Allocations DPD (Options).

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM503	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	Appendix 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN1 is also replaced by Policy SC1 • EN9 is replaced by Policies GRN1 & GRN2 • EN26 is also replaced by Policy GRN1 • NR10 is replaced by Policy SC3 not SC2 • H16, H17, H18 & H19 are not replaced by Policy H3 	Noted – Further changes have been made to these policies and the numbering of them since the consultation document was published
DM504	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	The following policies EN34, T8, T9, T10, VP11, EP13 and S4 all remain relevant and should be carried forward into the DPD	Noted. These Local Plan policies are either covered by national policy, county policy, have been carried forward in a different way or are issues that will be considered by the planning application process.
DM6	Karen Jefferys		Support approach subject to changes	Swanley should not be singled out as an area that should become more urbanised (5.6). There should be more benefits required of developers to current locals. Requirements should be enforceable.	The adopted Core Strategy policy is to concentrate sustainable development in the existing settlements. Developers are required to contribute to affordable housing and supporting infrastructure.
DM202	R Freeman	The Theatres Trust	Support approach subject to changes	Glossary would be useful to list the use classes including sui generis designations, for clarity.	Noted and incorporated.
DM313	James Wickham	Chipstead Sailing Club	Support approach subject to changes	Allocations and development management document should take adequate account of the needs of water-based recreational activities	Noted. Section 8 covers leisure and tourism.
DM384	Jennifer	Kent Downs	Support approach	Para 1.16 Add to bullet points • Landscape character	This is not appropriate as this is not covered by the Code for

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
	Bate	AONB	subject to changes		Sustainable Homes .
DM387	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	Would like to see encouragement given to ensuring new development uses renewable sources of energy.	New energy technologies are supported in Core Strategy Policy SP 2 (Sustainable Development/Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy Generation).
DM442	Angela Howells	Clerk Parish Council Westerham	Support approach subject to changes	Given that Westerham town is recorded as such an area, the Parish Council welcomes the requirement that development in areas of poor air quality must incorporate mitigation measures.	Noted and support welcomed.
DM472	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Given the generalised nature of the NPPF, it will be important to consider whether or not more detail is required in the DPD to support the proposed policies. Also, it may necessitate the inclusion of additional policies to cover topics previously dealt with in more detail in the PPGs/PPSs. Ideally, after the NPPF is finalised, an opportunity should be provided to interested parties to suggest what additional detail/policies should be provided before the DPD is finalised.	Noted. The document has been reviewed in light of the publication of the NPPF to further reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development and to incorporate further detail in areas previously covered by PPGs/PPSs.
DM506	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Policies LC1 - 4 do not consider that the policy replaces Local Plan Policy S6 (and neither does Appendix 2). Para 9.29 the Policy referred to should be LC5 not LC6.	Noted and amended. Noted and amended.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM3	Ms Hollingdale	Health and Safety Executive	Support approach	Suggest general statement on major hazard sites. "The Planning Authority has been advised by the Health and Safety Executive of consultation zones for each major hazard site and pipeline. In determining whether or not to grant planning permission for a proposed development within these consultation zones, the Planning Authority will consult the Health and Safety Executive about risks to the proposed development from the major hazards in accordance with Circular 04/00."	Noted. Any impacts in relation to major hazard sites will be dealt with through the planning application process.
DM4 DM8 DM10	Rachael Bust David Lamb	CAA Coal Authority Surrey CC	Support approach	No Specific Comments	Noted.
<u>1 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES & DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES</u>					
DM5	McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles	The Planning Bureau Ltd	Object to approach or wording	The requirements to meet Code Level should be left for the Building regulations	Adopted Core Strategy policy SP2 sets out the Council's requirements in relation to the CSH and BREEAM.
DM48	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Object to approach or wording	It is flawed without reference to require developers to identify how they intend to create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder or the fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.	Noted. Safety and security issues to be considered through the planning application process. Also see Design Principles (Policy EN1).

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				There needs to be a condition on developers that all new developments must comply with ACPO Secured by Design. This would also ensure developments do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion and assist SDC to discharge its responsibilities under the Crime and Disorder Act and PPS1.	
DM150	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	<p>The bullet points should be clarified and emphasis put on the importance of landscape, habitats, biodiversity and access to the natural environment</p> <p>(a) should indicate that “compatibility with location” seeks to ensure that proposals fit well with their landscape setting/context, protect key on-site features and add components that deliver enhancement.</p> <p>(b) should ensure protection and enhancement of the environment, including habitat, access and other networks that link with features around the site.</p>	<p>Noted – The concerns over the wording of the policy are now considered to be sufficiently covered by the following additions</p> <p>b. the layout of the proposed development would respect the topography and character of the site and the surrounding area and sensitively incorporate natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site;</p> <p>e. The proposal would incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential, where possible, and retaining and enhancing Green Infrastructure features including sustainable drainage systems. Proposals that affect a sites existing biodiversity and GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm;</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements are addressed by Policy SP9 of the</p>
DM204	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council		Add: f. the ability of infrastructure such as roads and services to support the development.	
DM275	B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council		Add criterion f. the maintenance of the GB and the enhancing and conserving the AONB designations. This will give added protection to land with GB and AONB status.	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM289	Hobson			Add f. the maintenance of the GB and the enhancing and conserving the AONB designations.	Core Strategy Balanced communities refers to support for communities with a mix of ages, skills and employment, i.e. housing and facilities to support the needs of a diverse community.
DM320	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	The following wording should added to section b of SC1. b. the impact of the proposal on the surrounding environment, and any natural habitats and biodiversity.	
DM385	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB		Add bullet point: The conservation and enhancement of the District's AONBs	
DM246	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council		Point (b) should include more detail. Impacts may include such things as air pollution, water pollution, light pollution, noise pollution, soil erosion and damage to ecology. Point (c) how is "balanced communities" defined?	
DM336	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council		'e' the contribution to the District's economy and employment Recommend a 6th point, along the lines of "Does not place undue strain on existing local infrastructure"	
DM359	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council		Recommended the following objective is included "To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the District including provision of a network of habitat corridors as part of the GI."	
DM360	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County		Support the principles Specific reference could be made to the need to have regard to the conservation and enhancement of	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
		Council		biodiversity/local and national designations.	
DM474	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)		Add "and natural assets" to the end of criterion d); and add a new criterion that recognises the need to maintain the GB.	
DM217 DM137	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Oxford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The meaning of 'a balanced community' should be clarified. Add new criteria "The development should not have an adverse effect upon local homes or the sustainability of local businesses".	Balanced communities refers to support for communities with a mix of ages, skills and employment, with housing and facilities to support the needs of a diverse community. Noted .
DM426	Jennifer Wilson	Environment Agency	Object to approach or wording	The terminology and wording used in this policy is not robust enough.	Noted – amendments incorporated in light of NPPF and additional environmental conservation references.
DM70 DM108 DM301	Christine Lane Tracy Godden Philip Jameson	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Thames Water	Support approach	Support	Support welcomed.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM14	Thomas Rand		Support approach subject to changes	Add an further criteria : Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone. Add wording that development should reflect the Local needs and circumstances of everyone.	Noted.
DM148	John Lister	Natural England	Support approach subject to changes	<p>The following Core Strategy Objectives should be included in para 1.9 as they are relevant to consideration of Development Management issues.</p> <p>To ensure that any infrastructure and service improvements needed to support delivery of Core Strategy objectives and policies or resolve existing deficiencies are brought forward in a co-ordinated and timely manner and that new development makes an appropriate contribution towards any improvements required as a result of new development. (Key Issue 10)</p> <p>To safeguard existing open spaces, sport and recreational facilities that meet community needs and improve provision where necessary. (Key Issue 10)</p> <p>To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the District including provision of a network of habitat corridors as part of the Green Infrastructure Network. (Key Issue 3)</p>	Noted. A summary of the Core Strategy has been added.
DM302	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Further emphasis should be given to promoting the effective use of land, promoting mixed use developments that create more vibrant places, and encouraging multiple benefits from the use of land in urban areas, as set out in the draft NPPF.	Noted. Policy EN1 has been reviewed in light of the publication of the draft NPPF to further reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM332	Armstrong (Kent) LLP	Christopher Hill GVA Grimley	Support approach subject to changes	Policy SC1 and the supporting text should take account of the NPPF and its definition of sustainable development. It should be amended and expanded to reflect these factors with significant weight to be given to the benefits of economic and housing growth.	
DM405	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Add effect on transport, i.e. to enable use of public transport rather than relying on cars. Add 'avoidance of building on flood plain'.	Noted. Impact on infrastructure (including transport) is covered by the Core Strategy Policy SP9. Flooding issues covered by national policy.
DM465	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach subject to changes	Clarity required on tandem development.	Noted. Amenity issues are covered by draft policy EN2.
<u>Policy SC2 Design Principles</u>					
DM1	Bob White	Kent Highway Services	Object to approach or wording	Under General Design Principles there is the opportunity to include post-occupation evaluation alongside Building for Life.	Noted – supporting text includes Building for Life ' and other post-occupation assessments '
DM152	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	Para 1.19 omits the need to seek enhancements, contrary to the CS Objective which refers to “maintain and enhance”. This is particularly important in view of the pressures on habitats and biodiversity arising from a range of factors including: development, recreational and economic use of the countryside & rural fringes, and	Noted. Amended ' protection and enhancement of biodiversity '. Policy EN1 refers to increasing biodiversity potential.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				climate change.	
DM155	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	d should recognise that sites may currently provide walking and cycling routes between communities and a range of facilities and opportunities, including routes to Accessible Natural Green Spaces and the wider countryside. These routes should be protected and/or new opportunities captured.	Noted amended f) The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas; and g) New development should be inclusive and make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access of those with disabilities; and criteria renumbered .
DM206	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	SDC should formulate and use its own parking provision criteria instead of using those of Kent County Council, reflecting the greater emphasis on car usage in Sevenoaks.	SDC currently has no proposals to develop its own parking standards. It is considered that preparation of countywide standards is a more efficient use of resources, given need to collect substantial evidence to support standards.
DM215	Y Tredoux	Kemsing Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Add to last paragraph "Where appropriate proposals should include details and strategies for the effective management and maintenance of sites following their completion" This should enable the Council to ensure that there is no undue delay in carrying out the approved works, leaving the site neat and tidy .	Noted and this is included in the last paragraph.
DM262	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The use of the word "respond" within the policy should be replaced with the word "complement" to be consistent with the term used in para 16 of PPS3.	'Respond' considered to be suitable in this context.
DM304	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Object to approach or wording	A character study should be prepared in support of Policy SC2.	SDC has produced a Residential Character Area for Sevenoaks and will prepare documents for Swanley and Edenbridge.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM337	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>No mention of the effects on local infrastructure. Would like to see “design quality” defined</p> <p>Point d should be amended to read “provide adequate parking facilities of a standard appropriate to the development, which may exceed the standards set by KCC” Welcome further positive action to maintain front gardens with combined parking facilities.</p> <p>Both external and internal ease of access must be considered; all houses designed for “lifetime use” Regret excessive development of “gated communities” Would like to see a clause preventing tandem development</p>	<p>Infrastructure is addressed by Core Strategy policy SP9.</p> <p>Quality design will be design that responds to the listed design criteria.</p> <p>Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment includes guidance in relation to retention of front gardens.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Amenity issues covered by draft policy EN2.</p>
DM361	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>Criterion (b) should be amended to say: “The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site and retain and enhance important Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows, shrubs and established water courses and ponds.”</p> <p>Criterion (e) should be amended to say: “The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential where possible. Proposals that affect a site’s existing biodiversity should be designed in a way that avoids and/or mitigates any potential harm.”</p>	<p>Noted in order to meet these concerns e) has been amended as follows</p> <p>e) The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential where possible, and retaining and enhancing Green Infrastructure features including sustainable drainage systems. Proposals that affect a site’s existing biodiversity or GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm;</p>
DM427	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Object to approach or	<p>Recommend that the following point is reworded as follows: “(b) The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, protect and</p>	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			wording	enhance the Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows and shrubs and any established water courses or ponds”	
DM13 DM15 DM156 DM466	Karen Jefferys Thomas Rand John Lister F Marshall	Natural England The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach	Support e) is welcomed. Emphasis on good design Council should seek specialist advice on design matters.	Noted and support welcomed.
DM49	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommends the following wording changes g) ‘The design of new developments should incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti social behaviour’.</p> <p>Supports d) but would strongly recommend the following: ‘The proposed development should ensure satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provide adequate off road parking facilities for residents and visitors with other appropriate measures to mitigate the risk of obstruction to emergency service vehicles’.</p> <p>Recommend b) is amended to the following: ‘The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, retain important Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows and shrubs, and enhance any established water courses or ponds whilst</p>	<p>Noted in order to meet these concerns h) has been amended as follows</p> <p>h) The design of new developments would result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti social behaviour;</p> <p>Noted. Detailed parking considerations will be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>Flooding is dealt with in national policy and reference is not considered appropriate in this policy on design principles.</p>

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				<p>mitigating the risk of flooding of the site’.</p> <p>Also recommend that the nationally accepted standard for designing out crime and disorder the ACPO Secured by Design, Park Mark and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) initiatives should be complied with, as relevant to the development, and should be incorporated within the policy</p>	Noted. Detailed safety and security considerations will be dealt with through the planning application process.
DM71	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Add the following to b) ‘and enhance any established water courses or ponds’- changes in the flood plain or river basins need very careful consideration; enhancement could have detrimental effects on other areas.</p>	Noted Flooding is dealt with in national policy and reference is not considered appropriate in this policy on design principles.
DM109	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>(d) needs further explanation of what ‘vehicles’. Does this relate to cars or is it supposed to ensure service vehicle access is considered?</p> <p>Add criteria to ensure fire, ambulance / police services have adequate access to a development site.</p>	This covers all vehicular access – cars, servicing vehicles, emergency access etc.
DM154	John Lister	Natural England	Support approach subject to changes	<p>c) should note that there will be cases where buildings and structures house protected species, which should be retained or, in exceptional cases, provision made for the professional and managed relocation of species.</p>	Noted. Detailed ecological issues will be dealt with through the planning application process.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM218 DM138	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Oxford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	'Security' should be clarified that this does not imply approval of 'electric-gating' and high-fencing used to stockade homes. Additional criteria should be added to require clear descriptions of materials and colours to be employed in the completed building which are compatible with near-by buildings. These shall constitute an integral part of the planning application.	Noted. Noted. Detailed issues related to material palette will be dealt with through the planning application process.
DM247	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Point (e) should say '...prevents any potential harm or by exception mitigates'. Tandem development should not be permitted. Landscaping should be incorporated into a design and benefit the environment. Point (d) refers to "adequate parking facilities" - what does adequate mean in this context? It is important that there is sufficient road space to allow safe and easy access for service and emergency vehicles.	Noted e) has been amended “ Proposals that affect a site's existing biodiversity or GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm ” Amenity issues covered by draft policy EN3. Noted. Noted. Detailed parking considerations will be dealt with through the planning application process. Noted – reference to access covers all vehicular access, cars, servicing vehicles, emergency access etc.
DM305	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Consider that some flexibility is required with regards to amenity protections, particularly for sites which seek the reuse of brownfield land where there may be more constraints.	Noted.
DM321	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to	Further wording required to strengthen policy. Should read; b) The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, retain enhance, extend,	Noted. e). has been amended to cover this point

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			changes	<p>connect and recreate important Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows, shrubs, established water courses or ponds and habitats of principal importance. Provision should be made to maintain and increase populations of protected species and species of principal importance;</p> <p>e) The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing and extending biodiversity potential such as corridors and stepping stones of natural habitat and landscape scale enhancement for biodiversity. Proposals that affect a site with existing biodiversity importance should be designed in a way that mitigates any potential harm;</p>	<p>e) The proposal would incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential where possible, while retaining and enhancing Green Infrastructure features. Proposals that affect a site's existing biodiversity or GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm;</p>
DM386	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	<p>b) Add bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for conserving and enhancing the landscape character of the area, for example by attention to boundary treatments, design of accesses streets and lanes, and the design of spaces and GI throughout the site. 	
DM406	Janice Butler		Support approach subject to changes	<p>Ensure balance is maintained between (a) social housing and private houses and (b) mix of sizes, e.g., 2,3,4 or more bed roomed houses, with reference to the Village Design Statement.</p>	
DM419	National	Nathaniel Lichfield &	Support approach	<p>To ensure flexibility in the policy should read</p> <p>b) The layout of the proposed development should respect</p>	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
	Grid	Partners	subject to changes	the topography of the site, retain important Green Infrastructure Network features <i>where appropriate</i> , including trees, hedgerows and shrubs, and enhance any established water courses or ponds;" This revised wording allows for a proper assessment on a site by site basis in respect of the need to retain landscape features.	circumstances cases are made.
DM475	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Add "and important views through the site" to criterion c); Add "so that there is no net loss of biodiversity" to the end of criterion e); and Add Policy H6B to the list of Local Plan policies to be replaced by this policy in Appendix 2.	No private right to a view in planning policy although important public views will be safeguarded. Noted .e) has been amended to address this concern. Noted Appendix Amended.
<u>Policy SC3 Amenity Protection</u>					
DM193	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The use of the term "will only be permitted" and "will be resisted" creates a negative policy. The removal of the word "only" and a rewording of the last sentence would create a positive policy.	Accepted. The policy has been reworded " Proposals will be permitted where they safeguard "
DM403	Sarah Harrison	Southern Water	Object to approach or wording	SC3. suggest the following wording: Development proposals in proximity to existing wastewater facilities will only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupants. The distance between the infrastructure and the development must be sufficient to allow adequate odour dispersion.	Noted. Policy is more general to cover all uses and facilities that might lead to reduced environmental quality.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM407	Janice Butler		Object to approach or wording	More definition is needed with regard to "Excessive" Protection of amenity is basically affected by housing density; definition required and how this differs in towns, villages and in the countryside. Safeguarding open spaces and the GB is part of "Protecting Amenity"	Noted. Acceptable noise levels will differ by use and location and will therefore be considered in detail via the planning application process. Protection of open space covered in design principles policy (EN1).
DM476	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	The final sentence needs to be clarified Policy S6 should be added to the list of Local Plan policies to be replaced by this policy in Appendix 2.	Noted In the interests of clarity the final sentence has been deleted. Noted - Appendix amended.
DM16 DM110 DM139	Mr Rand Tracy Godden Cllr Edwards-Winser	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support approach	Noted and support welcomed.
DM467	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach	Support policy but consider obscure glazing/secure windows unacceptable as a result of bad design	Noted.
DM50	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Recommend the inclusion that the development does not result in increasing crime and disorder. This can be mitigated by developers by incorporating Secured by Design, Park Mark and/or CPTED within the design.	Security issues covered in design principles policy (EN1).

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM72	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	The word 'outlook' is very subjective, clarification is needed over what constitutes a outlook worth preserving.	Noted. Right to a view is not a material consideration in planning. ' outlook ' Removed.
DM248	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The policy mentions "outlook", something that has not been seen in policy before. What does this mean? Does it infer the right to a view?	
DM185	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The wording should include " noxious emissions , dust, vibration light or heat" as in policy NR10 of the saved policies of the SDLP	Air quality is covered by Core Strategy policy SP2 and noise pollution by draft policy EN6.
DM362	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	Should refer specifically to air pollution as this is an important issue in Sevenoaks as it is the District with the most AQMA's in the County.	Add ' air pollution ' between odour and activity. Pollution control issues also covered by national policy (PPS23.)
DM338	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Occupants and future occupants of the development must also be safeguarded. Must be adequate provision for the storage of vehicles and refuse. Clarification on the meaning of 'proposals that introduce uses sensitive to environmental policy'	Noted. The term occupants encompasses future occupants. Noted – parking issues covered in design principles policy (EN1).” Refuse ” has been inserted into EN1.
DM420	National	Nathaniel Lichfield &	Support approach	This amendment is suggested: "Proposals that introduce uses sensitive to poor environmental quality into an area	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
	Grid	Partners	subject to changes	will be resisted unless amenity for future users can be adequately safeguarded, such as through appropriate environmental improvements.”	
DM424	Lorna Talbot	Parish Clerk Seal Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Should refer to the amenity of the future occupiers of the property being developed (it only refers to occupiers of nearby properties).	
DM428	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Support approach subject to changes	The word “resisted” should be replaced by “refused” so that it is clear to the reader what you wish prevented and to also make the policy robust.	
<u>Policy SC4 Reuse of Redundant School Buildings</u>					
DM197	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	<p>This policy requires consideration in relation to its impact on a proposal to relocate a school. A revised policy wording to incorporate consideration of viability in certain circumstances should be considered.</p> <p>This policy should be re worded in a positive way to follow the approach set out within the Draft NPPF.</p>	<p>Not accepted. It will be through the planning application process that exceptions may be considered, if exceptional circumstances cases are made, which could include viability.</p> <p>Accepted. Policy positively reworded – “will only be considered if it is demonstrated by the applicant that there is a identified community need that can be facilitated through the site or that community facilities that meet the identified need are incorporated into a wider missed use scheme”.</p>
DM339	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Care needs to be taken to ensure doesn't undermine the viability of existing community facilities. Opportunities from school facilities There is no provision	<p>Noted – buildings will only be used for community purposes if there is an identified need.</p> <p>Noted – the policy refers to re-using the building or site, so could</p>

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				for buildings which have come to the end of their natural life span.	include the demolition of poor quality buildings.
DM73 DM111	Christine Lane Tracy Godden	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Support noted and welcomed.
DM43	Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	If suitable facilities are nearby then part of any proposals should include a 106 Agreement for funding.	Noted
DM51	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support t approach subject to changes	Have concerns as to the sustainability of such changes of use and, therefore, the robustness of proposed Policy . Many school sites are large with associated playing fields and, therefore, the proposed policy may be counter productive leading to a low take up of the sites by developers resulting in further decay and increased criminality/disorder/anti social behaviour which would have a significant negative impact on local residents and Kent Police business.	Noted. The intention is that the policy promotes the use of these sites for community facilities or mixed use developments that include community facilities.
DM253	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish	Support approach subject to	Re-use of redundant school buildings should allow for use for recreation and sports. How will it be determined that there is no other need taking into consideration changes in population size etc?	Noted. GI2 covers the re-use of playing fields. Applicants will be required to demonstrate that they have assessed need for community facilities (advertising site /

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
		Council	changes	(para 1.28)	publicity / marketing etc.)
DM363	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	The stated policy is too rigid.	Not accepted. There is flexibility in the 2nd para regarding mixed use, residential or commercial uses. Policy amended.
DM140	Cllr Edwards-Winser	Otford Parish Council Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Suggest the addition of - Use re-conversion as potential conversion to apartments for older local residents.	“Proposals for change of use or redevelopment for alternative non community uses will only be considered if it is demonstrated by the applicant that there is no identified community need that can be facilitated through the site, or that community facilities that meet the identified need are incorporated into a wider mixed use scheme. Alternative uses that may be acceptable in this instance, subject being located close to services, include residential care homes or sheltered housing”.
DM219	Brenda Hambrook				
DM408	Janice Butler				
DM477	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	It should better reflect the sequential approach explained in para 1.28. Consequently, acceptable uses for redundant school buildings should be considered in the following order: Community use; then Residential Care/institutions and/or affordable housing; then Employment (B1 uses only); and then General residential (including the normal requirement for affordable housing).	
<u>Policy SC5 Reuse of School Playing Fields</u>					
DM28	Thomas Rand		Object to approach	Add - School playing fields should NOT be sold for any Development other than for Sport or Recreation	Noted The wording has been amended to clarify this point. Please refer to policy GI 2 of the document which has replaced

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			or wording		SC5.
DM135	Gillian King Scott	Clerk Halstead Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Supports re-use of school playing fields for sports and recreational, community activities but believe these redundant school sites should not be used as land for housing.	
DM432	Jennifer Wilson	Environmenta l Agency	Support approach subject to changes	Should be reworded to state: “Where a school playing field becomes available as a result of a school closure it shall be retained as part of Green Infrastructure Network for community sports and recreational uses. Supporting...sports pitch. Proposals for built development on playing fields, other than for essential facilities for outside sport and recreation will be refused.”	
DM432	Jennifer Wilson	Environmenta l Agency	Object to approach or wording	Policy GRN2 does not give KCC flexibility for its changing educational provision across Sevenoaks district.	The requirement for applicants to demonstrate that the school playing fields are surplus to requirements should allow for flexibility.
DM11	Karen Jefferys		Support approach	If there is sufficient consultation.	Noted.
DM89	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish	Support approach	Support.	Noted.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM127	Tracy Godden	Council			
DM169	Cllr Edwards-Winser	Sevenoaks Town Council			
DM351	Hugh D'Alton				
DM59	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Whilst accepting principle behind this policy for retention of facilities for public usage, infrastructure, policies/procedures should be put in place to deter misuse.	Noted.
<u>Policy SC6 Loss of Neighbourhood Services and Facilities</u>					
DM201	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	A more precise definition of a neighbourhood service should be added to the policy. Is a public house a neighbourhood service?	Noted. A PH would be considered a local service. Examples added to supporting text for policy CF 2 (replacing SC6): 'The provision of shops and local services, such as post offices, banks, public houses, schools, surgeries, churches, community facilities, and public transport, help to build sustainable communities by supporting the local economy and/or providing day-to-day facilities in locations where there is less need for people to travel by car'.
DM112	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish	Support approach	Resistance of loss of services and facilities is commendable but how, in practice will the Council be able to ensure that operation is continued given that the	Noted and support welcomed.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
		Council		reason for withdrawal of services and facilities is very often financial?	Policy needs to include flexibility if the service/facility is no longer financially viable.
DM207	Derek Johnson	Chevening Parish Council	Support approach	Endorse and support	
DM478 DM481	Tony Austin Ken Grist	Hextable Parish Council Secretary Manzoori Patients Forum	Support approach	Promotion of Hextable Heritage Site as preferred location for a new GP surgery.	GP provision within the district has been discussed with NHS West Kent. In relation to provision of a surgery in Hextable, a number of site options have been discussed with partners, including new build and use of existing premises. However, due to current re-organisation of GP service delivery, the site requirements, format and promoter are yet to be confirmed. Any applications for a new GP surgery to be considered via the development control process.
DM433 DM434	Stephen Ingram	Primary Care NHS Kent & Medway	Support approach subject to changes	Overview of GP facilities in Swanley, Hextable and Sevenoaks	GP provision within the district has been discussed with NHS West Kent. In relation to provision of a surgery in Hextable, a number of site options have been discussed with partners, including new build and use of existing premises. However, due to current re-organisation of GP service delivery, the site requirements, format and promoter are yet to be confirmed. Any applications for a new GP surgery to be considered via the development control process. Site allocation for Swanley town centre redevelopment requires the reprovision of GP facilities in this central, sustainable location. Any future applications for GP surgeries in Swanley to be considered via the development control process.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
					Site allocation for South Park is to protect the existing employment site (including the GP surgery). Any future applications for GP surgeries in Sevenoaks to be considered via the development control process.
DM74	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Should this policy be re-worded to take account of the 'Community Right to Build'. Offering the opportunity where the service is deemed no longer financially viable.	Noted. Reference to 'Community Right to Buy' added to supporting text for policy CF2 (replacing SC6).
DM141	Cllr Edwards- Winser		Support approach subject to changes	Financial considerations should be taken into account, but as an ageing population it should not be the only criteria.	Noted. However, policy needs to include flexibility if the service/facility is no longer financially viable. Policy CF2 (replacing SC6) is designed to support continuation of neighbourhood services.
DM364	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	It is considered that this policy should be redrafted to support service providers. The policy should recognise that this might include closure of some facilities	
DM254	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Loss of services should equally apply to rural settlements.	
DM340	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to	Would like confirmation that distance is covered within "equally accessible" also means nearby	Noted and confirmed that this means nearby.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			changes		
Policy ECC1 Outdoor Lighting					
DM220 DM142	Ms Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Oxford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Suggest following criteria A: The effects of lighting must be assessed on areas beyond curtilage of development. i.e effect upon neighbouring homes/ country areas. B: Parishes which have a 'no-public lighting' policy must be given additional consideration in all applications within or on borders of- those parishes.	Noted. Part c) refers to impact on amenity of neighbouring properties.
DM277	B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	b) could be ambiguous. It could be interpreted that alignment of lamps/shielding should be minimised. Suggest following wording:- b) The impact and suitability of lighting intensity, alignment of lamps and provision of shielding in relation to light pollution and impact upon night sky is minimised;	Noted –b) reworded as follows b) Any impact upon night sky shall be minimised through alignment of lamps, provision of shielding and selection of appropriate lighting type and intensity
DM291	Hobson		Object to approach or wording	Policy should be rewritten as; b) The impact in relation to light pollution and impact on night sky has been minimised by suitable lighting intensity, alignment of lamps and provision of shielding;	
DM113	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach subject to	More consideration should be given to environmental impact of artificial lighting given that District is 'a predominantly rural area' in which you would not expect	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			changes	there to be same degree of lighting as in urban areas?	
DM342	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	There needs to be restrictions on hours lighting can be on. All public facilities should always have conditions restricting their hours of use no mention of energy efficiency	Noted. Hours of operation / detailed issues can be considered via planning application process Noted.
DM480	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	Welcome recognition that lighting is an aspect of tranquillity. It should include a reference to use of low energy lighting as in Local Plan Policy EN31.	"Use of low energy lighting will be encouraged" . Added to supporting text.
DM409	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Re Flooding Would like to be added 'provision of hard standing will only be permitted where measures are taken so there is no surface run off.'	In relation to flooding, guidance is set out within National Planning Policy and there is no need for a specific local policy.
DM429	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Object to approach or wording	Detailed comments on water and flooding	
DM463	South East Water	Adams Hendry	Object to approach or wording	Request therefore that DPD includes a specific policy or policies	
DM341	Hugh	Sevenoaks	Object to approach or	There does not appear to be any policy covering water pollution or flooding. 2.15 mentions PPG25, which is soon	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
	D'Alton	Town Council	wording	to be abolished.	
DM479	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	Paragraph 2.8 should recognise composting alongside recycling, and should make reference to waste prevention which is at top of waste hierarchy.	Noted. The supporting text in Section 1 refers to re-use, recycling and composting.
DM75	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach	c) 'harmful impact on privacy or amenity for nearby residential properties'. What constitutes harmful? Could all artificial light be considered as harmful as light pollution? This needs clarification	Noted. Level of impact of individual proposals to be considered via planning application process.
DM388	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach	Support this policy and mention of sensitivity of AONB to light pollution.	Noted and support welcomed.
DM52	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Recommends inclusion of a further criterion: 'Any potential on crime, disorder and/or anti social behaviour is mitigated'	Noted but not accepted – this is referenced in design principles policy EN1.
DM255	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Clarification is needed as to whether this would exclude lighting for things like outdoor tennis courts and swimming pools	These proposals would need to be considered via planning application process and judged against criteria set out in this policy.
DM435	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish	Support approach subject to	Outdoor lighting is highly intrusive in hilly countryside and Westerham parish, particularly in Crockham Hill, does suffer from its impact.	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
		Council	changes		
DM365	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council		<p>Green Infrastructure is an integral part of climate change adaptation and it is recommend the inclusion here of the Core Strategy objective: "To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the District including provision of a network of habitat corridors as part of the Green Infrastructure Network."</p> <p>Criterion (e) should be amended to say: "Potential impacts on wildlife are avoided, or adequately mitigated where avoidance is not possible"</p>	Noted and amendment has been incorporated in relation to criterion e).
DM366	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	There is no reference to AQMA's in this paragraph. The Kent and Medway Air Quality Partnership have recently published technical guidance on considering planning and air quality this can be found at www.kentair.org.uk	Air quality is covered by Core Strategy policy SP2 which references Air Quality Management Plan.
<u>Policy EEC2 Noise Pollution</u>					
DM188	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>Policy WK6 relates specifically to excessive noise disturbance in West Kingsdown, policy LT4 does not adequately replace it.</p> <p>The following additions should be made ECC2. "The local planning authority will not permit new development particularly housing , in areas subject to excessive noise disturbance"</p>	Noted. Policy LT3 related specifically to Brands Hatch.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM221 DM143	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Oxford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Any form of noise pollution within a conservation area should not be permitted at any time.	Noted. Constraints such as conservation area status will be considered will be considered through planning application process.
DM278	B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Change "high noise" to "noise" in final sentence as word 'high' is meaningless and open to interpretation.	Noted, but there is a need to maintain a level of flexibility in policy and there may be some minimal noise generating uses that are acceptable.
DM292	Hobson		Object to approach or wording	High noise is very subjective. Therefore, in relation to AONBs, change "high noise" to "noise" in final sentence.	
DM114	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Support welcomed.
DM389	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach	Support this policy and should mention of sensitivity of AONB to noise pollution.	Support welcomed and policy referenced AONB.
DM76	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Under a). 'unacceptable impact' unacceptable to whom? This needs clarification.	Noted. Impact will be judged via planning application process in conjunction with statutory consultees and public consultation.
DM306	United	Planning	Support approach	Consider that some flexibility is required with regards to amenity protections, particularly for sites which seek	Noted. The policy includes a level of flexibility. Also see

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
	House	Potential Ltd	subject to changes	reuse of brownfield land where there may be more constraints.	amended policy on amenity protection.
DM322	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	Recommend a further clause is added to policy:- c) Will not result in activities which will cause disturbance to designated sites and nature reserves managed for their bird populations	Noted – “ or in sites designated for their biodiversity value, development will not be permitted if it would undermine the character or harm the biodiversity of these important areas ” added to policy.
DM482	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	The word “high” should be deleted from last paragraph.	Noted, but there is a need to maintain a level of flexibility in policy and there may be some minimal noise generating uses that are acceptable.
DM5	McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles	The Planning Bureau Ltd	Object to approach or wording	The requirements to meet Code Level should be left for the Building regulations	Adopted Core Strategy policy SP2 sets out the Council’s requirements in relation to the CSH and BREEAM.
DM48	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Object to approach or wording	It is flawed without reference to require developers to identify how they intend to create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder or the fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. There needs to be a condition on developers that all new developments must comply with ACPO Secured by Design. This would also ensure developments do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion and assist SDC to discharge its responsibilities under the Crime and Disorder Act and PPS1.	Noted. Safety and security issues to be considered through the planning application process. Also see Design Principles (Policy EN1).
DM150	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or	The bullet points should be clarified and emphasis put on the importance of landscape, habitats, biodiversity and	Noted – The concerns over the wording of the policy are now considered to be sufficiently covered by the following additions

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			wording	access to the natural environment (a) should indicate that “compatibility with location” seeks to ensure that proposals fit well with their landscape setting/context, protect key on-site features and add components that deliver enhancement. (b) should ensure protection and enhancement of the environment, including habitat, access and other networks that link with features around the site.	<p>b. the layout of the proposed development would respect the topography and character of the site and the surrounding area and sensitively incorporate natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site;</p> <p>e. The proposal would incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential, where possible, and retaining and enhancing Green Infrastructure features including sustainable drainage systems. Proposals that affect a sites existing biodiversity and GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm;</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements are addressed by Policy SP9 of the Core Strategy</p>
DM204	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council		Add: f. the ability of infrastructure such as roads and services to support the development.	
DM275	B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council		Add criterion f. the maintenance of the GB and the enhancing and conserving the AONB designations. This will give added protection to land with GB and AONB status.	
DM289	Hobson			Add f. the maintenance of the GB and the enhancing and conserving the AONB designations.	
DM320	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	The following wording should added to section b of SC1. b. the impact of the proposal on the surrounding environment, and any natural habitats and biodiversity.	<p>Balanced communities refers to support for communities with a mix of ages, skills and employment, i.e. housing and facilities to support the needs of a diverse community.</p>
DM385	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB		Add bullet point: The conservation and enhancement of the District’s AONBs	
DM246	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council		Point (b) should include more detail. Impacts may include such things as air pollution, water pollution, light pollution, noise pollution, soil erosion and damage to ecology. Point (c) how is "balanced communities" defined?	
DM336	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council		‘e’ the contribution to the District’s economy and employment Recommend a 6th point, along the lines of “Does not place undue strain on existing local infrastructure”	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM359	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council		Recommended the following objective is included "To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the District including provision of a network of habitat corridors as part of the GI."	
DM360	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council		Support the principles Specific reference could be made to the need to have regard to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity/local and national designations.	
DM474	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)		Add "and natural assets" to the end of criterion d); and add a new criterion that recognises the need to maintain the GB.	
DM217 DM137	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Otford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The meaning of 'a balanced community' should be clarified. Add new criteria "The development should not have an adverse effect upon local homes or the sustainability of local businesses".	Balanced communities refers to support for communities with a mix of ages, skills and employment, with housing and facilities to support the needs of a diverse community. Noted .
DM426	Jennifer Wilson	Environment Agency	Object to approach or wording	The terminology and wording used in this policy is not robust enough.	Noted – amendments incorporated in light of NPPF and additional environmental conservation references.
DM70 DM108 DM301	Christine Lane Tracy Godden Philip Jameson	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Thames Water	Support approach	Support	Support welcomed.
DM14	Thomas Rand		Support approach subject to	Add an further criteria : Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone. Add wording that development should reflect the Local	Noted.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			changes	needs and circumstances of everyone.	
DM148	John Lister	Natural England	Support approach subject to changes	<p>The following Core Strategy Objectives should be included in para 1.9 as they are relevant to consideration of Development Management issues.</p> <p>To ensure that any infrastructure and service improvements needed to support delivery of Core Strategy objectives and policies or resolve existing deficiencies are brought forward in a co-ordinated and timely manner and that new development makes an appropriate contribution towards any improvements required as a result of new development. (Key Issue 10)</p> <p>To safeguard existing open spaces, sport and recreational facilities that meet community needs and improve provision where necessary. (Key Issue 10)</p> <p>To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the District including provision of a network of habitat corridors as part of the Green Infrastructure Network. (Key Issue 3)</p>	Noted. A summary of the Core Strategy has been added.
DM302	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Further emphasis should be given to promoting the effective use of land, promoting mixed use developments that create more vibrant places, and encouraging multiple benefits from the use of land in urban areas, as set out in the draft NPPF.	Noted. Policy EN1 has been reviewed in light of the publication of the draft NPPF to further reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
DM332	Armstrong (Kent) LLP	Christopher Hill GVA Grimley	Support approach subject to changes	Policy SC1 and the supporting text should take account of the NPPF and its definition of sustainable development. It should be amended and expanded to reflect these factors with significant weight to be given to the benefits of economic and housing growth.	
DM405	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to	<p>Add effect on transport, i.e. to enable use of public transport rather than relying on cars.</p> <p>Add 'avoidance of building on flood plain'.</p>	Noted. Impact on infrastructure (including transport) is covered by the Core Strategy Policy SP9. Flooding issues covered by national policy.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			changes		
DM465	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach subject to changes	Clarity required on tandem development.	Noted. Amenity issues are covered by draft policy EN2.
Policy SC2 Design Principles					
DM1	Bob White	Kent Highway Services	Object to approach or wording	Under General Design Principles there is the opportunity to include post-occupation evaluation alongside Building for Life.	Noted – supporting text includes Building for Life ‘ and other post-occupation assessments ’
DM152	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	Para 1.19 omits the need to seek enhancements, contrary to the Core Strategy Objective which refers to “maintain and enhance”. This is particularly important in view of the pressures on habitats and biodiversity arising from a range of factors including: development, recreational and economic use of the countryside & rural fringes, and climate change.	Noted. Amended ‘ protection and enhancement of biodiversity ’. Policy EN1 refers to increasing biodiversity potential.
DM155	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	d should recognise that sites may currently provide walking and cycling routes between communities and a range of facilities and opportunities, including routes to Accessible Natural Green Spaces and the wider countryside. These routes should be protected and/or new opportunities captured.	Noted amended f) The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas; and g) New development should be inclusive and make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access of those with disabilities; and criteria renumbered .
DM206	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	SDC should formulate and use its own parking provision criteria instead of using those of Kent County Council, reflecting the greater emphasis on car usage in Sevenoaks.	SDC currently has no proposals to develop its own parking standards. It is considered that preparation of countywide standards is a more efficient use of resources, given need to collect substantial evidence to support standards.
DM215	Y Tredoux	Kemsing Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Add to last paragraph "Where appropriate proposals should include details and strategies for the effective management and maintenance of sites following their completion" This should enable the Council to ensure that there is no undue delay in carrying out the approved	Noted and this is included in the last paragraph.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				works, leaving the site neat and tidy .	
DM262	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The use of the word "respond" within the policy should be replaced with the word "complement" to be consistent with the term used in para 16 of PPS3.	'Respond' considered to be suitable in this context.
DM304	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Object to approach or wording	A character study should be prepared in support of Policy SC2.	SDC has produced a Residential Character Area for Sevenoaks and will prepare documents for Swanley and Edenbridge.
DM337	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>No mention of the effects on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Would like to see "design quality" defined Point d should be amended to read "provide adequate parking facilities of a standard appropriate to the development, which may exceed the standards set by KCC" Welcome further positive action to maintain front gardens with combined parking facilities.</p> <p>Both external and internal ease of access must be considered; all houses designed for "lifetime use" Regret excessive development of "gated communities" Would like to see a clause preventing tandem development</p>	<p>Infrastructure is addressed by Core Strategy policy SP9.</p> <p>Quality design will be design that responds to the listed design criteria.</p> <p>Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment includes guidance in relation to retention of front gardens.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Amenity issues covered by draft policy EN2.</p>
DM361	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>Criterion (b) should be amended to say: "The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site and retain and enhance important Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows, shrubs and established water courses and ponds."</p> <p>Criterion (e) should be amended to say: "The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential where possible. Proposals that affect a site's existing biodiversity should be designed in a way that avoids and/or mitigates any potential harm."</p>	<p>Noted in order to meet these concerns e) has been amended as follows</p> <p>e) The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential where possible, and retaining and enhancing Green Infrastructure features including sustainable drainage systems. Proposals that affect a site's existing biodiversity or GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm;</p>

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM427	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Object to approach or wording	Recommend that the following point is reworded as follows: “(b) The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, protect and enhance the Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows and shrubs and any established water courses or ponds”	
DM13 DM15 DM156 DM466	Karen Jefferys Thomas Rand John Lister F Marshall	Natural England The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach	Support e) is welcomed. Emphasis on good design Council should seek specialist advice on design matters.	Noted and support welcomed.
DM49	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommends the following wording changes g) ‘The design of new developments should incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti social behaviour’.</p> <p>Supports d) but would strongly recommend the following: ‘The proposed development should ensure satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provide adequate off road parking facilities for residents and visitors with other appropriate measures to mitigate the risk of obstruction to emergency service vehicles’.</p> <p>Recommend b) is amended to the following: ‘The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, retain important Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows and shrubs, and enhance any established water courses or ponds whilst mitigating the risk of flooding of the site’.</p> <p>Also recommend that the nationally accepted standard for designing out crime and disorder the ACPO Secured by</p>	<p>Noted in order to meet these concerns h) has been amended as follows h) The design of new developments would result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti social behaviour;</p> <p>Noted. Detailed parking considerations will be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>Flooding is dealt with in national policy and reference is not considered appropriate in this policy on design principles.</p> <p>Noted. Detailed safety and security considerations will be dealt with through the planning application process.</p>

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				Design, Park Mark and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) initiatives should be complied with, as relevant to the development, and should be incorporated within the policy	
DM71	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Add the following to b) 'and enhance any established water courses or ponds'- changes in the flood plain or river basins need very careful consideration; enhancement could have detrimental effects on other areas.	Noted Flooding is dealt with in national policy and reference is not considered appropriate in this policy on design principles.
DM109	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	(d) needs further explanation of what 'vehicles'. Does this relate to cars or is it supposed to ensure service vehicle access is considered? Add criteria to ensure fire, ambulance / police services have adequate access to a development site.	This covers all vehicular access – cars, servicing vehicles, emergency access etc.
DM154	John Lister	Natural England	Support approach subject to changes	c) should note that there will be cases where buildings and structures house protected species, which should be retained or, in exceptional cases, provision made for the professional and managed relocation of species.	Noted. Detailed ecological issues will be dealt with through the planning application process.
DM218 DM138	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Oxford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	'Security' should be clarified that this does not imply approval of 'electric-gating' and high-fencing used to stockade homes. Additional criteria should be added to require clear descriptions of materials and colours to be employed in the completed building which are compatible with near-by buildings. These shall constitute an integral part of the planning application.	Noted. Noted. Detailed issues related to material palette will be dealt with through the planning application process.
DM247	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Point (e) should say '...prevents any potential harm or by exception mitigates'. Tandem development should not be permitted. Landscaping should be incorporated into a design and benefit the environment. Point (d) refers to "adequate parking facilities" - what does	Noted e) has been amended “ Proposals that affect a site's existing biodiversity or GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm ” Amenity issues covered by draft policy EN3. Noted. Noted. Detailed parking considerations will be dealt with

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				adequate mean in this context? It is important that there is sufficient road space to allow safe and easy access for service and emergency vehicles.	through the planning application process. Noted – reference to access covers all vehicular access, cars, servicing vehicles, emergency access etc.
DM305	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Consider that some flexibility is required with regards to amenity protections, particularly for sites which seek the reuse of brownfield land where there may be more constraints.	Noted.
DM321	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	Further wording required to strengthen policy. Should read; b) The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, retain enhance, extend, connect and recreate important Green Infrastructure Network features including trees, hedgerows, shrubs, established water courses or ponds and habitats of principal importance. Provision should be made to maintain and increase populations of protected species and species of principal importance; e) The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing and extending biodiversity potential such as corridors and stepping stones of natural habitat and landscape scale enhancement for biodiversity. Proposals that affect a site with existing biodiversity importance should be designed in a way that mitigates any potential harm;	Noted. e). has been amended to cover this point e) The proposal would incorporate within the design opportunities for increasing biodiversity potential where possible, while retaining and enhancing Green Infrastructure features. Proposals that affect a site's existing biodiversity or GI should be designed in a way that avoids or mitigates any potential harm;
DM386	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	b) Add bullet point: • The proposal should incorporate within the design opportunities for conserving and enhancing the landscape character of the area, for example by attention to boundary treatments, design of accesses streets and lanes, and the design of spaces and GI throughout the site.	
DM406	Janice Butler		Support approach	Ensure balance is maintained between (a) social housing and private houses and (b) mix of sizes, e.g., 2,3,4 or	Noted. Core Strategy Policy SP5 (Housing Size and Type) seeks a mix of housing.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
			subject to changes	more bed roomed houses, with reference to the Village Design Statement.	
DM419	National Grid	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Support approach subject to changes	To ensure flexibility in the policy should read b) The layout of the proposed development should respect the topography of the site, retain important Green Infrastructure Network features <i>where appropriate</i> , including trees, hedgerows and shrubs, and enhance any established water courses or ponds;" This revised wording allows for a proper assessment on a site by site basis in respect of the need to retain landscape features.	Not accepted. It will be through the planning application process that exceptions may be considered, if exceptional circumstances cases are made.
DM475	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Add "and important views through the site" to criterion c); Add "so that there is no net loss of biodiversity" to the end of criterion e); and Add Policy H6B to the list of Local Plan policies to be replaced by this policy in Appendix 2.	No private right to a view in planning policy although important public views will be safeguarded. Noted .e) has been amended to address this concern. Noted Appendix Amended.
Policy SC3 Amenity Protection					
DM193	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The use of the term "will only be permitted" and "will be resisted" creates a negative policy. The removal of the word "only" and a rewording of the last sentence would create a positive policy.	Accepted. The policy has been reworded " Proposals will be permitted where they safeguard "
DM403	Sarah Harrison	Southern Water	Object to approach or wording	SC3. suggest the following wording: Development proposals in proximity to existing wastewater facilities will only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupants. The distance between the infrastructure and the development must be sufficient to allow adequate odour dispersion.	Noted. Policy is more general to cover all uses and facilities that might lead to reduced environmental quality.
DM407	Janice Butler		Object to approach or wording	More definition is needed with regard to "Excessive" Protection of amenity is basically affected by housing density; definition required and how this differs in towns,	Noted. Acceptable noise levels will differ by use and location and will therefore be considered in detail via the planning application process.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				villages and in the countryside. Safeguarding open spaces and the GB is part of "Protecting Amenity"	Protection of open space covered in design principles policy (EN1).
DM476	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	The final sentence needs to be clarified Policy S6 should be added to the list of Local Plan policies to be replaced by this policy in Appendix 2.	Noted In the interests of clarity the final sentence has been deleted. Noted – Appendix amended.
DM16 DM110 DM139	Mr Rand Tracy Godden Cllr Edwards-Winser	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support approach	Noted and support welcomed.
DM467	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach	Support policy but consider obscure glazing/secure windows unacceptable as a result of bad design	Noted.
DM50	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Recommend the inclusion that the development does not result in increasing crime and disorder. This can be mitigated by developers by incorporating Secured by Design, Park Mark and/or CPTED within the design.	Security issues covered in design principles policy (EN1).
DM72	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	The word 'outlook' is very subjective, clarification is needed over what constitutes a outlook worth preserving.	Noted. Right to a view is not a material consideration in planning. 'outlook' Removed.
DM248	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The policy mentions "outlook", something that has not been seen in policy before. What does this mean? Does it infer the right to a view?	
DM185	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The wording should include " noxious emissions , dust, vibration light or heat" as in policy NR10 of the saved policies of the SDLP	Air quality is covered by Core Strategy policy SP2 and noise pollution by draft policy EN6. Add 'air pollution' between odour and activity. Pollution control

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM362	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	Should refer specifically to air pollution as this is an important issue in Sevenoaks as it is the District with the most AQMA's in the County.	issues also covered by national policy (PPS23.)
DM338	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Occupants and future occupants of the development must also be safeguarded. Must be adequate provision for the storage of vehicles and refuse. Clarification on the meaning of 'proposals that introduce uses sensitive to environmental policy'	Noted. The term occupants encompasses future occupants. Noted – parking issues covered in design principles policy (EN1).” Refuse ” has been inserted into EN1.
DM420	National Grid	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Support approach subject to changes	This amendment is suggested: “Proposals that introduce uses sensitive to poor environmental quality into an area will be resisted unless amenity for future users can be adequately safeguarded, such as through appropriate environmental improvements.”	
DM424	Lorna Talbot	Parish Clerk Seal Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Should refer to the amenity of the future occupiers of the property being developed (it only refers to occupiers of nearby properties).	
DM428	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Support approach subject to changes	The word “resisted” should be replaced by “refused” so that it is clear to the reader what you wish prevented and to also make the policy robust.	
Policy SC4 Reuse of Redundant School Buildings					
DM197	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	This policy requires consideration in relation to its impact on a proposal to relocate a school. A revised policy wording to incorporate consideration of viability in certain circumstances should be considered. This policy should be re worded in a positive way to follow the approach set out within the Draft NPPF.	Not accepted. It will be through the planning application process that exceptions may be considered, if exceptional circumstances cases are made, which could include viability. Accepted. Policy positively reworded – “will only be considered if it is demonstrated by the applicant that there is a identified community need that can be facilitated through the site or that

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
					community facilities that meet the identified need are incorporated into a wider missed use scheme”.
DM339	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Care needs to be taken to ensure doesn't undermine the viability of existing community facilities. Opportunities from school facilities There is no provision for buildings which have come to the end of their natural life span.	Noted – buildings will only be used for community purposes if there is an identified need. Noted – the policy refers to re-using the building or site, so could include the demolition of poor quality buildings.
DM73 DM111	Christine Lane Tracy Godden	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Support noted and welcomed.
DM43	Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	If suitable facilities are nearby then part of any proposals should include a 106 Agreement for funding.	Noted
DM51	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support t approach subject to changes	Have concerns as to the sustainability of such changes of use and, therefore, the robustness of proposed Policy . Many school sites are large with associated playing fields and, therefore, the proposed policy may be counter productive leading to a low take up of the sites by developers resulting in further decay and increased criminality/disorder/anti social behaviour which would have a significant negative impact on local residents and Kent Police business.	Noted. The intention is that the policy promotes the use of these sites for community facilities or mixed use developments that include community facilities.
DM253	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Re-use of redundant school buildings should allow for use for recreation and sports. How will it be determined that there is no other need taking into consideration changes in population size etc? (para 1.28)	Noted. GI2 covers the re-use of playing fields. Applicants will be required to demonstrate that they have assessed need for community facilities (advertising site / publicity / marketing etc.)

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM363	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	The stated policy is too rigid.	Not accepted. There is flexibility in the 2nd para regarding mixed use, residential or commercial uses. Policy amended.
DM140 DM219 DM408	Cllr Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook Janice Butler	Otford Parish Council Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Suggest the addition of - Use re-conversion as potential conversion to apartments for older local residents.	“Proposals for change of use or redevelopment for alternative non community uses will only be considered if it is demonstrated by the applicant that there is no identified community need that can be facilitated through the site, or that community facilities that meet the identified need are incorporated into a wider mixed use scheme. Alternative uses that may be acceptable in this instance, subject being located close to services, include residential care homes or sheltered housing”.
DM477	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	It should better reflect the sequential approach explained in para 1.28. Consequently, acceptable uses for redundant school buildings should be considered in the following order: Community use; then Residential Care/institutions and/or affordable housing; then Employment (B1 uses only); and then General residential (including the normal requirement for affordable housing).	
Policy SC5 Reuse of School Playing Fields					
DM28	Thomas Rand		Object to approach or wording	Add - School playing fields should NOT be sold for any Development other than for Sport or Recreation	Noted The wording has been amended to clarify this point. Please refer to policy GI 2 of the document which has replaced SC5.
DM135	Gillian King Scott	Clerk Halstead Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Supports re-use of school playing fields for sports and recreational, community activities but believe these redundant school sites should not be used as land for housing.	
DM432	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Support approach subject to changes	Should be reworded to state: “Where a school playing field becomes available as a result of a school closure it shall be retained as part of Green Infrastructure Network for community sports and recreational uses. Supporting...sports pitch. Proposals	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				for built development on playing fields, other than for essential facilities for outside sport and recreation will be refused.”	
DM432	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Object to approach or wording	Policy GRN2 does not give KCC flexibility for its changing educational provision across Sevenoaks district.	The requirement for applicants to demonstrate that the school playing fields are surplus to requirements should allow for flexibility.
DM11	Karen Jefferys		Support approach	If there is sufficient consultation.	Noted.
DM89	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach	Support.	Noted.
DM127	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council			
DM169	Cllr Edwards-Winser	Sevenoaks Town Council			
DM351	Hugh D'Alton				
DM59	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Whilst accepting principle behind this policy for retention of facilities for public usage, infrastructure, policies/procedures should be put in place to deter misuse.	Noted.
Policy SC6 Loss of Neighbourhood Services and Facilities					
DM201	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	A more precise definition of a neighbourhood service should be added to the policy. Is a public house a neighbourhood service?	Noted. A PH would be considered a local service. Examples added to supporting text for policy CF 2 (replacing SC6): 'The provision of shops and local services, such as post offices, banks, public houses, schools, surgeries, churches, community facilities, and public transport, help to build sustainable communities by supporting the local economy and/or providing

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
					day-to-day facilities in locations where there is less need for people to travel by car’.
DM112	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Resistance of loss of services and facilities is commendable but how, in practice will the Council be able to ensure that operation is continued given that the reason for withdrawal of services and facilities is very often financial?	Noted and support welcomed. Policy needs to include flexibility if the service/facility is no longer financially viable.
DM207	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Support approach	Endorse and support	
DM478 DM481	Tony Austin Ken Grist	Hextable Parish Council Secretary Manzoori Patients Forum	Support approach	Promotion of Hextable Heritage Site as preferred location for a new GP surgery.	GP provision within the district has been discussed with NHS West Kent. In relation to provision of a surgery in Hextable, a number of site options have been discussed with partners, including new build and use of existing premises. However, due to current re-organisation of GP service delivery, the site requirements, format and promoter are yet to be confirmed. Any applications for a new GP surgery to be considered via the development control process.
DM433 DM434	Stephen Ingram	Primary Care NHS Kent & Medway	Support approach subject to changes	Overview of GP facilities in Swanley, Hextable and Sevenoaks	GP provision within the district has been discussed with NHS West Kent. In relation to provision of a surgery in Hextable, a number of site options have been discussed with partners, including new build and use of existing premises. However, due to current re-organisation of GP service delivery, the site requirements, format and promoter are yet to be confirmed. Any applications for a new GP surgery to be considered via the development control process. Site allocation for Swanley town centre redevelopment requires the reprovision of GP facilities in this central, sustainable location. Any future applications for GP surgeries in Swanley to be considered via the development control process.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
					Site allocation for South Park is to protect the existing employment site (including the GP surgery). Any future applications for GP surgeries in Sevenoaks to be considered via the development control process.
DM74	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Should this policy be re-worded to take account of the 'Community Right to Build'. Offering the opportunity where the service is deemed no longer financially viable.	Noted. Reference to 'Community Right to Buy' added to supporting text for policy CF2 (replacing SC6).
DM141	Cllr Edwards- Winser		Support approach subject to changes	Financial considerations should be taken into account, but as an ageing population it should not be the only criteria.	Noted. However, policy needs to include flexibility if the service/facility is no longer financially viable. Policy CF2 (replacing SC6) is designed to support continuation of neighbourhood services.
DM364	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	It is considered that this policy should be redrafted to support service providers. The policy should recognise that this might include closure of some facilities	
DM254	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Loss of services should equally apply to rural settlements.	Noted. Facilities in rural settlements are covered by Core Strategy policy L07.
DM340	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Would like confirmation that distance is covered within "equally accessible" also means nearby	Noted and confirmed that this means nearby.
Policy ECC1 Outdoor Lighting					
DM220 DM142	Ms Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards- Winser	Otford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Suggest following criteria A: The effects of lighting must be assessed on areas beyond curtilage of development. i.e effect upon neighbouring homes/ country areas. B: Parishes which have a 'no-public lighting' policy must be given additional consideration in all applications within	Noted. Part c) refers to impact on amenity of neighbouring properties.

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
				or on borders of- those parishes.	
DM277	B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	b) could be ambiguous. It could be interpreted that alignment of lamps/shielding should be minimised. Suggest following wording:- b) The impact and suitability of lighting intensity, alignment of lamps and provision of shielding in relation to light pollution and impact upon night sky is minimised;	Noted –b) reworded as follows b) Any impact upon night sky shall be minimised through alignment of lamps, provision of shielding and selection of appropriate lighting type and intensity .
DM291	Hobson		Object to approach or wording b) The impact in relation to light pollution and impact on night sky has been minimised by suitable lighting intensity, alignment of lamps and provision of shielding;		
DM113	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	More consideration should be given to environmental impact of artificial lighting given that District is 'a predominantly rural area' in which you would not expect there to be same degree of lighting as in urban areas?	
DM342	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	There needs to be restrictions on hours lighting can be on. All public facilities should always have conditions restricting their hours of use no mention of energy efficiency	Noted. Hours of operation / detailed issues can be considered via planning application process Noted.
DM480	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	Welcome recognition that lighting is an aspect of tranquillity. It should include a reference to use of low energy lighting as in Local Plan Policy EN31.	“Use of low energy lighting will be encouraged” . Added to supporting text.
DM409	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Re Flooding Would like to be added ‘provision of hard standing will only be permitted where measures are taken so there is no surface run off.’	In relation to flooding, guidance is set out within National Planning Policy and there is no need for a specific local policy.
DM429	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Object to approach or wording	Detailed comments on water and flooding	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM463	South East Water	Adams Hendry	Object to approach or wording	Request therefore that DPD includes a specific policy or policies	
DM341	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	There does not appear to be any policy covering water pollution or flooding. 2.15 mentions PPG25, which is soon to be abolished.	
DM479	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	Paragraph 2.8 should recognise composting alongside recycling, and should make reference to waste prevention which is at top of waste hierarchy.	Noted. The supporting text in Section 1 refers to re-use, recycling and composting.
DM75	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach	c) 'harmful impact on privacy or amenity for nearby residential properties'. What constitutes harmful? Could all artificial light be considered as harmful as light pollution? This needs clarification	Noted. Level of impact of individual proposals to be considered via planning application process.
DM388	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach	Support this policy and mention of sensitivity of AONB to light pollution.	Noted and support welcomed.
DM52	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Recommends inclusion of a further criterion: 'Any potential on crime, disorder and/or anti social behaviour is mitigated'	Noted but not accepted – this is referenced in design principles policy EN1.
DM255	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Clarification is needed as to whether this would exclude lighting for things like outdoor tennis courts and swimming pools	These proposals would need to be considered via planning application process and judged against criteria set out in this policy.
DM435	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Outdoor lighting is highly intrusive in hilly countryside and Westerham parish, particularly in Crockham Hill, does suffer from its impact.	
DM365	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning		Green Infrastructure is an integral part of climate change adaptation and it is recommend the inclusion here of the	Noted and amendment has been incorporated in relation to criterion e).

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
		Kent County Council		Core Strategy objective: "To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the District including provision of a network of habitat corridors as part of the Green Infrastructure Network." Criterion (e) should be amended to say: "Potential impacts on wildlife are avoided, or adequately mitigated where avoidance is not possible"	
DM366	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	There is no reference to AQMA's in this paragraph. The Kent and Medway Air Quality Partnership have recently published technical guidance on considering planning and air quality this can be found at www.kentair.org.uk	Air quality is covered by Core Strategy policy SP2 which references Air Quality Management Plan.
Policy EEC2 Noise Pollution					
DM188	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Policy WK6 relates specifically to excessive noise disturbance in West Kingsdown, policy LT4 does not adequately replace it. The following additions should be made ECC2. "The local planning authority will not permit new development particularly housing , in areas subject to excessive noise disturbance"	Noted. Policy LT3 related specifically to Brands Hatch.
DM221 DM143	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards- Winser	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Any form of noise pollution within a conservation area should not be permitted at any time.	Noted. Constraints such as conservation area status will be considered will be considered through planning application process.
DM278	B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Change "high noise" to "noise" in final sentence as word 'high' is meaningless and open to interpretation.	Noted, but there is a need to maintain a level of flexibility in policy and there may be some minimal noise generating uses that are acceptable.
DM292	Hobson		Object to approach or wording	High noise is very subjective. Therefore, in relation to AONBs, change "high noise" to "noise" in final sentence.	

Ref No	Name	Organisation	Comment	Summary	SDC Response
DM114	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Support welcomed.
DM389	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach	Support this policy and should mention of sensitivity of AONB to noise pollution.	Support welcomed and policy referenced AONB.
DM76	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Under a). 'unacceptable impact' unacceptable to whom? This needs clarification.	Noted. Impact will be judged via planning application process in conjunction with statutory consultees and public consultation.
DM306	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Consider that some flexibility is required with regards to amenity protections, particularly for sites which seek reuse of brownfield land where there may be more constraints.	Noted. The policy includes a level of flexibility. Also see amended policy on amenity protection.
DM322	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	Recommend a further clause is added to policy:- c) Will not result in activities which will cause disturbance to designated sites and nature reserves managed for their bird populations	Noted – “ or in sites designated for their biodiversity value, development will not be permitted if it would undermine the character or harm the biodiversity of these important areas ” added to policy.
DM482	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	The word “high” should be deleted from last paragraph.	Noted, but there is a need to maintain a level of flexibility in policy and there may be some minimal noise generating uses that are acceptable.

HERITAGE ASSETS					
Policy HA1 Heritage Assets					
DM144	Cllr Edwards-Winser	Oxford Parish	Object to approach or wording	Heritage assets should include all items/artefacts discovered below surface in archaeological excavations. No form of 'intrusive' archaeological survey should take	National Planning policy on archaeological remains on land and how they should be preserved or recorded is given in the NPPF section 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic
DM222					

	Brenda Hambrook	Council		<p>place without application to District Council. A report of findings should be submitted to Council. Non-intrusive archaeological surveys should require permission from District Council.</p> <p>Need for local list agreed in advance with local Parish Council.</p>	<p>environment. This gives guidance for determining planning applications where archaeological excavations may be required. The wording in HA1 reflects this guidance No further wording is considered necessary to ensure archaeological interests are protected.</p> <p>Noted The CS states that “The Council aims to produce a List of Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest during Core Strategy period, to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document”.</p>
DM157	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	<p>Policy HA1 may not reflect national guidance which requires protection of ancient woodland. The notion of development in an Ancient Woodland and idea of mitigation of potential harm are matters of great concern and complexity. The provision of new wood land elsewhere does not address loss</p>	<p>The policy reflects the guidance given in the NPPF para 118. This states that development should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including Ancient Woodland and veteran trees.</p>
DM256	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>This policy is inadequate. It will not protect woodland that is lost for example, to agricultural expansion, rather than development. Planning permission should be required. Para 3.4 should specifically include specimen trees. Para 3.6 - Loss of listed buildings to development cannot ordinarily be justified. Para 3.8 – In last sentence, term 'destroyed' should be followed by 'or markedly degraded'. Para 3.14 - How will it be decided what qualifies as a heritage asset?</p>	<p>The policy can only be applied where permission is required under national regulations.</p> <p>This wording is taken from CS policy no amendment is considered necessary. Noted. The policy reflects this.</p> <p>These assets are covered by national or local designation .</p>
DM115 DM468	Tracy Godden F Marshall	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach	Support Local List	Noted
DM40	Sir Michael	Chairman Sevenoaks	Support approach	Policy HA1 and/or text should be amended to include intention to compile a local list. To do so would be	The CS states that “The Council aims to produce a List of Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest during Core

	Harrison	Conservation Council	subject to changes	consistent with national policy in PPS5, and it should be treated as a priority.	Strategy period, to be adopted as a SPD". No additional commitment is required.
DM77	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>The meaning of second statement is unclear, does it refer to sites where demolition is proposed?</p> <p>Objects to idea of a local list . The Listed Building register provides a high level of protection. Buildings not listed, if important enough add to character of area and would be protected as changes could effect distinctive local character of area protected under SC2</p>	<p>The 2nd para of this policy has been reworded for clarification “Applications will be assessed with reference to historical and/or architectural importance of asset, prominence of its location and setting and historic and architectural importance of any elements to be lost or replaced.”</p> <p>Noted The preparation of Residential Character Areas will also identify important features/building in an area.</p>
DM189	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	There should be a list of local ancient woodlands, historic parks and gardens as well as important buildings	Historic Parks and Gardens are listed by English Heritage a local list is not considered necessary. The District Council is currently undertaking a survey of all ancient woodland.
DM323	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommend that following wording be added to policy. Planning application proposals that affect a heritage asset, ancient woodland or its setting, will only be permitted where development preserves or enhances character, appearance and settings of asset through high quality, sensitive design.</p> <p>Applications will be assessed with reference to prominence of location, historic, ecological and architectural value of asset and historic and architectural value of feature to be replaced.</p> <p>In case of ancient woodland application should prove that there will be no impact on ecological integrity of woodland or species that use site. Such application should be accompanied by a full ecological assessment of ancient woodland and species present</p>	<p>The text with this policy has been amended to cover this concern.</p> <p>Ecology is covered by Policy SP11 Biodiversity, this is an overarching policy that will be taken into consideration in all applications. A specific reference in this policy is not required to ensure ecology is protected. Applicants will be required to submit an appropriate ecological assessment as part of planning application.</p>
DM343	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Care needs to be taken to ensure that enthusiastic application does not discourage development where neglect would lead to deterioration of buildings</p> <p>Strongly agrees that a local list should be drawn up There needs to be a provision to allow relaxation of</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Cases regarding viability will be judged on their merits. This is to be in exceptional circumstances only and therefore it is not appropriate wording for policy.</p>

				conservation requirement where buildings are no longer economically viable.	
DM367	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommend that following should be added to wording of 3.13 and/or included as part of Policy HA1:</p> <p>“Proposals that would result in loss or deterioration of ancient woodland will not be granted planning permission unless need for, and benefits of, development in that location outweigh loss of woodland habitat.”</p> <p>In 2nd para it is suggested that word ‘value’ is replaced by ‘significance’ as this is preferred term in PPS5.</p> <p>The 3rd para should start with “Where planning application...” rather than “Where asset...”</p>	<p>Noted amended to “Heritage Assets is term used to describe highly valued components which make up historic character of District, they can be buildings, monuments, woodland, particular street scenes or areas, landscapes or outstanding views. Historic assets can be nationally or locally designated by Local Planning Authority or those identified during determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Designated Heritage Assets include - Scheduled Ancient Monuments Archaeological Sites Listed Buildings Conservation Areas Historic Parks and Gardens Ancient Woodland and Ancient Trees</p> <p>The policy wording has been amended to address these issue.</p>
DM390	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	Suggest mention of Kent Farmstead Guidance	The AONB Management Plans and other guidance is referred to in Policy LO8 and Countryside Character Assessment. An additional reference in this section is not considered necessary.
DM410	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Would welcome a list of locally important buildings, and wonder where village Green stands on this and how it is officially classified.	Open spaces are protected under CS Policy SP10 - Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision. This area is currently protected under Saved Local Plan policy EN9.
DM483	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	<p>The second para should also refer to landscape. Para 3.1 clearly regards landscapes as part of heritage assets of District, but policy seems to imply that Policy just relates to historical assets. The Policy should better reflect supporting text.</p> <p>Policy EN23 should be added to list of Local Plan policies to be replaced by this policy in accordance with Appendix</p>	<p>Reworded 2nd para of HA1 as follows “ Applications will be assessed in terms of historic and/or architectural significance of asset and prominence of asset and its setting and historic and architectural significance of any elements to be lost or replaced”.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

				2.	
Policy HA2 Demolition within Conservation Areas					
DM41	Sir Michael Harrison	Chairman Sevenoaks Conservation Council	Object to approach or wording	There should be an equivalent policy to EN23. It is not sufficient to rely on other policies such as Policy SC2. There should be a provision in policy requiring District Council to consult English Heritage on applications relating to, or otherwise affecting, listed buildings, locally listed or other significant buildings in or adjoining Conservation Areas.	Listed buildings and their settings are protected by national policy this is reflected in CS policy SP1 Design of New Development and Policy EN1 Design Principles . These policies will also apply to other significant buildings where ever they are located.
DM470	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society		There should be a provision within Policy HA2 aimed at preventing demolition of buildings in Conservation Areas until redevelopment is commenced. Planning permission for demolition and redevelopment should contain a condition prohibiting demolition until approval of all relevant reserved matters, or a condition prohibiting demolition until District Council is satisfied about immediacy of re development. This should be general policy provision for all development. Demolition applications should be delayed until all outstanding matters resolved.	Noted. Conditions prohibiting demolition until approval of all relevant reserved matters can be applied, however any more stringent requirements would be contrary to national guidelines.

DM145 DM224	Cllr Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>There should be a policy to cover future protection or enhancement of conservation areas throughout District.</p> <p>A: That highways signage be reduced to minimum in Conservation Areas. That highways signage only include that required for safety of pedestrians and traffic.</p> <p>B: That there is a uniformity of shop signage in terms of style, colour and size within a specified Conservation Area.</p> <p>C: That there is no (exterior) advertising or promotional signing (with exception of parish notice boards) within a specified Conservation Area.</p> <p>D: That introduction of finger-posts, information boards or directions use local materials and be of a uniform style and colour.</p>	Where appropriate these elements can be addressed in guidance adopted by Council ie Local Character Area Assessments, Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, Village Design Statements and Parish Plans. These are material consideration is planning applications. A further policy is not considered appropriate.
DM344	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>There is no mention of an "All developments must preserve or enhance Conservation Area"</p> <p>Would like above policy to apply to developments directly adjacent to Conservation Areas.</p>	Core Strategy policy SP1 The Design of New Development and Conservation state that "The District's heritage assets and their settings, will be protected and enhanced" This policy will cover developments that affect CA.
DM17 DM78 DM116	Thomas Rand Christine Lane Tracy Godden	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Noted
DM223	Brenda Hambrook	Otford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The local list should be fully agreed in advance with local Parish Council .	Noted
DM257	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Para 3.16 - This should mean presenting plans that show context of development, i.e. not just elevations and floor plans but proposed views and street scenes.	Noted In appropriate cases these plans will be required by District Council.

DM411	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Add point requiring alterations/additions to buildings in a conservation area to be appropriate to conservation area, with more consideration given to Village Design Statement.	All applications will be subject to EN1. A reference to the requirements of policy SP1 "Design of New Development and Conservation" has been added with the following text "The choice of materials and detailed design are vital elements in achieving new buildings which preserve the local character and distinctiveness which typifies the Districts Conservation Areas" .
DM469	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach subject to changes	Heritage Assets should be subject to external consultations.	These assets are covered by national or local designation therefore additional consultation is not appropriate.
THE GREEN BELT					
Policy GB1 Reuse of Buildings within GB					
DM18	Thomas Rand		Object to approach or wording	Provides too much protection Use disused Nurseries for sheltered or warden controlled housing	All of District's nursery sites are located within GB where strict policies apply that precludes development.
DM184	Graham Simpkin	Graham Simpkin Planning	Object to approach or wording	<p>Could also refer to re-use of buildings for holiday accommodation to help meet aspirations for additional tourist accommodation in District and could cross-reference to Policies related to Tourist Development.</p> <p>Could also usefully refer to potential for equestrian use of existing buildings in GB and cross-reference Policy LT3.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However priority should be given to conversion for employment or non residential tourism facility uses in first instance.</p> <p>In most instances rural buildings that are subject to proposals for conversion would be of sizes and nature significantly greater than that required for keeping of horses. There is also issue of associated grazing land for keeping of horses. However policy LT2 does set out that re-use for equestrian development is acceptable in principle. A separate SPD is proposed with regards to equestrian activities.</p>
DM192	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	There needs to be a condition to cover criteria 1.) of existing policy GB3B, " where building itself or other buildings within a related group have been constructed within last 10 years it will be necessary to demonstrate that there was a genuine agricultural justification for building when originally constructed "	<p>Noted. New sentence inserted into policy GB7.</p> <p>Where conversions are considered acceptable for residential purposes it is reasonable for an associated curtilage to be defined regardless of whether site is in AONB or not.</p>

				In order to give same protection to ANOB as existing policy GB3A sentence " The creation of a residential curtilage as part of a conversion proposal will not be permitted in areas of Outstanding Natural beauty where this would be harmful to character of those areas" needs to be added.	
DM250	Robinson Escott	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott	Object to approach or wording	Objection to description of VSC's Objection to 75% of existing structure being maintained.	Residents are consulted as part of planning application process. The 75% limit has been removed from policy and the supporting text has been amended to refer to a "substantial proportion" to allow flexibility.
DM146	Cllr Edwards-Winser		Object to approach or wording	No enough control. Local neighbourhood should be consulted on re-use of redundant farm buildings. 75% retention of current structure should not be mandatory as it may prove unsafe. Otford PC should be fully involved with any future SPD.	
DM290	J.L Phillips	Tandridge District Council	Support approach subject to changes	Proposing that least 75% of original structure be maintained to protect its rural character may not be workable in practice. Given draft NPPF stance 75% figure for rebuilding may no longer be appropriate. Notwithstanding these comments, This limit should help to ensure that such development does not result in any adverse impact on character of openness of countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining Tandridge/Sevenoaks District boundary.	
DM464	South East Water	Adams Hendry	Object to approach or wording	Notes that DPD only includes draft Policy GB1 dealing with re-use of buildings in GB, which makes no reference to development of new buildings	New development in GB is covered by National Planning Policy and as such should not be repeated.
DM79	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM225	Brenda Hambrook	Otford Parish Council	Support approach	Would like to be fully involved in all discussions throughout consultation period and in any development of future planning policy in this regard.	Noted.

DM368	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach	Considers that Policy GB1 provides sufficient control to ensure development respects and protects District's GB.	Noted.
DM471	F Marshall	The Sevenoaks Society	Support approach	Support principle of GB. Do not agree in commercial re-use being prioritised above residential. Notice lack of reference to other key designations	Noted. The Core Strategy stated that reuse for economic development purposes should take priority over residential.
DM485	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	Support but Policy GB3B should be added to list of Local Plan policies to be replaced by this policy in accordance with Appendix 2.	Appendix 2 already sets out this policy will replace GB3B.
DM95	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The Policy provides sufficient control but may encourage retention of semi-derelict buildings that would be better substantially improved or replaced	Noted. The Council feel policy is suitably worded to ensure that priority is given to reuse or buildings over replacement.
DM117	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	It may encourage retention of semi-derelict buildings that would be better substantially improved or replaced. This policy may be too restrictive and, rather than retaining character of area, will result in derelict buildings harming character of area.	
DM258	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Leisure or community activities that do not alter external appearance should be considered ahead of residential. Priority given to conversion to agricultural use to prevent speculative building for non-viable uses. Permission should be subject to boundary treatments not affecting openness of GB. Traffic/traffic movements must be taken into account Proliferation of such conversions that cause increased density should also be taken into account. It is necessary for developer to demonstrate that likely traffic movement and size of vehicles from business use is appropriate to local roads and area.	Where possible leisure and community facilities should be prioritised within most sustainable locations within settlements. All other comments are noted.
DM316	Adrian	Ark Projects	Support	Criteria of saved Policy EP13 should be incorporated within	Noted.

	Standing	Limited	approach subject to changes	proposed GB SPD.	
DM391	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	This policy is also applicable to buildings within AONB	Whilst AONB is a national designation it is not an absolute constraint and has different objectives to GB policy, which places emphasis on openness above all else.
DM484	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	The first and second sentences should be re-worded as follows: "National and local policies controlling development in countryside apply with equal force in GB. However, there is a strong presumption against development within GB, and it will only be accepted in very exceptional circumstances."	Noted.
Minor GB Boundary Amendments					
DM106	Christina Wilton	Brasted Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	The phrase "where land no longer contributes to GB" is dangerously loose.	The commitment to considering minor GB amendments was established through Core Strategy, where it was clearly identified that these relate to minor GB anomalies and not release for development purposes.
DM118	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Under what circumstances would land be deemed to 'no longer contribute to GB? Land becoming derelict is indicated as not being sufficient reason	
DM19	Thomas Rand		Support approach	In some cases GB is over protected as in case of small plots adjoining boundaries. Minor adjustment to Boundaries would encourage land owners to enhance and recycle derelict land.	
DM35	Alice de la Rue		Object to approach or wording	Are not aware that there have ever been any amendments to GB boundary to accommodate sites for Gypsies or Travellers in any part of country, yet there have been many such alterations to accommodate mainstream housing	Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will be subject to future consultation.
DM412	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach	Ensure Sevenoaks District Council's procedures for amendments facilitate consultation with Parish Councils and neighbours.	Any GB amendments proposed will be subject to statutory consultation through publication stage of production.
DM30	Leslie		Support	There remains a real need for housing in particular Social	The site is a redundant nursery.

	Robis		approach subject to changes	<p>Housing and purpose built Retirement Homes</p> <p>In Swanley/Hextable there are 2 sites which if developed would improve street scene not affect GB and if designated for local need, provide much needed local housing. These sites are old now defunct nursery land.</p> <p>Corner of New Barn Road and Swanley Lane at Five Wents. It would not affect green wedge separating Hextable from Swanley and would clean up boundary of residential land. Development would not form a precedents as two sites are not surrounded by GB or agricultural land. If developed would form an integral part of local community, particularly if developed specifically for defined local need including a much needed health clinic.</p>	<p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of GB as defined in the NPPF, providing a Green Wedge between Swanley and Hextable. The separation between the two settlements is narrow at this point.</p> <p>A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in this instance. Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for development</p>
DM31	Leslie Robis		Support approach subject to changes	<p>There remains a real need for Social Housing and purpose built Retirement Homes.</p> <p>In Swanley/Hextable there are 2 sites which if developed would improve street scene not affect GB and if designated for local need, provide much needed local housing. These sites are old now defunct nursery land.</p> <p>College Road, Hextable following severe damage to glasshouses this is no longer viable. It could be incorporated into village envelope with new boundary separating it from industrial land. Development would not form a precedent as two sites are not surrounded by GB or agricultural land. If developed would form an integral part of local community, particularly if developed specifically for defined local need including a much needed health clinic.</p>	
DM42	John Sparrow	Matthew Blythin DHA Planning	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Propose a minor amendment to boundary south of Parkfield on Wildernesse Estate, Sevenoaks, to form a straight line along boundary of golf course.</p>	<p>The areas of land in question continue to play a role in fulfilling objectives of GB as defined in the NPPF. The existing GB boundaries are defined by physical features.</p>

DM105	Sawyers Park Homes	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott Planning	Support approach subject to changes	Minor Boundary Amendment of West Kingsdown to include "The Bungalow, London Road, West Kingsdown".	No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to the GB boundary. The changes are of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomalies.
DM282	Barbara Ayres		Support approach subject to changes	<p>Hextable Parish Council Complex . The small piece of land lies right on edge of GB and is completely surrounded by development, with Crawfords on one side and parish complex on other sides, which is not needed and not used. This area could accommodate a small detached house 'completing close'</p> <p>3 options proposed Take site from GB. Take parish complex site containing development out of GB. Leave all site in GB including small plot and submit a planning application for a residential unit.</p>	This site comprises a number of buildings clustered around a court yard which is used for car parking. The buildings are in active use including Parish Council offices, residential, workshops, community uses and storage. The buildings are permanent buildings and there has been new building constructed on the site since the Green Belt was first designated in 1958. Most are single storey buildings with pitched roofs. The number, location and scale of the buildings mean that the site now has more of a built up character and its contribution to the openness of the green belt is diminished. The level of built development on the site, its location adjacent to the village envelope and the change in character of the site since the original Green Belt designation all contribute to the exceptional circumstances that justify an amendment to the settlement boundary and exclusion from the Green Belt.
DM103	Mark Batchelor	Robinson Escott Planning	Support approach subject to changes	Minor Amendment to Halstead Village to embrace Deer Leap Stud Farm, all buildings within Warren Court as well as Warren Court Farmhouse.	This site was previously allocated for employment use in the Sevenoaks District Local Plan (2000) and was carried forward in the 2010 Allocations consultation, which proposed the continued allocation of this site for employment use, as recommended by the Council's ELR. Warren Court Farm is an unusual site in planning policy terms, in that it is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, but it is also an identified employment site with an allocation that allows for further employment development. It is the only identified employment site in the district (other than the Major Developed Sites) that is within the Green Belt, and is therefore a historic anomaly. The site is one of five identified in the ELR as being of poor/very poor quality. Warren Court is the only one of the five poor/very poor quality employment sites that has not been redeveloped or re-allocated for residential/mixed-use. The Council's recent ELR update (2011) indicates that there is no

					<p>requirement for additional office space and a reduction in the need for industrial space (-2.3ha). Therefore, there is not now considered to be a need to continue to safeguard this remaining poor quality employment site.</p> <p>The Council has proposed that this site be reallocated for residential development, with a concurrent amendment of the green belt boundary to bring this site within the village envelope. The recommendation is based on the fact that the revised allocation would result in the regeneration of an existing poor quality commercial site without having an adverse impact upon the character and openness of the Green belt. The level of built development on the site, its location adjacent to the village envelope and its poor environmental quality, combined with the fact that the site is an anomaly being the only allocated employment site in the greenbelt (except for designated Major Developed Sites), all contribute to the exceptional circumstances that justify an amendment to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The land to the north at Deer Leap Stud Farm is a separate site where there is no apparent justification for an amendment to the Green belt boundary or for development for housing.</p>
DM182	Mr A Lee and Ms Ackleton		Support approach subject to changes	<p>Fiveways Nursery (North) and Fiveways Nursery (South) Swanley Lane, Swanley (1.19 hectares)</p> <p>The pattern of development across this site is more closely related to pattern of development in adjacent settlement of Swanley than in land beyond site boundaries that is predominantly open. The uses and activity within site has a functional relationship to settlement because all access into and out of site takes place through settlement of Swanley.</p> <p>A substantial gap of open land will remain that will separate Hextable from edge of Swanley and prevent neighbouring settlements from merging into one another. This area of land no longer fulfils fundamental aim of GB that is to retain openness of land because it is already built</p>	<p>The site is a redundant nursery.</p> <p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of GB as defined in the NPPF, providing a Green Wedge between Swanley and Hextable. The separation between the two settlements is narrow at this point.</p> <p>A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in this instance.</p>

				up. The Inspector in his report into Sevenoaks District Local Plan recommended that GB boundary should be redefined as suggested in this representation. However, at time Inspectors decisions were not mandatory and SDC decided not to accept recommendation.	
DM216	P Brazier		Support approach subject to changes	<p>Land north of New Barn Road, Swanley. It is bounded by New Barn Road to north, New Barn Park to west, and a derelict Nursery and housing development to east and south. It is for most part undeveloped with buildings contained to northern end of Veitchii Nursery comprising a detached cottage and range of buildings in employment use. The undeveloped part of site is not in productive use and suffers from fly tipping and unauthorised access to detriment of visual amenities of area.</p> <p>The proposal is to utilise site as a crematorium, garden of remembrance and extension to New Barn Park. There is an under provision of burial space and gardens of remembrance in Swanley area, and there is a growing requirement locally for a crematorium. The proposal would meet a local need and is situated in a sustainable location thereby reducing need to travel. The extension to New Barn Park would augment a popular community facility and would bring into public control a significant area of land between Swanley and Hextable. With careful consideration to access design, massing and location of a crematorium together with associated landscaping, it is contended 'green wedge' between Swanley and Hextable would be preserved. The local need and provision of public open space would amount to very special circumstances for allocation of uses in LDF, in an area otherwise designated as GB.</p>	<p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling the objectives of GB as defined in the NPPF, providing a Green Wedge between Swanley and Hextable. The separation between the two settlements is narrow at this point. A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in this instance.</p> <p>The use of land for cemeteries is not necessarily inappropriate development in the greenbelt and any applications will be considered via the development management process.</p>
DM183	M Johnson		Support approach subject to changes	Hextable Development across this site is more closely related to pattern of development in adjacent settlement of Hextable than in land beyond site boundaries that is predominantly open. The uses and activity within site has a functional relationship to settlement because all access	<p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling objectives of GB as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>The existing GB boundary is defined by physical features.</p>

				<p>into and out of site takes place through settlement of Hextable. A significant part of site should now be regarded as previously developed land "Brown Field land. A substantial gap of open land will remain that will separate Hextable from edge of Swanley and prevent neighbouring settlements from merging into one another.</p> <p>This area of land no longer fulfils fundamental aim of GB that is to retain openness of land because it is already built up. It is also apparent that there are community lead needs for development e.g. new medical centre and sheltered housing that cannot be met within existing confines of settlement of Hextable. The release of this land from GB would provide for these development needs to be met without having to rely upon very special circumstances.</p>	<p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to GB boundary. The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
DM285	Tracy Lane	Parish Clerk Hextable Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Minor amendment at Hextable Parish Council.</p>	<p>This site comprises a number of buildings clustered around a court yard which is used for car parking. The buildings are in active use including Parish Council offices, residential, workshops, community uses and storage. The buildings are permanent buildings and there has been new building constructed on the site since the Green Belt was first designated in 1958. Most are single storey buildings with pitched roofs. The number, location and scale of the buildings mean that the site now has more of a built up character and its contribution to the openness of the green belt is diminished. The level of built development on the site, its location adjacent to the village envelope and the change in character of the site since the original Green Belt designation all contribute to the exceptional circumstances that justify an amendment to the settlement boundary and exclusion from the Green Belt.</p>
DM147 DM236	Cllr John Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook	Oxford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Oxford Parish Council is planning to improve its car parking facilities and may wish to seek a Minor GB Amendment in order to introduce a Green car park area on village's Southern boundary.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

DM317	Mr and Mrs K Vizard	Adrian Standing Ark Projects Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Minor Boundary Amendments Bartram Farm Estate Old Otford Road Sevenoaks	The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.
DM318	Brian Chandler	Adrian Standing Ark Projects Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Minor Amendments College Road Nurseries College Road Hextable	<p>Site is in the green belt and therefore does not meet the criteria for allocation for development.</p> <p>The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate.</p>
DM34	Leigh Family	Carter Planning Limited	Support approach subject to changes	Leighs Yard and Shefts Croft, Mill Hill, Edenbridge should be considered for residential development.	<p>The land owner has demonstrated that the site is not viable for employment use during the Core Strategy period. As such the removal of the site from protected employment use complies with policy SP8.</p> <p>The land has since gained planning permission for mixed use.</p>
DM404	Helen Milner	Network Rail	Support approach subject to changes	Promotion of Station Road Edenbridge	Core Strategy considered the inclusion of this land as a strategic reserve site to come forward in the latter part of the Core Strategy period, and only in the event that the Council cannot demonstrate a clear supply of housing land. The decision and approach was found sound by the independent Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination.
DM319	P Cruickshank	Adrian Standing Ark Projects Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Minor Boundary Amendments Land at Park Lane Kemsing	The site is in GB where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that GB land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of site for development would therefore be contrary to the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.

					There is a clearly and well defined GB boundary to Park Lane Kemsing and this site does not contain any development that reduces openness or implies that that this site does not uphold purposes of including land in GB. A minor GB amendment would not be appropriate in this instance.
DM47	J Hoad	Hartley Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The GB boundary at Billings Hill Shaw, Hartley, should be amended as agreed in previous SDLP.	<p>This area was previously included within the green belt, until the adoption of the 1994 Swanley Planning Area Local Plan, when it was removed, although there is no written justification for this amendment. Representations were made by the Parish Council in relation to the subsequent Local Plan in 2000, requesting that the land at Billings Hill Shaw be included in the Green Belt. The Inspector commented at that time that the non-inclusion of the land in the Green Belt was an anomaly and that there was a clear case for its inclusion in the Green Belt to provide a rational and coherent boundary along the highways margin of Billings Hill Shaw. In the Inspector's view, the apparent error in the previously defined boundary (from 1994) provided justification for an amendment. Notwithstanding the Inspector's report, the Council maintained the existing boundary in the Local Plan (2000) but noted in the Plan that:</p> <p><i>'the Council recognises the force of the Inspector's recommendation in respect of the land at Billings Hill Shaw. In particular the need to rectify two "apparent" (cartographical) errors made in 1984 and 1994 in the line of the Green Belt boundary. This would clearly incorporate this land within the Green Belt and re-establish the Hartley Village envelope at this point. The Council will, therefore, be proposing a change in the Green belt boundary to rectify this error at the earliest opportunity.'</i></p> <p>The Council has reviewed the land in question, which is covered in trees and is clearly differentiated from the adjoining housing estate from which it is separated by a clearly defined boundary (Billings Hill Shaw road). The site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and the continuous strip of trees extends onto the land to the west of the site. The area to the west of the site is included within the Green Belt, and the site in</p>

					question is of similar character to the land to the west. Its character reads more as part of the surrounding countryside than the developed area. It is considered that the highways margin of Billings Hill Shaw provides a rational and coherent Green Belt boundary. These considerations, together with the comments of the previous Local Plan Inspector who recommended that the site be included in the Green Belt and the Council's acceptance that the error would be rectified at the earliest opportunity, provide the exceptional circumstances to justify the amendment to the Green Belt in this location.
DM102	Clark's College Ltd	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott Planning	Support approach subject to changes	Request for a small scale boundary amendment at Southdown House, High Street, Brasted as land does not contribute to purposes of GB and boundary cut across curtilages.	<p>The land in question continues to play a role in fulfilling objectives of GB as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>Whilst existing GB boundary is not defined by physical features, it is clear where built part of Brasted ends and open GB begins. Amendment of boundary as proposed would allow principle of development within currently open area altering character significantly (backland development).</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances are apparent that would warrant an amendment to GB boundary. The change is of a significant scale and as such could not be defined as an anomaly.</p>
Major Developed Site Boundaries					
DM486	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	If proposals are put forward, there should be a further round of targeted consultation with interested stakeholders before a decision is made on them. This should include Parish Councils, and CPRE.	Noted.
DM333	Armstrong (Kent) LLP	Christopher Hill GVA Grimley	Support approach subject to changes	Promoting amendment to Fort Halstead MDS boundary.	The MDS has been redrawn to take into account extent of site that is developed.
HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT					
Promoting Land for Housing					

DM226	Brenda Hambrook	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Concern over effect of additional housing on small communities. Add criterion that any application for a new site development clearly establish that its effect will not be detrimental to sustainability of local community.	The call for housing sites included criteria that sites should be in conformity with Core Strategy.
DM276	Cooper Estates Limited	Robin Buchanan	Object to approach or wording	Supports approach (of DPD) subject to changes' as follows: (a) That site be included as a new housing allocation in merged Allocations and Development Management DPD. (b) That second bullet point parameter in table at para 5.1 of DPD be amended as follows: "The site is located within confines of an existing built settlement or on edge of a built up settlement and not within GB". There are only very limited locations that could satisfy both 'or' provision and 'and' provision.	Response to Broom Hill.
DM311	Cooper Estates	Paul Watson Phillips Planning Services	Object to approach or wording	Promotion of safeguarded land, early release proposed.	The Core Strategy sets out procedure for release of reserve land.
DM104	Mark Batchelor	Robinson Escott Planning	Support approach	Allocation of land to west of no.5 Mill Lane, Shoreham for housing. Already submitted during Allocation (Options) consultation.	<p>The site is located within settlement confines of Shoreham, however main portion of site has been subject to a number of planning applications for residential development in recent years. There have also been 4 separate appeals (Most recently July 2011) dismissed following refusal of planning permission by Council.</p> <p>The main issues of concern surround this site are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether development would preserve or enhance character or appearance of Shoreham Mill Lane Conservation Area; • The effect on setting of adjacent and nearby listed buildings • The effect on living conditions of adjacent occupiers, in terms of loss of privacy, outlook, natural light and noise and disturbance; and • The effect on highway safety. <p>Taking into consideration above issues, Council feel that site is best considered through detailed planning application process</p>

					due to constraints that impact upon principle of development.
DM307	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach subject to changes	Continued promotion of United House for housing allocation	The site is included within pre submission draft for mixed use including housing.
DM334	Armstrong (Kent) LLP	Christopher Hill GVA Grimley	Support approach subject to changes	Support of Fort Halstead as a mixed use housing led allocation.	The site was considered for mixed use development allocation and rejected through Core Strategy process.
DM392	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	Housing and residential development The AONBs should be mentioned in this chapter. Para 5.1 Add'enabling GB and AONBs to continue to be protected' Promoting Land for Housing Wherever GB is mentioned AONB could also be added. AONB is not exempt from receiving planning applications! Therefore add to bullet point 2: '..... and not within GB or AONB'	First point noted. The AONB is not an absolute constraint that would prohibit well designed and suitable development. Notwithstanding call for sites will not be included within pre submission draft.
Policy H Residential Conversions					
DM251	Robinson Escott	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott	Object to approach or wording	Objection to criteria a) being too restrictive.	The conversion for houses to flats cannot be achieved if a building is not structurally suitable for conversion.
DM20 DM80 DM119 DM293	Thomas Rand Christine Lane Tracy Godden J.L Phillips	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Tandridge D C	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM53	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent	Support approach subject to	Conversion of residential properties in to apartments usually leads to more vehicles being parked on highway, highway often already being congested. This impacts on	Criteria c) inserted to read 'c) Suitable parking and access arrangements could be achieved' .

		Police	changes	emergency services responses to premises in vicinity. Recommends a further criterion: 'The proposal not increasing traffic congestion and on street vehicle parking in vicinity'	
DM149	Cllr John Edwards-Winser		Support approach subject to changes	Might be difficult to prove if development will produce a materially greater impact on openness of GB compared with what it is replacing. ANY application for a new development clearly establishes that its effect will not be detrimental to sustainability of local community	Determining impact of development will be a role for Development Control team with each proposal judged on its own merits.
DM413	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Add 'or significantly increase traffic flow along country lanes or roads without pavements'	
DM345	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Point 5.4 should be amended to cover not just apartments, but developments where dwellings are split vertically. i.e. successful redevelopment of RUC hall in Hollybush Lane	Noted. Policy and supporting text amended to include subdivision as well as apartment conversion.
DM393	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	This policy should also cover AONBs.	The AONB is not an absolute constraint that would prohibit well designed and suitable development.
DM488	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Consider that reference to flood risk should be specifically included in Policy. Also, for clarity, reference to policies SC1, SC2 and SC3 should be included.	Flood risk is covered by National Planning Policy and as such does not need specific reference. Policies SC1, 2 (now EN1) and 3 (now EN2) relate to all development proposals and as such does not need specific reference.
Policy H Limited Extensions or Outbuildings to Existing Dwellings in GB					
DM37	Mike Tatham	Tatham Homes Ltd	Object to approach or wording	Each application should be treated on its merits and on its design to decide if it was an acceptable development in GB. Some schemes meet proposed criteria but are not acceptable and vice versa.	The policy has been substantially re worded please refer to document. The draft Green Belt policies now retain a floorspace (rather

				<p>Basements that are below ground level should not be included in volume or area calculation as they have no bearing on visual bulk of building and cannot possibly impact on GB.</p> <p>If there is a restriction it should be method currently used based on floor areas. Volumes can distort proposed designs with acceptable volumes in planning terms for instance, incorporation of a flat roof extensions that may be out of character to existing.</p>	<p>than volume) limit calculation, in conjunction with qualitative assessment criteria related to the scale and bulk of the resultant building, to capture the impact of the development on the Green Belt. Although a volume-based policy was considered to accurately reflect the impact of a proposal on the green belt, the practical problems of calculations when tested against real life examples, were considered to be prohibitive.</p> <p>The draft policies also retain a 50% floorspace figure, in that the size of any extension/replacement dwelling in the Green Belt, should not result in an increase of more than 50% above the floorspace of the original dwelling. This is as per the existing saved Local Plan policy, as the consultation feedback suggested that reducing this figure to 30% volume was too restrictive. There was also some debate during the consultation about whether the percentage figure should be removed from the policy, suggesting that this would increase flexibility and the opportunity to assess each development on its merits.</p> <p>However, it is held that the inclusion of a percentage figure in the policy provides a useful level of guidance for both those submitting and assessing development proposals. The policy makes it clear that the percentage criteria is considered to be secondary to good design and proposals that comply with the 50% rule will not necessarily be approved if the extension is poorly designed or overly intrusive in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Separate green belt policies have also been drafted on basements (GB2), outbuildings (GB3) and 'very special circumstances' dwellings (GB5) in order to provide further guidance in these areas. A Green Belt SPD will also be produced to assist the implementation of these policies.</p> <p>1 July 1948 relates to when TCPA came into effect. The</p>
DM44	Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Objects to reduction in total volume of extensions or outbuildings to existing dwellings in GB, from 50% to 30%	
DM425	Lorna Talbot	Clerk Seal Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The Parish Council believes that existing Local Plan Policy H14B (2) which limits size of outbuildings to 40 square metres should be retained. The proposed change contained in Policy H2 could result in large buildings in open countryside, up to 30% of volume of an existing house, which could be substantial.	
DM132	Gillian King Scott	Clerk Halstead Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	30% Volume more complicated to calculate than 50% floorspace. Does this include non-habitable roof spaces?	
DM186	Graham Simpkin	Graham Simpkin Planning	Object to approach or wording	<p>The base line for consideration of an Original dwelling is 1948 when aspirations were very different from today, by restricting increases to 30% of what existed in 1948 there is a danger that it is merely perpetuating social inequalities.</p> <p>The volume calculation based on such a distant date will add to arguments between Council and applicants and appeals. The choice of volume is a retrograde step. If volume is used horizon date or base date for operation of Policy should be much more recent e.g. 2000 from which time it will be possible to use reliable sources to determine volume that existed at that date by use of modern aerial</p>	

				<p>photography, better quality sources of information. If not then it is appropriate to retain floor space as basis on which calculations should be made.</p> <p>The Policy should be related to what can be undertaken using Permitted Development Rights that have been changed recently. It is likely that this Policy will offer less than can be built using Permitted Development Rights. The Government makes no distinction between development in GB areas and those elsewhere (apart from certain protected areas) for use of P D Rights.</p> <p>It is also noted that GPDO has moved away from volume limits to specific criteria and therefore proposed DPD Policy H2 seems to be going in opposite direction.</p>	<p>'resetting' of basedate would result in properties that have been developed up to their limits being given a new allowance and scope for development.</p>
DM194	Lynda Harrison	West Kingsdown Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>Proposed policy H2 is not a replacement for existing policy H14B which relates to outbuildings in AONB. There should be a new policy covering criteria contained in H14B, i.e. total gross floor area of 40sqm, building being single storey, 30% increase in volume, design and siting and fact that outbuildings will not be permitted within curtilages of buildings converted to dwellings.</p> <p>The change from 50% floor space to 30% volume could be a positive approach provided some height restriction is introduced . There is no case for allowing proportionally larger extensions to smaller properties. Smaller dwellings provide accommodation for those of lesser means. The policy also helps to protect countryside from urbanising effect of increasing numbers of large properties.</p>	
DM213	Y Tredoux	Kemsing Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>The volume-based figure of 30%, is likely to create applications for extensions upwards, resulting in applications for 3 storey dwellings, which could be injurious to street scene and create additional overlooking of neighbouring properties to detriment of amenity of residents.</p>	
DM227	Brenda	Otford Parish	Object to	<p>Recommend retention of 50% rule. Proportionately larger</p>	

	Hambrook	Council	approach or wording	extensions to smaller properties should only be allowed when there is proven justifiable need.
DM263	Robinson Escott	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott	Object to approach or wording	Policy text should reflect text contained in GPDO with regards to ancillary uses; PPG2 allows limited extension of dwellings in GB and should not be subject to individuals circumstances; Cannot identify any valid reason why current policy should be changed. Basements don't impact upon GB openness reference should be deleted.
DM295	Hobson		Object to approach or wording	It would be beneficial for small houses to be allowed a greater scope. Suggest adding to clause b) at end of sentence "or exceed 120 m3, whichever is larger"
DM346	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	A reduction to a 30% floorspace allowance is too drastic and would prefer to see higher percentage allowed. There is a case for allowing proportionately larger extensions to smaller properties when properties are under 1200-1400sq ft size range.
DM414	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Unsure of rationale behind suggestion of 30% of original volume and therefore suggest 50% of volume is retained, particularly in relation to smaller dwellings.
DM453	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Difficult if not impossible to assess applications using these criteria. Clarification is needed as to whether proximity of outbuildings as well as whether things like tennis courts and swimming pools would count in calculations.
DM473	L Moss	Fawkham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Detailed Objection to Policy H2.
DM287	Tracy Lane	Clerk Hextable Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Believe change in approach is confusing for some applicants. The 50% rule should be kept
DM21	Thomas		Support	The extensions allowed should be same for every property

	Rand		approach subject to changes	
DM489	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	<p>30% doesn't seem unreasonable, would prefer to see an approach that does not set limits. Refer to para 3.6 of PPG2 and draft NPPF proposes to keep same approach and same wording.</p> <p>The standard floor area or volume approach seeks to provide control and certainty by limiting size of extensions, but makes it difficult to refuse anything that is at absolute limit people inevitably will push to limits of what they are allowed.</p> <p>There is also issue of permitted development rights, and how (and if) this is taken into account. Whilst proposed Policy H2 in regard to extensions explicitly says that 30% volume figure includes any previous extensions and outbuildings, what is situation where original house has not had any extensions and is in its original form? If owner achieves permission for a 30% increase will Council automatically remove permitted development rights for any further extensions? This is an option Council has and would be relatively straightforward in this clear cut situation, but it is more difficult if owner only applies for a 20% extension. What would (can) Council do about controlling permitted development rights in this instance to ensure only 30% overall? It makes for a rather complicated, and potentially confrontational, approach.</p> <p>The policies should not actually set any size limit but each case should be considered on its merits against general advice of PPG2/the NPPF – that extensions do not result in 'disproportionate additions' and that replacements are not 'materially larger'. This wording should be included in policy (or at least supporting text), whilst other proposed criteria would remain relevant (and perhaps could be added to). This will enable Council to consider each proposal</p>

				individually and, where considered appropriate, not accept even 30% .	
DM214	Y Tredoux	Kemsing Parish Council	Support approach	Agree that there is a case for allowing proportionately larger extensions to smaller properties.	
DM96	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	There is a case for allowing proportionately larger extensions to smaller properties, but for larger properties, maximum extension should be less than 30%.	
DM107	Christina Wilton	Brasted Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Changing from floorspace to volume will make calculations more difficult. Introduce a reducing sliding scale according to original size of property, possibly starting at a higher percentage.	
DM151	Cllr Edwards-Winser		Support approach	Volume is a lot easier to consider than area. Should there be a cut-off date included? ie 30% volume at date built or as at 1947. No reason for proportionately larger extensions for smaller properties unless there is proven justifiable need	
DM294	J.L Phillips	Tandridge D C	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM81	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Concern over case for including basements, suggest if they don't have separate entrances and are no habitable space they should not be included.	Not counting basements in initial calculation would result in potential for vast amounts of development underground.
DM436	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Seeks confirmation of detailed interpretations.	As set out in draft DPD a Supplementary Planning Document will accompany pre submission draft of document providing detailed interpretations.
DM245	James Tagg		Object to approach or wording	On Environmental Grounds - shortage of housing (often done by relaxing Greenbelt restrictions) on Socioeconomic Grounds- The scheme will reduce increase in habitable area within countryside. On Design and Heritage Grounds.- The proposal will result in building schemes that maximize utility of space within new restrictions.	The Core Strategy has established that GB will be protected and that development needs can be met within urban confines.

DM260	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Do all outbuildings count in calculation? Serious concerns that PCs will find it difficult to assess applications.	Noted.
DM358	Andrew Michaelides		Support approach subject to changes	Support change to policy- will be better at capturing real impact of extensions in comparison to existing 50% floorspace limit. Believe existing limit on outbuildings for dwellings in GB of 40 square metres should be retained.	Noted.
Policy H Replacement Dwellings in GB					
DM38	Mike Tatham	Tatham Homes Ltd	Object to approach or wording	<p>Each application should be treated on its merits and on its design to decide if it was an acceptable development in GB. Some schemes meet proposed criteria but are not acceptable and vice versa.</p> <p>Basements that are below ground level should not be included in volume or area calculation as they have no bearing on visual bulk of building and cannot possibly impact on GB.</p> <p>If there is a restriction it should be method currently used based on floor areas. Volumes can distort proposed designs with acceptable volumes in planning terms for instance, incorporation of a flat roof extensions that may be out of character to existing.</p>	<p>The policy and supporting text have been redrafted Please see document.</p> <p>See response related to Policy on 'Limited Extensions or Outbuildings to Existing Dwellings in GB' above.</p>
DM101	Timothy Ball	JHD Architects	Object to approach or wording	<p>Proposed changes will reduce potential for well designed and energy efficient dwellings. The policy should be more flexible to allow good design, percentage will result in some schemes that are too large and others rejected. Change to volume may affect good architecture, non habitable basement areas should not be included.</p> <p>Suggest using gross internal floor area instead as this directly relates to occupancy of both existing and replacement house.</p>	
DM133	Gillian	Clerk	Object to	30% Volume more complicated to calculate than 50% floor-	

	King Scott	Halstead Parish Council	approach or wording	space. Does this include non-habitable roof spaces?	
DM190	Graham Simpkin	Graham Simpkin Planning	Object to approach or wording	<p>Difficulties will arise for calculating historic volumes dating back to 1948.</p> <p>Basements wholly underground have no bearing upon "openness" of GB and therefore should be excluded from calculations relating to volume.</p> <p>Should refer to circumstances where it is proposed to replace a dwelling that has already been extended in excess of new policy i.e. where it has been extended by previous Policy allowance of 50%.</p> <p>The policy should therefore state categorically that replacements on a like for like basis where parameters of policy are already exceeded will be acceptable.</p>	
DM273	Robinson Escott	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott	Object to approach or wording	Para 5.21 seems to suggest that dwellings in GB can only be replaced if existing house is at end of its useful life.	
DM297	Hobson		Object to approach or wording	Beneficial to GB communities to be allowed a greater scope. Suggest adding to clause b) at end of sentence "or exceed 120 m3, whichever is larger"	
DM454	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	<p>Policy H3 - First sentence should end '!...are met.' Same requirements regarding 30% rule apply.</p> <p>Any alternative site on plot should be no more detrimental to GB than existing building and preferably less detrimental.</p>	
DM153	Cllr John Edwards-Winser		Support approach subject to changes	(d) should be regarded sympathetically if it is self-build. The change from 50% area to 30% volume is positive as it is easier to assess	

DM196	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	There needs to be a para explaining meaning of " original ",The change 50% floor space to 30% volume could be a positive approach some height restriction is introduced into it. The word "consider" should be removed from penultimate para of policy H3	
DM490	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	See summary for DM489	
DM22 DM82 DM97 DM120 DM296	Thomas Rand Christine Lane Alison de Jager Tracy Godden J.L Phillips	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Tandridge D C	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM54	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Much of highway within GB comprises narrow lanes, etc. emergency vehicles may encounter obstructions delaying attendance. Recommends inclusion of: 'The proposal does not increase traffic congestion and on street vehicle parking in vicinity'.	Noted.
DM261	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Same comments as for Policy H2. "are met" instead of "is met". Any alternative site on plot should be no more detrimental to GB than existing building and preferably less detrimental.	Noted.
DM394 DM395 DM397	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	Para 5.11 This paragraph should relate to GBs and AONBs HS2 should be amended to relate to AONBs. These are issues common to GB and AONBs Para 5.21 This applies equally to AONBs These are issues common to GB and AONBs Should apply also AONBs.	The AONB is not an absolute constraint that would prohibit well designed and suitable development and AONB is set within a different planning policy context to GB.

DM437	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Concerns - requires confirmation of no greater impact as a result of changes.	Assessing impact will be central responsibility of Development Control team.
Policy H Re – Use and Protection of Existing Housing Stock					
DM252	Simon McFarlane	Planning Issues	Object to approach or wording	Additional wording is required to ensure that redevelopment that leads to a net increase in housing is permitted provided it meets with other policy objectives.	The policy and supporting text is clear that proposals for a net increase in housing will be subject to detailed housing policies.
DM274	Robinson Escott	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott	Object to approach or wording	Policy H4 relates to "residential housing". If it is housing it must be residential so more careful wording is required.	Noted.
DM23 DM55 DM83 DM98 DM121 DM162 DM347	Thomas Rand Trevor R Hall Christine Lane Alison de Jager Tracy Godden Cllr Edwards-Winser Hugh D'Alton	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach	Support	Noted.
Policy H New Residential Care Homes					
DM7	McCarthy and Stone	The Planning Bureau Ltd	Object to approach or wording	The background research guiding emerging policies makes it very clear that District will experience a very significant ageing of population with over 65s representing a much	The Policy on New Residential Care Homes (previously Policy H5) has been deleted since it was worded as a negative policy that sought to restrict the location of these uses.

	Retirement Lifestyles Ltd			<p>greater proportion of total.</p> <p>Therefore there should be greater emphasis whether within Policy H5 or a separate policy to actively support housing for older population. There are different ways in which potential older population will wish to be housed and not just within traditional family Houses or care homes. An holistic approach should be taken in policy terms to ensure that there is a more positive approach to likes of Owner Occupied Retirement Housing.</p>	<p>The Council strongly supports the provision of housing to meet the requirements of people in special need of help or supervision where they are fully integrated into existing communities and located in sustainable locations. The housing allocations proforma at Appendix 3 of the DPD now identify sites that are particularly suitable for housing specifically designed for older people (including those with special needs).</p>
DM24	Thomas Rand			<p>Criterion a) should only say with good access to public transport services and community facilities. There should be a policy on warden controlled homes. The policy should allow for more use of disused nurseries sites in GB for warden controlled homes</p>	
DM259	Simon McFarlane	Planner Planning Issues		<p>Policy should be widened to include all forms of specialist accommodation specifically including C3 residential Category II Sheltered Housing.</p>	
DM283	Robinson Escott	Mark Batchelor Robinson Escott		<p>Criterion (b) of policy refers to "defensible amenity space" but it is unclear what this means.</p>	
DM312	Cooper Estates	Phillips Planning Services		<p>Taken a negative slant.</p>	
DM163	Cllr Edwards-Winser		Support approach	<p>Support</p>	
DM33	Leigh Family	Carter Planning Limited		<p>Reference to need to control concentration of accommodation to protect character of an area could be interpreted too rigidly and should not be based purely on proximity. For example sites could be adjacent but with access onto different roads, therefore there is unlikely to be cumulative adverse impact</p>	

DM84	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council		How will undue noise and disturbance' be judged? Residential units by their nature tend to be fairly large and could therefore always be seen as causing undue noise and disturbance. If may be necessary for a policy on C2a institutions to be considered to ensure security issues have been addressed.	
DM198	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council		To prevent future changes of use that, whilst still under C2, could result in noise and disturbance to surrounding residents, a further criteria should be applied to policy H5,that restricts planning permission to that shown on application.	
DM264	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council		The 30% rule should apply here too.	
Policy H Siting of Caravan and Mobile Homes					
DM25	Thomas Rand		Object to approach or wording	Add "Mobile homes and caravans will only be allowed for duration for new build and should be removed on completion of any build"	The comments relate to proposals that are Permitted Development and as such are not within scope of this policy.
DM99	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	The policy does not provide sufficient criteria to control mobile home development, there is no justification for using this policy for any permanent consent and should be restricted to temporary consent. Applications for permanent location should be dealt with through a planning application adhering to local planning policy. The Criteria regarding mobile homes should be more defined and policy limited to temporary permission as in 5.39.	The supporting text within the Housing within Urban Confines section states explicitly that "Within existing built confines all proposals for new or replacement dwellings will be assessed against the design, amenity, safety and environmental principles set out in Policies SC1, EN1 and EN2. Proposals for the temporary or permanent location of a mobile home or caravan in the confines of an existing settlement will be considered in the same manner as a new permanent dwelling.'
DM164 DM228	Cllr Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook	Oxford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Include following Only be a temporary residence on site for limited/seasonal agricultural use. To prevent any farmer to open a caravan park on his field all year. They should be inconspicuously sited as much as possible within landscape.	The policy is explicit that stationing of mobile homes will be for agricultural or forestry purposes only and as such use for a caravan park would require detailed planning permission.

DM199	Lynda Harrison	Clerk West Kingsdown Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Does not provide sufficient criteria to control mobile home development. In order to provide proper control wording of policies H19, H17 and H16 of SDLP should be included as criteria under new policy H6.	The Council feel that policy is adequately worded as stands.
DM265	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Policy too restrictive. Non-residential leisure caravans should be allowed for. There should be a time limit for completion of construction associated with a temporary caravan	The policy refers to caravans as a whole and not with reference to a specific use. Proposals for leisure use should be subject to policies contained within Leisure and Tourism chapter of document. The temporary stationing of a mobile home during construction works is permitted development and as such a time limit cannot be imposed.
DM284	Mark Batchelor	Robinson Escott	Object to approach or wording	There is no cross-reference to annex to PPS7. In relation to criterion (a), feel that policy should also include reference to equestrian activities.	
DM396	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Object to approach or wording	This applies equally to AONBs These are issues common to GB and AONBs	The AONB is not an absolute constraint that would prohibit well designed and suitable development and AONB is set within a different planning policy context to GB.
DM415	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Incorporate point from paragraph 5.35 above about subsequent changed use leading to detrimental impact on local surrounding.	Noted “ environmental and local amenity considerations ” added to b).
DM455	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Policy H5 - The 30% rule should apply here too. Para 5.39 - There should be a time limit for completion of construction associated with a temporary caravan. Policy H6 - This would appear to prevent you parking a leisure caravan, not used for residential purposes, on your driveway.	Proposals for C2 care homes in GB will be resisted and as such 30% rule is not required. The temporary stationing of a mobile home during construction works is permitted development and as such a time limit cannot be imposed. Under planning law, householders can park caravans in their gardens or driveways indefinitely, provided that no material change of use of land occurs.
DM85 DM122	Christine Lane Tracy Godden	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish	Support approach	Support	Noted.

		Council			
DM430	Jennifer Wilson	Environmental Agency	Support approach subject to changes	It should be made clear mobile homes are classed as 'Highly Vulnerable' and will not be permitted in flood risk areas.	Noted.
DM438	Angela Howells	Clerk Parish Council Westerham	Support approach subject to changes	a) Once a caravan or mobile home has been granted permission in GB. Seek regular checks that there is a continuing need for this and that there is a viable agricultural or forestry activity actually taking place on this site.	Noted.
DM491	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Within criterion a) there needs to be reference to removal of a mobile home/caravan when need for it has gone. This should also be addressed in paragraph 5.38.	Agreed. However this is a matter that will be deal with through conditions on any planning application and through enforcement if required.
<u>Promoting Land for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show People Accommodation</u>					
DM26	Thomas Rand		Object to approach or wording	No more Gypsies because we already have enough legal and illegal sites in Sevenoaks District	The Council considers that Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, carried out in 2006, is out of date and does not form an appropriate basis for developing planning policy to 2026. It commissioned a new Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showperson Accommodation Needs Assessment. This document will form evidence base for separate Gypsy and Traveller Plan, which Council aims to consult on in 2013.
DM36	Alice de la Rue		Object to approach or wording	Whilst national planning policy on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is currently under review, this should not be an opportunity for further delay of appropriate provision of accommodation. The facts have not changed there is a shortage of this specialist accommodation type. Should adopt pitch targets in Partial Review and turn focus to delivery, an approach supported by current and emerging national policy. Support cross-boundary working, but this should not be seen as an opportunity to delay progress, and should not be used as an excuse by a local authority to try to avoid making appropriate provision in their area.	

DM134	Gillian King Scott	Clerk Halstead Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Inviting land owners to promote their land for gypsy and travellers sites will encourage landowners to sell to travellers and there will be large increase of GB sites	Existing national policy (Planning for Traveller Sites) sets out that non GB locations should be favoured but allows for minor amendments to GB to meet specific needs for Gypsy and Traveller sites. Policy SP6 of Core Strategy reflects this approach.
DM456	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Any development in GB should be subject to same rules as for anybody else. There should be no special treatment as this would be inequitable.	
DM266	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Any development in GB should be subject to same rules as for anybody else.	
DM369	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	Will provide some comfort to councils that Traveller sites really are recognised as inappropriate development in GB. Applications from Travellers for development in GB should be dealt with in exactly same way as applications from members of settled community. Retrospective applications should not be treated any differently. This should be reflected in this document.	
DM439	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Planning policy for gypsy and traveller sites should be same as that for other forms of housing, in interest of fairness and equality of treatment between travellers and others.	
DM56 DM123	Trevor R Hall Tracy Godden	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM398	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	This applies equally to AONBs These are issues common to GB and AONBs The following should be added to green box: Development of sites within AONBs are considered inappropriate development.	The AONB is not an absolute constraint that would prohibit well designed and suitable development and AONB is set within a different planning policy context to GB.
TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT					

Policy T1 Mitigating Travel Impact					
	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Object to approach or wording	Disagree that this replaces Local Plan policies T8, T9 & T10. It is difficult to see how this can be as Local Plan policies cover a different policy topic. It also conflicts with Appendix 2.	Policy T1 is intended to consider transport impacts of development in a more holistic way than previous Local Plan policies. SDC do not see need for direct replacements for policies T8, T9 & T10. Kent County Council, who are the Local Transport Authority, have not objected to loss of these policies.
	Cllr Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Amend wording of second Paragraph: From "This may mean.." to "This requires..." Does not have sufficient weight to mitigate travel impact. There must be a clear policy of promoting walkways and footpaths and defined introduction of independent or combined cycle routes within district.	Change is not agreed. Not all development will result in adverse transport impacts that require mitigation.
	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	Paragraph 6.2 makes reference to health benefits of walking and cycling, however Policy T1 makes no reference to these modes	Core Strategy Policy SP2 seeks improvements to facilities for cycling and walking as a means of reducing reliance on travel by car. It provides the strategic context for this policy.
	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	The proposals as drafted do not have sufficient weight or substance. A policy is needed to protect Air Quality, particularly from extra traffic resulting from development.	Core Strategy Policy SP2 seeks to prevent unmitigated negative impacts of development on air quality.
	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	There appears to be no consideration of traffic impact on quiet lanes and unsuitability of certain commercial traffic movements.	Traffic impacts on quiet lanes and unsuitability of certain commercial traffic movements will be considered through the environmental, noise and amenity considerations referred to in first sentence of this policy.
	Christine Lane Tracy Godden United House	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach	Support Support proposal to improve links to Station.	Support noted and welcomed.

	John Henderso n	NDD SE Planner Highways Agency	Support approach subject to changes	Remove words in brackets stating for 'non-residential purposes'. Include reference to Draft and CLG Guidance on Transport Assessment.	Agreed ' non-residential purposes ' deleted.
	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Support policies which seek to minimise congestion. New transport infrastructure must have public safety 'designed in' and must adopt Secured by Design measures. Car parks must be compliant with "Park Mark" standards.	Support noted. The need for new development to create safe environments is established in Core Strategy Policy SP1.
	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	There appears to be no consideration of traffic impact on quiet lanes and unsuitability of certain commercial traffic movements.	Traffic impacts on quiet lanes and unsuitability of certain commercial traffic movements will be considered through the environmental, noise and amenity considerations referred to in first sentence of this policy.
	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Interested to see this being placed in context of an integrated transport policy.	KCC's Sevenoaks District Strategy for Transport provides an overarching transport strategy for District, which seeks to reduce congestion by promoting public transport, walking and cycling, particularly in urban areas.
	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	The term 'sustainable transport' should be included in second sentence of Policy T1.	This change is not agreed. Whilst Core Strategy Policy SP2 provides that the Council will give preference to sustainable modes, in some circumstances improvement to highway network may be required as a result of development.
	National Grid	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Support approach subject to changes	Amend policies to include reference to need for transport assessments. Also suggests deletion of second half of first sentence.	The suggested amendment to include reference to transport assessments is not agreed. Sufficient guidance is provided in DfT and KCC documents on when there is a need for transport assessments and transport statements. Deletion of second half of first sentence is not agreed. The travel impact of development is not simply an issue of number of vehicle movements. The impact of movements on unsuitable roads and on communities, for example, are also important.
	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Support but it should additionally state that planning permission will be refused if acceptable mitigation is not achievable.	This is not considered to be necessary in the policy. However, it has been added to the supporting text.

Policy T2 Vehicle Parking					
	<p>CLlr John Edwards-Winser</p> <p>Brenda Hambrook</p>	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	It presupposes that public transport IS available. The current allowance of one car per household is proven to be insufficient. Space must be allowed for 2-3 cars – together with additional ‘common use or visitor’ parking of 0.5 cars per household.	Current residential parking standards are contained in KCC’s Interim Guidance Note 3. Whilst this recommends a maximum of 1 space per unit in locations such as town and city centres, for larger units (e.g. 3 bed houses) in village and suburban edge areas it recommends a minimum of 2 spaces per unit and additional 0.2 cars per unit for visitor parking. Comments can be considered in any future countywide review of parking standards.
	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Point (a) should not be restricted to just where there is good public transport. On-street parking can be a problem anywhere, and especially in rural villages. There should be minimum standards for rural villages and these should be fiercely defended.	
	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	<p>Reference to setting "maximum parking standards" should be reconsidered in light of recent Government advice allowing a more flexible approach.</p> <p>PPS4 advises at policy EC8 (Car Parking for Non Residential Development) that properly adopted and justified polices should be provided within local development frameworks. It seems that where an advice provision takes place of adopted standards for an interim period, a more detailed explanation of basis for this advice should be set out within policy.</p>	<p>Current residential parking standards are contained in KCC’s Interim Guidance Note 3. This recommends maximum parking standards in certain locations and minimum standards in others. This is considered to be consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Advice from Kent County Council’s highway engineers is provided in context of national and local policy objectives, such as encouraging sustainable modes and not compromising road safety. Previously adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 4 to Kent and Medway Structure Plan is used as a starting point for advice.</p>
	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	SDC should formulate and use its own parking provision criteria instead of using those of Kent County Council, reflecting greater emphasis on car usage in Sevenoaks.	SDC currently has no proposals to develop its own parking standards. It is considered that preparation of countywide standards is a more efficient use of resources, given need to collect substantial evidence to support standards.
	Hugh D’Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Has very strong objections to this policy. KCC parking standards are often inadequate, like to see SDC create its own parking policy tailored to Sevenoaks.	
	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Object to approach or	Westerham is particularly poorly served by public transport, so KCC interim vehicle parking standards may not always be appropriate for a new residential	Noted. Application of residential parking standards, and choice between minimum and maximum standards, in Interim Guidance Note 3 should take account of character of area,

			wording	development.	which includes public transport provision.
	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach	Adequate provision using car parking associated with development or conversion should be used where ever possible to protect car parks and High Street parking.	Noted.
	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Support noted.
	United House	Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach	Welcome flexibility that Council may depart from established standards in order to allow for some relaxation in town centres or elsewhere if a site is well served by public transport.	Support noted.
	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	Support but do not consider that it replaces Local Plan policies VP10 & VP11 (and neither does Appendix 2).	Agreed that T2 is not a replacement for policies VP10 and VP11. It is considered unnecessary to replace these policies.
	Bob White	Kent Highway Services	Support approach subject to changes	Explain key difference between "destination" parking and "origin" parking and either remove reference to maximum standards or indicated that while non-residential standards remain as maxima, residential guidance IG3 distinguishes between areas with parking controls and those without.	Reference to residential parking standards being maxima in some locations and minima in others will be referred to in policy or supporting text.
	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	In new developments sufficient off road parking should be provided, taking in to account average motor vehicle ownership/dwelling size, for residents and allowances made for visitors. Supports proposal for utilising public car parks but they should meet ACPO Park Mark criteria.	Noted.
	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Point (a) should not be restricted to just where there is good public transport. There should be minimum standards for rural villages and these should be fiercely defended.	Current residential parking standards are contained in KCC's Interim Guidance Note 3. This sets out minimum parking standards for suburban, village and rural areas. This is considered to be consistent with national policy.
	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning	Support approach	It would be helpful if town centre approaches to parking were in context of town centre parking strategies. The	Comment on consistency between policy on residential parking and recent Government announcements is noted.

		Kent County Council	subject to changes	section on residential parking is consistent with recent Government announcements and Transport White Paper.	
	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Increased car parking spaces should be permitted adjacent to railway stations to encourage transfers from cars to rail.	It is considered that the benefits that increasing parking can have on rail usage needs to be balanced with potential for it to exacerbate local congestion and discourage people from travelling to stations by more sustainable forms of transport. A policy giving blanket support for increasing parking is not considered to be appropriate. Proposals should be considered on their merits in the context of national and local policy.
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE					
<u>Policy GRN1 Green Infrastructure and New Development</u>					
DM27	Mr Rand		Object to approach or wording	Too much protection. Landscaping should be incorporated. Some development in GB would be in accordance with CS policy LO8.	The level of protection afforded to GB is set out in the NPPF section 9, DPD policies must comply with this guidance.
DM160	John Lister	Natural England	Object to approach or wording	It is unclear how development in BOAs will be managed, and in event that development comes forward within these areas, how local opportunities will be captured, and habitats created, improved and managed. It is unclear whether BOAs will be shown on proposals map and further policy guidance prepared to deal with these issues.	Bio diversity is dealt with in CS policy SP11 and BOA's are shown in Fig 7. The GI section has been redrafted to address these concerns In of determination of applications in these areas, policies SP11 and GRN1 will ensure that an evaluation of opportunities for improvements of habitats is carried out and if appropriate actions taken as a condition of permission.
DM331	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Object to approach or wording	The Trust is concerned that there is no delivery and monitoring plan for GI proposed within this document	The performance indicators are contained in CS. Monitoring at this level is consider to be most appropriate.
DM350	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Would prefer not to see tier 3 Councils denied right to have an impact on this. Believe that a portion of all S106 agreement monies should go by right to Local Town and Parish Councils for provision of green infrastructure.	Town and Parish Councils will need to prove that seeking of contributions towards infrastructure tat they wish to fund meet tests set out in law for use of planning obligations, i.e. that they are 'necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale

					and kind to development'. The Council plans to introduce a CIL Charging Schedule in 2013. The Government proposes that a 'meaningful proportion' of CIL receipts should be paid to town and parish councils to fund their infrastructure priorities.
DM372	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Object to approach or wording	Various detailed comments on GI Network .	The GI section has been redrafted to address these concerns.
DM459	Naomi Wolfe	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	The word 'fully' should proceed 'mitigate'. Should seek net gain for green infrastructure. There is no reference to Sites of Nature Conservation Interest or Local Nature Reserves, both of which deserve special attention.	The addition of fully does not give flexibility to enable best overall scheme for GI network to be achieved. SNCI are now know as Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves are also covered by term Local Wildlife Sites.
DM159	John Lister	Natural England	Support approach	Welcomed. However context for making judgments under this policy is unclear. There is excellent work on GI in countryside and there should be equivalent work in urban and peri-urban areas.	The judgements will be made with reference to design guides, AONB management plans and Countryside Assessment. The GI network covers urban areas in as much detail as rural areas.
DM9	Karen Jefferys		Support approach	Planning permission should consider more closely added pressures that new houses will bring in terms of parking, leisure facilities, transport etc and what building companies will positively contribute- e.g. a new playground, extra parking, more trees. When requirements are made e.g. to have greenery around a building- they also need to be enforceable.	Noted
DM88 DM126 DM431	Christine Lane Tracy Godden Jennifer Wilson	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Environmental Agency	Support approach	Support	Noted

DM167 DM231	Cllr Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook	Oxford Parish Council	Support approach	Support, providing green infrastructures can be adequately located in each parish. The 'GI' should be clearly established with local parishes and agreed in advance.	Noted. The GI network will be subject to public consultation as part of Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.
DM136	Ruth Childs	High Weald AONB Unit	Support approach subject to changes	Concerned with lack of AONB references and landscape features in CS. Support reference to existing Green Infrastructure. Reference could be made to heritage GI features. Strongly support final paragraph, but not all GI should or will be accessible.	The GI section has been redrafted to address these concerns.
DM161	John Lister	Natural England	Support approach subject to changes	The definition of GI components under para 7.3 , include predominantly urban features so consideration of GI through and around key settlements would be appropriate. A clear and integrated overview of urban and rural GI provision would provide a robust context for making judgements under Policy GRN1, and for coming to a broader view on existing provision against changing needs.	The list is intended to cover GI in urban and rural areas this will provide overview required.
DM177	Ruth Childs	High Weald AONB Unit	Support approach subject to changes	The link between geology-landscape-habitats-biodiversity could be made clearer. Heritage and landscape features can also form part of GI network. Should recognise that High Weald provides a wealth of existing multifunctional GI across southern part of the District.	Noted The GI section has been redrafted to address these concerns.
DM178	Ruth Childs	High Weald AONB Unit	Support approach subject to changes	Paragraph 7.2 should demonstrate understanding of landscapes as determinants for habitat types and therefore biodiversity within district. The link between geology-landscape-habitats-biodiversity could be made clearer .	A reference to AONB Management Plan is considered to be sufficient in this instance.
DM179	Ruth Childs	High Weald AONB Unit	Support approach subject to changes	Paragraph 7.3 – should make it clear that heritage features and landscape features (character components) can also form part of existing GI network. Heritage features may offer more robust GI (in terms of biodiversity and well-being) due to their longevity, e.g. hedgerows or banks and shaws along historic routeways	
DM181	Susan Pittman	(Sevenoaks Protect	Support approach	Suggest that Kent Downs guidance documents - Landscape Design Handbook and Rural Streets and Lanes Design	

		Kent))	subject to changes	Handbook be added to policy	
DM314	James Wickham	Chipstead Sailing Club	Support approach subject to changes	Promoting inclusion of Chipstead Lake in GI Network suggest that Policy GRN1 be amended by inserting an additional paragraph as follows: “Additionally, parts of Green Infrastructure Network of open space, sporting or recreationally value, will be retained, as required by Core Strategy Policy SP10.”	This wording repeats CS and is not appropriate .
DM325	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommend that policy be strengthened by making following changes.</p> <p>Development proposals will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that any impact on Green Infrastructure Network and biodiversity of surrounding area have been fully considered and integrated into proposal and that biodiversity is enhanced and extended.</p> <p>All proposals must accord with Policy LO8 of Core Strategy.</p> <p>Proposals must preserve existing Green Infrastructure and biodiversity features and enhance and where possible extend Green Infrastructure Network and biodiversity. It must be demonstrated that proposal includes measures or features that mitigate against any potential harm or loss and ensure net gains as a result of development.</p> <p>New landscaping and habitat restoration and/or re-creation should be incorporated as an integral part of new developments, in accordance with principles contained in Kent Design Guide and Countryside Assessment SPD.</p> <p>Any open spaces provided as part of new development, must, wherever practicable, be located where they can provide a safe connection, with existing features of Green Infrastructure Network and provide connectivity for population and biodiversity.</p>	<p>In order to strengthen policy has been amended as follows</p> <p>POLICY GI 1 – GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Proposals will be permitted where opportunities for provision of additional Green Infrastructure have been fully considered and would be provided where justified by the character of the area or the need for open space.</p> <p>Any open spaces provided as part of new development should, wherever practical and appropriate, be located where they can provide a safe link for the population and connectivity for biodiversity with the existing features of the Green Infrastructure Network.</p> <p>Additional green infrastructure and habitat restoration and/or re-creation, should be provided in accordance with the appropriate guidance contained in the Kent Design Guide and the Countryside Assessment SPD and should take account of the guidance within the AONB Management Plans and associated guidance where appropriate.</p>

DM373	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	<p>The principles of this policy in enabling protection of GI are supported. However it could contain a vision for future GI Network of District, detailing areas of impoverished GI, or aspects of multiple use of GI that need improvement in particular areas. This will help to focus and deliver policy in order to "...where possible enhance Green Infrastructure and biodiversity..."</p> <p>The first paragraph should be amended to: "Development proposals will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that any impact on Green Infrastructure Network and biodiversity of surrounding area have been fully considered and appropriate measures to avoid, mitigate and/or compensate for impacts have been integrated into proposal."</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by requirement to provide a "safe connection" between new open spaces and existing GI features.</p>	
DM399	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Para 7.2 Add 'National Policy and CS policy LO8 ensure that designated landscape areas will be conserved and enhanced and recognises that small scale development within AONBs can support rural economy, provide space for informal recreation and support Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Para 7.3 (Accessible countryside includes AONBs) Add ' Kent Downs Landscape Design Handbook' i.e. 'New landscaping should be incorporated as an integral part of new developments, in accordance with principles contained in Kent Design Guide and Countryside Assessment SPD and Kent Downs Landscape Design Handbook.'</p>	<p>This wording does not add to existing text and is not considered necessary.</p> <p>This has been addressed above in response to High Weald AONB Unit's comments.</p>
DM422	National Grid	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Proposals must preserve existing Green Infrastructure and biodiversity features where possible and should include measures or features that mitigate against any potential harm of loss."</p> <p>The revised wording allows for a proper assessment on a site by site basis in respect of green infrastructure.</p>	<p>It is national policy to preserve GI and Biodiversity inclusion of phrase "where possible" in this context is not acceptable.</p>

DM495	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Should recognise role of roadside verges as part of green infrastructure.	Where designated Roadside verges have been included however any evaluation of impact of development should include these features.
Open Space Provision					
DM288	Tracy Lane	Parish Clerk Hextable Parish Council	Support approach	Promotion of open space adjacent to St Peters Church and Village Green.	This can be put forward as part of formal consultation.
DM326	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach	Support	Noted
DM168 DM235	Cllr Edwards-Winser Brenda Hambrook	Otford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Requires a list of open space land identified under policy EN9 of Saved Local Plan, before a response for a full list of Open Spaces that require protection can be made	Noted This will be available as part of formal consultation.
DM315	James Wickham	Chipstead Sailing Club	Support approach subject to changes	Suggests that lakes and open water be added to list of types of open space in para 7.12 The water at Longford Lake and adjacent land at Chipstead Sailing Club should be allocated to be retained and protected for use as a non-commercial sailing club and ancillary facilities/uses."	Agreed Leisure sites have not been allocated although rural tourism is supported in Core Strategy Policy L08.
DM324	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	Welcomes aims but is concerned that vision seems to focus on preservation only. Would expect within Green Infrastructure policy that there would be a commitment to large landscape scale projects within Biodiversity Opportunity Areas identified within Core Strategy and throughout urban areas wherever possible.	Where suitable projects come forward they will be supported by District Council.
DM374	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	Open space can be used for SUDS schemes, and SUDS schemes can also contribute to GI network.	Noted
DM400	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB	Support approach	Suggest that some local mineral and waste sites in Sevenoaks District could provide some open space provision in longer	Noted

			subject to changes	term. Early proactive engagement with operators and MPA (KCC) could ensure that restorations are related to Sevenoaks LDP needs.	
DM417	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Wish to be advised what if any land is protected by saved policy EN9 within parish, and whether The Green part of Green Infrastructure Network? Also require confirmation of type of protection for school playing fields in Lealands Avenue.	Noted. This will be available as part of formal consultation on Allocations and Development Management DPD.
THE ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT					
Policy EMP1 Employment					
DM191	Graham Simpkin	Graham Simpkin Planning	Object to approach or wording	Clear guidance is required on extent to which GB sites may be extended/upgraded or replaced. There should be a policy that protects and allows these sites to be improved, upgraded and for replacement buildings without having to rely upon very special circumstances.	Guidance will be given in the forthcoming Green Belt SPD. This will take into account the guidance given in the NPPF.
DM249	Dennis Pope	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Object to approach or wording	Policy SP8 already provides sufficient criteria to ensure protection of employment land. The word "protection" within proposed Policy EMP1 duplicates Policy SP8. It is not necessary for further criteria in relation to protection of employment sites. The policy as drafted would appear to relate to improvement of Districts employment provision as opposed to its protection. For above reasons words "protect and" should be deleted from first sentence in EMP1	The intention of this policy is to identify allocated sites.
DM60 DM90 DM170 DM310	Trevor R Hall Christine Lane Cllr Edwards-Winser	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Planning Potential Ltd	Support approach	Support policy.	Noted.

DM376	United House Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council			
DM496	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	Support but do not consider that it replaces Local Plan Policy EP8 (and neither does Appendix 2).	Noted.
DM32	Leigh Family	Carter Planning Limited	Support approach subject to changes	Paragraph 8.2 should be amended to include reference to provision in SP8 that employment sites will be retained unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of their up take or continued use for business purposes. Leighs Yard should be removed from identified employment sites in Edenbridge and beneficial used made of site.	The land owner has demonstrated that the site is not viable for employment use during the Core Strategy period. As such the removal of the site from protected employment use complies with policy SP8. The land has planning permission for residential development.
DM327	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	To ensure these gains for biodiversity we would recommend following changes to policy When considering proposals for employment development, Council will assess impact of such proposals on environment, economy, and community and on transport network; and ensure there is no harm to surrounding uses, including nature conservation areas and that biodiversity is enhanced and extended and site fully integrated into Green Infrastructure network.	The proposed text is considered to be repetitive of GI policies and as such is not required.
DM335	Armstrong (Kent) LLP	Christopher Hill GVA Grimley	Support approach subject to changes	Promote Fort Halstead and justification based on loss of employment	The site is considered in Policy EMP3.
DM352	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Broadly welcomes proposed policy, these restrictions should not be at cost of home working.	Noted.
TOWN CENTRES AND SHOPPING					

Policy LC1 Sevenoaks Town Centre					
DM195	R Freeman	The Theatres Trust	Object to approach or wording	Policy LC1 does not deal adequately with other town centre uses to reflect PPS4 and in particular, your evening economy. The third paragraph provides hardly any development guidance for uses other than shops in your main town centre. PPS4 Policy EC4.2 should be reflected in policy.	Policy LC1 has been amended to cover other town centre uses.
DM237	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The policy relating to primary retail frontage seeking retention of existing retail units is over prescriptive and does not take proper account of more flexible approach set out in PPS4.	Policy LC1 has been amended to provide greater flexibility in where retail is provided within the primary retail frontage, whilst seeking to maintain the existing level of provision.
DM353	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Supports policy LC1 subject to regular review, however some flexibility must be retained/built into system due to sudden and rapid changes that retail market is capable of making.	Support is noted. Policy LC1 has been amended to provide greater flexibility in where retail is provided within the primary retail frontage, whilst seeking to maintain the existing level of provision.
DM377	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach	The approach to Town Centre policies for Sevenoaks, Swanley and Edenbridge, Neighbourhood and Village Centres is supported.	Support is noted and welcomed.
DM61	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	In general supports this policy. However, any increase in A4, especially if coupled with A5 usage and as Late Night Refreshment Houses has potential for a significant increase in demand for policing services and each application for such would be considered very seriously by Kent Police.	General support is noted and welcomed. Policy EN1 addresses crime and disorder issues.
DM232 DM171	Brenda Hambrook Cllr John Edwards-Winser	Otford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	In interests of maintaining a vibrant retail sector, properties sited along secondary frontage (being generally more vulnerable to overhead charges than those located on primary frontage) should be more favourably assessed for business rates.	Noted. However, this issue is outside scope of planning policy.
Policy LC2 Swanley Town Centre					
DM29	D.A.T Siggins		Object to approach or wording	Do we really need more betting shops ,tanning parlours , food takaways etc ? Free vehicle parking to attract visitors to town is not answer.	Policy LC2 seeks to retain a percentage of the length of the primary frontage in A1 retail use, whilst providing sufficient flexibility with retail uses to prevent high numbers of vacant units. Core Strategy Policy LO5

					supports wider regeneration of Swanley town centre so that it better meets needs of population it serves.
DM45	Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Station Road should be included within primary or secondary frontage	Station Road is considered to contribute towards retail offer of Swanley as will be designated as part of secondary frontage.
DM238	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The policy relating to primary retail frontage seeking retention of existing retail units and only allowing changes to other A class units is over prescriptive and does not take proper account of more flexible approach set out in PPS4. Will what Council considers to be a "prominent" retail unit be shown on proposals map?	Policy LC2 seeks to retain a percentage of the length of the primary frontage in A1 retail use, whilst providing sufficient flexibility with retail uses to prevent high numbers of vacant units. This is not considered to be an over prescriptive approach. The reference to prominent units has been deleted.
DM12	Karen Jefferys		Support approach	Pleased to see that Swanley centre is getting some attention in strategy	Support noted and welcomed.
DM378	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach	The approach to Town Centre policies for Sevenoaks, Swanley and Edenbridge, Neighbourhood and Village Centres is supported.	
DM62	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	In general support this policy. However, any increase in A4, especially if coupled with A5 usage and as Late Night Refreshment Houses has potential for a significant increase in demand for policing services and each application for such would be considered very seriously by Kent Police.	General support is noted and welcomed. Policy EN1 addresses crime and disorder issues.
Policy LC3 Edenbridge Town Centre					
DM239	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	Swanley is higher in settlement hierarchy than Edenbridge. Why does Edenbridge have a higher percentage of units required to be retained in A1 use? Will what Council considers to be a "prominent" retail unit be shown on proposals map?	Policies now consider the percentage of the length of the frontage that is in A1 use rather than the number of units. The percentage of the frontage in A1 to be retained is based on the existing situation rather than position in settlement hierarchy. The reference to prominent units has been deleted.

DM298	J.L Phillips	Tandridge Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach	Support .	Support noted and welcomed.
DM379	Paul Crick				
DM63	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	In general supports this policy. However, any increase in A4, especially if coupled with A5 usage and as Late Night Refreshment Houses has potential for a significant increase in demand for policing services and each application for such would be considered very seriously by Kent Police.	General support is noted and welcomed. Policy EN1 addresses crime and disorder issues.
DM91	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Assuming that should significant changes take place a review would be forthcoming a minimum of 60% A1 was considered appropriate.	Noted.
Policy LC4 Neighbourhood Centres					
DM128	Tracy Godden	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Continues to object to Dunton Green's classification as 'urban'.	Noted. Dunton Green is identified as part of Sevenoaks Urban Area in LDF Core Strategy.
DM233 DM172	Brenda Hambrook Cllr John Edwards-Winser	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Add criteria, a) Any adverse effects upon local neighbourhood centres should be carefully assessed before any agreement to introduce a (major) supermarket/retail centre into/adjoining neighbourhood be considered. b) That an annual average turn-over for each shop within recognised 'Neighbourhood Centre' be assessed before arrival of a new supermarket/retail centre. c) A compensation scheme should be agreed in case a retailer located within designated 'neighbourhood centre' fails within a year due to direct competition from new development	National policy in the NPPF identifies town centres as preferable areas for major supermarkets and retail centres. Proposals for major supermarkets and retail centres outside of town centres need to be accompanied by evidence to show that there are not sequentially preferable sites (i.e. town centre, then edge of centre and then out of centre) and that impact on town and local centres is acceptable. Compensation schemes are outside scope of planning policy.
DM240	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or	The use of term "broad ratio" is an unexplained term and could cause confusion in terms of its interpretation.	The term 'broad ratio' is not considered to be required within policy as remaining text sufficiently sets out approach. Reference to 'broad ratio' to be deleted.

			wording		
DM380	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach	The approach to Town Centre policies for Sevenoaks, Swanley and Edenbridge, Neighbourhood and Village Centres is supported.	Support noted and welcomed.
DM64	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	In general supports this policy. However, any increase in A4, especially if coupled with A5 usage and as Late Night Refreshment Houses has potential for a significant increase in demand for policing services and each application for such would be considered very seriously by Kent Police.	General support is noted and welcomed. Policy EN1 addresses crime and disorder issues.
DM354	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The northern ST Johns area needs to be extended downwards to incorporate garage at bottom of hill. 2. South St Johns needs to be modified to incorporate Johns house furnishings. 3. Conversions to fast food takeaways should only be approved when applicants can show provision for parking within 15 m of establishment. 	<p>Agree need for changes to Northern St John's area, which will be extended to north and south.</p> <p>The need to extend Southern St John's is not agreed. Johns House Furnishings is considered to be too disconnected from proposed Southern St John's area.</p> <p>The need for parking spaces will be considered against policies on parking standards and adopted standards.</p>
Policy LC5 Village Centres					
DM234 DM173	Brenda Hambrook Cllr Edwards-Winser	Otford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	In Otford Village, given close proximity of two designated centres, recommend that they be combined into one centre so that any future alterations or changes be recognised as affecting whole local retail economy not just parts of it.	The two Otford Village centres are considered to be too disconnected from each other to be combined into one centre.
DM241	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The use of term "broad ratio" is an unexplained term and could cause confusion in terms of its interpretation.	The term 'broad ratio' is not considered to be required within policy as remaining text sufficiently sets out approach. Reference to 'broad ratio' to be deleted.
DM244	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	Village Centre maps such as Brasted show village boundaries that dissect properties and do not seem logical. A check of boundary should be undertaken.	Village centre boundary maps have been checked and amended where necessary.

DM418	Janice Butler	Leigh Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Add Leigh – important to prevent change of use of village shop and pub, Fleur de Lis. Adjacent to High Street there is hairdresser, shop, pub, Leigh Motors and just along start of Penshurst Road Fairlawn Garden Services and DART, Corvette repair business so hope this can be considered to make 5 units	Leigh doesn't have sufficient A1 units located in close proximity to each other to meet criteria for allocating village centres. Local facilities in Leigh will be protected under Core Strategy Policy L07. Specific units that are considered to be important at local level could be considered for protection through a Neighbourhood Plan.
DM460	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Eynsford must be designated/listed here.	Eynsford doesn't have sufficient A1 units located in close proximity to each other to meet criteria for allocating village centres. Local facilities in Eynsford will be protected under Core Strategy Policy L07. Specific units that are considered to be important at local level could be considered for protection through a Neighbourhood Plan.
DM270	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Para 9.28 - Eynsford must be designated/listed here.	
DM299 DM381	J.L Phillips Paul Crick	Tandridge Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach	Support	Support noted and welcomed.
DM65	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	If Village Centres did see an increase in A4 and A5 then same comments as contained in LC1 – LC3 would apply.	General support is noted and welcomed. Policy EN1 addresses crime and disorder issues.
DM497	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Concerned that this Policy is proposed to replace Policy S3A of Local Plan as it will mean that for those smaller rural communities that do not have a defined village centre there is no equivalent specific protection for shops and services. Notwithstanding general protection that may be offered by Core Strategy Policy L07. Policy LC5 should be extended to ensure retention of shops and services in smaller rural communities along line of Local Plan Policy S3A. The Policy could helpfully include support for 'community right to buy' initiatives.	Local facilities in village centres not covered by Policy LC5 will be protected through Core Strategy Policy L07. The retention of individual units which are not in village centres, as is currently case in Saved Local Plan Policy S3A, is considered inflexible. For example, this approach does not allow for facilities to close if they are replaced elsewhere in village. A reference to Community Right to Buy to be added to policy. Saved Local Plan Policy S6 was drafted at a time when

				Do not consider that it replaces Local Plan Policy S6 (and neither does Appendix 2).	hot food takeaways were covered by Use Class A3. The Council has more control over development of hot food takeaways now that they are covered by their own Use Class (A5). Policies in this section and those on amenity protection (SC3) and vehicle parking standards (T2) should be sufficient to control development of hot food takeaways and their impacts.
--	--	--	--	--	--

LEISURE AND TOURISM

Policy LT1 Hotels and Tourist Accommodation

DM	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach	Re-iterates issue around parking on Highways and obstructions to emergency vehicles and need for this to be mitigated.	Noted.
DM92 DM129 DM355	Christine Lane Tracy Godden Hugh D'Alton	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council Sevenoaks Town Council	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM328	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommend that following be incorporated into LT2.</p> <p>“Proposals for new tourist facilities will be permitted where they are located within built confines of an existing settlement and where they do not generate activity levels which would harm character ecology or amenities of locality.</p> <p>Proposals to create tourist facilities in GB through restoration or re-use rural of buildings will be considered against their impact on openness and tranquillity of GB and countryside and their impact on biodiversity and will only be accepted where it is demonstrated by applicant that activity levels would not be such as to harm character ecology or amenities of locality”.</p>	<p>Ecology/biodiversity is covered by CS Policy SP11 Biodiversity, this is an over arching policy that will be taken into consideration in all applications. A specific reference in this policy is not required to ensure ecology is protected.</p> <p>Policy L1 and 2 have been replaced by a new policy LT1 Tourist Accommodation and Visitor Attractions The benefits to the local economy will be recognised in considering proposals for tourist accommodation or facilities.</p> <p>Existing tourist accommodation and visitor attractions will be protected from conversion to non tourist use unless it is demonstrated that the use is no longer viable or inappropriately sited.</p>

DM498	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	Paragraph 10.11 should also acknowledge potential impact on GB.	The designation as GB is an overriding policy consideration in all applications. Any development proposal will firstly be assessed in terms of its impact on GB.
DM242	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or wording	The use of word "tranquillity" is not taken from Government Policy and should be omitted. The policy allows for no consideration of merits of new tourist buildings. This is an unreasonably restrictive policy running contrary to more flexible approach suggested within PPG2 and at policy EC12 of PPS4 that allows for provision for replacement buildings	This policy now accords with GB policy in the NPPF see above.
DM271	Holly Ivaldi	Clerk Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	There are no policies for other forms of outdoor recreation, such as war games, motor cycling, clay pigeon shooting, model aircraft flying etc.	Applications for these activities will primarily be judged against their impact on character of landscape, biodiversity and residential amenities. The protection of these assets are contained in existing policies. No further policy is required to ensure control these activities.
DM356	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Believes that in some cases it may be appropriate and needed to create new buildings on site, and provision must be retained for this. eg The Jeffery Harrison Visitor Centre at Kent Wildlife Reserve in Sevenoaks Tourism is an important contributor to local economy and STC does not welcome a blanket ban on Tourism developments in GB.	Noted such proposal may be appropriate and can be dealt with by making a case for exceptional circumstances under GB policy. Policy must accord with GB restrictions on development.
DM499	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach	Support, but content of South East Plan Policy TSR5 should be considered, particularly in regard to need and location.	Policy TSR5 has nothing appropriate to add to policy.
DM67 DM93 DM130 DM174	Trevor R Hall Christine Lane Tracy Godden Cllr John	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council Clerk Dunton	Support approach	Support	Noted.

	Edwards-Winser	Green Parish Council			
LT2 New Tourist Attractions and Facilities					
DM209	Derek Johnson	Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Support, but there needs to be a clearer idea of activity levels.	
DM329	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	<p>Recommend that following wording be incorporated into LT2.</p> <p>Proposals for new tourist facilities will be permitted where they are located within built confines of an existing settlement and where they do not generate activity levels which would harm character ecology or amenities of locality.</p> <p>Proposals to create tourist facilities in GB through restoration or re-use rural of buildings will be considered against their impact on openness and tranquillity of GB and countryside and their impact on biodiversity and will only be accepted where it is demonstrated by applicant that activity levels would not be such as to harm character ecology or amenities of locality.</p> <p>Proposals to create new buildings for tourist facilities in GB are considered to be inappropriate development and will be resisted.</p>	<p>Policy L1 and 2 have been replaced by a new policy LT1 Tourist Accommodation and Visitor Attractions</p> <p>The benefits to the local economy will be recognised in considering proposals for tourist accommodation or facilities.</p> <p>Existing tourist accommodation and visitor attractions will be protected from conversion to non tourist use unless it is demonstrated that the use is no longer viable or inappropriately sited.</p> <p>Ecology/biodiversity is covered by CS Policy SP11 Biodiversity, this is an over arching policy that will be taken into consideration in all applications. A specific reference in this policy is not required to ensure ecology is protected.</p>
DM500	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent Sevenoaks Committee	Support approach subject to changes	Support need for a Policy, but regard should be given to including relevant content of Policy TSR4 of South East Plan.	Policy TSR4 does not add anything to policy at local level. No amendment is considered necessary.
Policy LT3 Equestrian Development					
DM243	Jo Tasker	Robinson Escott Planning	Object to approach or	Criterion b) is inflexible and would not allow for provision of stables to support grazing land that might not be located next to other buildings.	Noted. The aim of policy is to limit isolated development to reduce impact of stables on openness of GB and to protect character of countryside.

			wording		
DM300 DM279	Hobson B Ide	Shoreham Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	Suggest that clause b) be amended to change "farm buildings or other groups of buildings," to ""farm buildings, other groups of buildings or an associated dwelling,"	
DM357	Hugh D'Alton	Sevenoaks Town Council	Object to approach or wording	Does not consider this policy to be appropriate as it brings employment into local area.	Agreed. Reworded as follows "Horse and other equestrian-related activities are popular forms of recreation in the countryside that can fit in well with farming activities, and help diversify the rural economy. The Core Strategy acknowledges this and identifies horse riding as a significant recreational activity which can offer benefits to rural communities. The Council will support equine enterprises that maintain environmental quality and countryside character.
DM401	Colin Dibsdall		Support approach	SPD required	Noted.
DM68	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach	The development of Equestrian Facilities is not a matter for Kent Police unless they generate a potential increase in demand for policing services.	Noted.
DM131 DM175 DM200	Tracy Godden Cllr John Edwards- Winser Lynda Harrison	Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council West Kingsdown Parish Council	Support approach	Support	Noted.
DM46	Christopher Drake	Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	A policy on horses/stabling near residential areas (such as Swanley Village) is required	This can be addressed in proposed SPD.

DM94	Christine Lane	Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council	Support approach subject to changes	Mostly agree with identified approach, add "sufficient off road riding areas are available."	Agreed "sufficient off road riding areas are available" before "amenities of adjoining residents" added.
DM330	Debbie Salmon	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support approach subject to changes	Recommend that following wording be added. f) The development should not result in an adverse impact on character of landscape or ecological value of area in which it is situated.	Agree "or ecological value of area" added after landscape in criterion d.
DM382	Paul Crick	Environment and Planning Kent County Council	Support approach subject to changes	Reference to terrestrial environment should be included in criterion (e).	This is dealt with in criteria the amended criteria . c) the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the water environment and sewage disposal, and d) the development would not result in harm to the character of the landscape or the ecological value of the area in which it is situated.
DM441	Angela Howells	Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	A factor not mentioned in text is need to ensure a necessary minimum of open land to support number of horses to be accommodated in stables, without degrading quality of landscape. This aspect should be covered in proposed SPD.	Noted.
DM501	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks Committee)	Support approach subject to changes	It needs to also include reference to cumulative effect of small equestrian developments.	Agreed add "Proposals for equestrian development in the Green Belt will be permitted where the scale of the development is appropriate to a Green Belt setting, and where the cumulative impact of other buildings, does not harm the openness of the Green Belt."
Policy LT4 Brands Hatch					
DM210	Lynda Harrison	West Kingsdown Parish Council Clerk	Object to approach or wording	The wording of WK2 is preferable to LT4 .It in no way replaces WK6 as this states "The local planning authority will not permit new development, particularly housing, in areas subject to excessive noise disturbance " WK6 could be replaced by additional criteria in policy ECC2.	The amenities of residents will be protected by EN1 and EN2.
DM502	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent (Sevenoaks	Support approach subject to	Would rather see retention of wording in Policy WK2. The Policy would be better located in GB section of DPD, following after major development sites. Also, it should be additionally	

		Committee)	changes	referenced that it replaces Local Plan Policy WK6 in accordance with Appendix 2.	
DM461	Naomi Wolfe	Eynsford Parish Council	Object to approach or wording	There are no policies for other forms of outdoor recreation, such as war games, motor cycling, clay pigeon shooting, model aircraft flying etc.	Applications for these activities will primarily be judged against their impact on character of landscape, biodiversity and residential amenities. The protection of these assets are contained in existing policies. No further policy is required to ensure control these activities.
DM176	Cllr Edwards-Winser		Support approach	Support, providing current measures are enforced	Noted.
DM69	Trevor R Hall	Developer Contributions Manager Kent Police	Support approach subject to changes	Where increase of use are proposed then Brands Hatch management must be required to make provision for necessary number of Stewards/Marshalls within venue to ensure safety of public attending, as required by any Safety Certificate, Licenses, Insurances, etc without reliance on policing services and provision of suitable temporary traffic management infrastructure deemed appropriate through multi agency discussions with event organiser/Brands Hatch.	Noted.
DM100	Alison de Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council	Support approach subject to changes	Development should only be supported if overall affect is a reduction in noise levels and this should be expanded to include residential properties anywhere in surrounding area.	The Council cannot require a reduction in noise and cannot control Permitted Development Rights.

Open Space Allocations consultation September – November 2011

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
OS4 John Clarke	Add 1 Hextable School Egerton Avenue - playing fields. 2 Open Space opposite Egerton Avenue (Hextable).	1 This site is in the Green Belt (GB) and therefore is protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given in Core Strategy Policy (CSP) SP10. 2 The site is below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.
OS6 Mrs J Hoad Hartley Parish Council	There is an anomaly over the position of the GB boundary at Billings Hill Shaw, the Parish Council seeks to redress this matter so that the area of woodland to the south of Billings Hill Shaw, is shown as being within the GB.	This area was previously included within the green belt, until the adoption of the 1994 Swanley Planning Area Local Plan, when it was removed, although there is no written justification for this amendment. Representations were made by the Parish Council in relation to the subsequent Local Plan in 2000, requesting that the land at Billings Hill Shaw be included in the Green Belt. The Inspector commented at that time that the non-inclusion of the land in the Green Belt was an anomaly and that there was a clear case for its inclusion in the Green Belt to provide a rational and coherent boundary along the highways margin of Billings Hill Shaw. In the Inspector's view, the apparent error in the previously defined boundary (from 1994) provided justification for an amendment. Notwithstanding the Inspector's report, the Council maintained the existing boundary in the Local Plan (2000) but noted in the Plan that: <i>'the Council recognises the force of the Inspector's recommendation in respect of the land at Billings Hill Shaw. In particular the need to rectify two "apparent" (cartographical) errors made in 1984 and 1994 in the line of the Green Belt boundary. This would clearly incorporate this land within the Green Belt and re-establish the Hartley Village envelope at this point. The Council will, therefore, be proposing a change in the Green belt boundary to rectify this error at the earliest opportunity.'</i> The Council has reviewed the land in question, which is covered in trees and is clearly differentiated from the adjoining housing estate from which it is separated by a clearly defined boundary (Billings Hill Shaw road). The site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and the continuous strip of trees extends onto the land to the west of the site. The area to the west of the site is included within the Green Belt, and the site in question is of similar character to the land to the west. Its

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
		character reads more as part of the surrounding countryside than the developed area. It is considered that the highways margin of Billings Hill Shaw provides a rational and coherent Green Belt boundary. These considerations, together with the comments of the previous Local Plan Inspector who recommended that the site be included in the Green Belt and the Council's acceptance that the error would be rectified at the earliest opportunity, provide the exceptional circumstances to justify the amendment to the Green Belt in this location.
OS7 Riverhead Parish Council	Add The top Church Field as Amenity Greenspace, aware that this is relatively small bit of land that might not correspond to the criteria in term of size.	The site is below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.
OS8 Barbara Morris Clerk Crockenhill Parish Council	Add 1 All Souls Burial Ground, Eynsford Road Baptist Burial Ground, Eynsford Road Cricket Meadow, Green Court Road Crockenhill Primary School Playing Fields, Stones Cross Road Green Court Meadow, Land on the corner of Green Court Road/Goldsel Road 2 West View Green Barnfield Green Green at Church Farm Close Anchor and Hope Site on corner of Main Road/Broadway	1 These sites are in the GB and therefore are protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given by CSP SP10. 2 These sites are below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.
OS9 Mrs Louise Kleinschmidt, Chiddingstone Parish Clerk	Add St. Luke's church, Chiddingstone Causeway: churchyard and cemetery Sports Field, Chiddingstone Causeway: amenity green space Tennis Courts, Chiddingstone: outdoor sports facility Sports Field, Chiddingstone: outdoor sports facility Village Green, Chiddingstone (in front of The Rectory): amenity green space Community Garden, Chiddingstone (r/o Hall): allotments & community gardens St. Mary's church, Chiddingstone: churchyard and cemetery The New Cemetery, Chiddingstone: churchyard and cemetery The Green, Chiddingstone Hoath: amenity green space Stonewall Park Cricket Pitch: outdoor sports facility	These sites are in the GB and therefore are protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given by CSP SP10.

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
<p>OS11 Dr Geoff Brown St. John's Residents' Association</p>	<p>Add These areas are important to the physical/spiritual wellbeing of members.</p> <p>1 The whole of the grounds in Bradbourne Rd surrounding the Sevenoaks Primary School and the Adult Education Centre.</p> <p>2 The lower part of the Hollybush Lane recreation area.</p> <p>3 The triangle of land where Woodside Rd meets Bradbourne Park Rd.</p> <p>4 The allotments on Bradbourne Vale Rd.</p> <p>5 The allotments on the north side of Quakers Hall Lane. Bradbourne Lakes.</p>	<p>1 It is not considered appropriate to designate the whole un developed area of the site. There is however a significant open area along the frontage at the corner of Bradbourne and Bradbourne Park Road. Visually this area makes a contribution to the character of the area, forming part of the larger open space around the school and featuring established boundary vegetation. The boundary of site GI 563/4 should be amended to include this area and the description amended to include amenity greenspace.</p> <p>2 This area is used as a car park and therefore does not fall into the definition of open space used for these allocations.</p> <p>3 The site is below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.</p> <p>4 This site is in the GB and therefore is protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given in CSP SP10.</p> <p>5 These sites are designated as EN9 and this protection will be carried forward.</p>
<p>OS12 Ms Tracy Godden Clerk Dunton Green Parish Council</p>	<p>New Site in Mill Road.</p> <p>Why are some GB sites included whilst others are not. Change name of "Donnington Road Allotments" to "Dunton Green Allotments"</p>	<p>The site is below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.</p> <p>Some sites, have the majority of their area is in the GB, but have very small areas which are not. Where this is the case they are listed. Noted.</p>
<p>OS13 Mr C Drake Assistant Town Clerk Swanley Town Council</p>	<p>Sites for "Local Green Space" designation: Junction of Edgar Close and Swanley Lane, Swanley Between Russett Way and Conifer Way, Swanley</p>	<p>These sites are below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.</p>
<p>OS14 Mr Nigel Sivyver</p>	<p>Broom Hill area be designated open space for Swanley</p>	<p>This site has been allocated for Employment and Open Spcae. Further details are included in the ADM Plan.</p>

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
<p>OS16 Christine Lane Town Clerk Edenbridge Town Council</p>	<p>Amendments: GI 704 should allow for cemetery extension. GI 547 should be Edenbridge cemetery GI 1098 Pound Green not Pond Green</p> <p>Additional Open Space (or designation as Local Green Space : GI 535 south junction of High Street and Mont St Aigan Way GI 534 Verges along Mont St Aigan Way Green space on Gresham Way.</p> <p>Changes: GI 327 has been identified for housing</p> <p>Boundary of Stangrove Park has changed</p> <p>If "Reserve Land" in Edenbridge is to be reviewed in the future consideration should be given for allotments, open space and tennis courts</p>	<p>Changes between these uses would be acceptable providing it does not result in a shortfall in the existing use. Noted Amend . Noted.</p> <p>Agreed Amend.</p> <p>Noted The ADM Plan identifies this site and this will be decided through the preparation of this document.</p> <p>The boundary reflects the changes due to the construction of Mont St Aigan Way</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>OS3 Andrew Sands</p>	<p>Asks questions about the playground in Church Street, Edenbridge if this open space was to be de-designated/used as a new cemetery.</p>	<p>These questions should be directed to the Town Council. See OS16 above.</p>
<p>OS17 Hugh D'Alton Sevenoaks Town Council</p>	<p>Remove: GI346 Julian's Meadow Woodland GI266 White Hart Beeches - has little value to the public as area has restricted access</p> <p>Add: 1 Knole Academy East – "Sports Facilities" 2 Bethel Road, Burial Ground</p> <p>Change: GI564 St Hilary's School should be listed as Walthamstow Hall Jr. School</p> <p>GI335 Bouchier Close should remain protected</p> <p>Other: GI218 Greatness Park Cemetery, remove frontage from Green Belt.</p>	<p>These are areas of natural/semi natural amenity space which is of value to the community and part of the GI network. GI1266 is also covered by a TPO. No justification has been forward to warrant their deletion. Many of these areas are designated for their biodiversity value as part of the network of wildlife corridors that run within the Sevenoaks built up area regardless of public access. Both these sites form part of this network and should be protected.</p> <p>1 This site is in the GB and therefore is protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given in CSP SP10. 2 The site is below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted See OS35 below.</p>

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
		<p>The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate. Cemeteries are also considered to be an important part of the wider GI Network.</p>
<p>OS18 Mr Alan Sterling Savills</p>	<p>The parcel of land that lies on the edge of a much larger area of woodland, with a recreation ground in the middle, known as the Chalk Pit Recreation Ground. This whole area is an EN9 designation. The Open Space Allocations document continues to identify this area (GI 698) as protected Open Space - natural and semi-natural urban green space.</p> <p>Strongly consider that this parcel of land is distinct and different to the wider Chalk Pit Recreation Ground area, and should be de-designated as a protected site and the boundary for this designated area be redrawn</p> <p>Agree that the rest of the Chalk Pit Recreation Ground area should be designated as protected Open Space.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS10 and the Open Space Allocations sets out a number of criteria for assessing the merits of open space.</p> <p>For the following reasons, this site does not meet the criteria, is significantly different and distinct from the rest of the Chalk Pit Recreation Ground area and therefore should be removed from the wider designation.</p> <p>The parcel of land is in private ownership.</p> <p>The site has been built on in the past and historically was occupied by a dwelling This was removed in the 1960's however the footings can still be seen on site.</p> <p>The site is not accessible to the public and therefore cannot contribute to the aim to protect and link a network of accessible and multi-functional open space.</p> <p>The site is not natural/semi-natural space. It has been cleared of trees and vegetation and is not woodland and no longer has biodiversity value, it no</p>	<p>CSP SP10 defines areas of open space that form part of the GI network. This network includes a variety of types of open space including formal, informal, natural and semi natural . It states that “open space……. of value to the local community will be retained”</p> <p>The Open Space Allocations states that the retention, improvement and management of informal and formal facilities …….. is a priority” and that “Sites have been identified which are important to the visual amenity of the locality or provide informal recreation/playspace and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>For a significant number of years this site has formed part of the larger area of open space. This area has a number of uses and types of vegetation/habitat. Any remains of a previous building have been absorbed into the natural environment and cannot be considered as any kind of development. The site is remains natural/semi-natural although it has been cleared of trees etc.</p> <p>The fact that the site is no longer open to the public does not prevent it making a valuable contribution to the GI network. The site is part of the existing network of wildlife habitats and corridors which run through the towns and villages in the District linking these areas with the wider countryside.</p> <p>While the timber boarded fence prevents views directly into the site itself the views across to the remaining wooded area beyond have an important visual amenity value contributing to the character of this part Otford.</p> <p>This view has been supported on appeal.</p> <p>In the Appeal decision Ref: APP/G2245/A/10/2131774 in relation to</p>

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
	<p>longer exhibits the characteristics of a natural or semi-natural space and does not function as such and there is no prospect of it doing so.</p> <p>The site is enclosed by timber boarded fence which prevents views into the site. Previous Planning Inspectors have found the fencing to have a negative impact on the appearance of the site and thus the visual amenity value of the land.</p> <p>The site does not offer any visual amenity value that the rest of the area provides and will continue to remain cleared and enclosed in perpetuity.</p> <p>The site is no longer an area of open space of value to the local community warranting its retention.</p> <p>The overall thrust of policy is to ensure that protected areas of open space continue to provide a visual amenity benefit to the public, or provide informal recreation/playspace and wildlife habitats. This site does not contribute in either manner and no longer has the quality to do so. I am advised that the quality of this parcel of land will not change.</p> <p>The document states that there is no shortfall in natural and semi-natural green space within the District, rather there is enough. Furthermore, within Otford, a new larger area of protected natural and semi-natural space (GI 697) is being proposed, and therefore even with the removal of this small site from the current designation, there will be a significant net increase in open space within the village providing amenity and recreational benefit to residents.</p> <p>The planning history to this site has involved schemes for a single dwelling house at. Appeal the Planning Inspector considered that there were differences between this site and the wider designated area but clearly stated that an individual appeal is not the mechanism by which to alter land designations as these are more appropriately addressed through the LDF process</p> <p>Consider that there is a strong case for the removal of this parcel of land from the wider designation.</p>	<p>the proposal for a 4 bed dwelling on the site the inspector considered that “there would still be visible signs of the built form intruding into the area of undeveloped and green space which is the character of this part of the locality.”</p> <p>The Inspector agreed with previous appeal letter that stated “The land forms part of an undeveloped frontage, providing a break in the developed area and giving the locality a more natural quality” and was of the view that “it is important in this area, to provide a significant undeveloped and natural break to this part of Otford ...The appeal land may not be regarded as being as attractive as the remaining parts of the green space, but it still contributes to the visual amenity and undeveloped character of this area”.</p> <p>Conclusion It is considered that the Designation remains appropriate and that to remove the it would be contrary to CSP 10 as it would mean a loss to the existing GI network.</p>

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
OS19 Mr Derek Johnson Clerk Chevening Parish Council	Add Bullfinch Green for designation as Local Green Space, even though its area is approximately half of the minimum 0.2ha recommended.	The site is below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.
OS20 Ms C Allart Horton Kirby & South Darenth Parish Council	GI 739 Top Paddock, South Darenth. Currently designated as an amenity greenspace for possible future use as allotments.	Changes between these uses would be acceptable providing it does not result in a shortfall in the existing use.
OS21 Angela Howells Clerk Westerham Parish Council	Keen to emphasise the importance it attaches to the protection of all the small areas of green space within areas of housing in Westerham. GI 578 'Farleycroft Allotments' should be described as 'Farley Allotments'.	All open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10. Noted.
OS22 Louise Kleinschmidt Leigh Parish Council	Amend the description of The Green, Leigh from "outdoor sports facility" to "amenity greenspace and outdoor sports facility" Add Charcott Green - amenity greenspace old cemetery area r/o of the Village Halls in Leigh cemetery/churchyard Area around the pond in Well Close, Leigh - amenity greenspace Area of green in middle of Garden Cottages, Leigh - amenity greenspace	Noted Amend to "amenity green space including outdoor sports facility". These sites are below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.
OS23 Debbie Salmon Kent Wildlife Trust	Raise a number of concerns regarding the natural and semi natural open space and green corridor allocations and that work is required before the open space allocations could be viewed as a integrated multifunctional Green Infrastructure in line with PPS9 Paragraph 12 and CC8 of the SE Plan. Concerned regarding the decision not to allocate areas within the green belt as natural or semi natural open space or provide protection for the network detailed and mapped within the Core Strategy. Recommend that corridors for protection, re-creation and management are clearly identified with resilient policies to ensure protection from or integration into development in line with PPS9 Paragraph 12. Delivery mechanisms should be detailed within a delivery plan with funding streams identified.	This document is not intended to define the GI network. It is a consultation exercise aimed at gaining peoples views on the sites identified and in order to seek additional sites. A full GI report is being prepared which defines the GI network and outlines opportunities for improvements. This includes opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on individual sites which can feed into landscape scale improvements, improved access arrangements to the existing network and cross boundary schemes. A map showing these opportunities will be included in the ADM Plan along side the policy for the protection and enhancement of the GI network.
OS24 Mrs Gillian King Scott	28 sites put forward Recreation Ground, Station Road	These sites are in the GB and therefore are protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given by CSP SP10.

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
Clerk Halstead Parish Council	<p>Fields to the side of the Recreation Ground abutting Station Road</p> <p>Field by the Village Gateway in Station Rd/Watercroft Rd behind flats Clarks Lane</p> <p>Village Green, Church Road</p> <p>Walnut Tree Meadow, Church Road</p> <p>Churchyard adjacent to St Margaret's Church and field between the church and the new Rectory, Church Road</p> <p>Fields behind the new Rectory and Widmore Cottages, Church Road</p> <p>Playing fields and open spaces surrounding Halstead Place, Church Road</p> <p>Walled Garden allotments, Halstead Place, Church Road</p> <p>Fields behind Stonestacks, Stonehouse Lane</p> <p>Fields either side of Stonehouse Lane</p> <p>Field at the junction with Station Road, Otford Lane and Shoreham Lane</p> <p>Fields behind Meadway and backing onto The Meadows</p> <p>Field behind Village Hall, Knockholt Road</p> <p>Field to the side of Village Hall abutting Spinney Cottage, Knockholt Road</p> <p>Fields either side of Shoreham Lane and Otford Lane</p> <p>Fields between Otford Lane and Fort Halstead</p> <p>Watercrofts Wood, Watercroft Road/Old London Road</p> <p>Fields one side of Watercroft Road</p> <p>Allotments Beldam Haw</p> <p>Fields behind Deer Leap Stud Farm, Knockholt Road</p> <p>Fields behind properties in Knockholt Rd to Church Rd,- 'The Park'</p> <p>Fields in Halstead Lane between Village Gateway and Parish boundary</p> <p>Fields at Warren Court, Knockholt Road</p> <p>Orchard adjacent to Broke Hill Golf Club</p> <p>Broke Hill Golf Club</p> <p>Fields linking Broke Hill Golf Club with Pratts Bottom</p> <p>Fields Halstead Community Primary School</p> <p>On several maps Church Road is referred to as Stonehouse Lane</p>	Noted.
<p>OS26 Mr Andrew Burton Bursar & Clerk to Governors Sevenoaks School</p>	<p>GI 308 and 322 are marked as Outdoor Sports Facilities. the School Masterplan, shows that a boarding house is planned on GI 308. The favoured site is to the west of GI 2048 and to the north of the all-weather sports pitch shown on the map.</p> <p>With regard to GI 309, I could not identify Map 25 referred to in your</p>	The allocations are based on current land uses. Applications on these sites will be judged on their merits and a balanced judgement made on the impact of the loss of the open space against the benefits of an individual scheme. It would not be appropriate to remove the designations in advance of any application being made.

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
	<p>schedule. The land marked as GB is leased by the School from the Knole Trust, primarily for use as sports fields. Some of the land is, however, already used as access roads and car parks for the School. There are plans to improve parking and access to the School at this point (Dukes Meadow) in order to alleviate current problems on the highway.</p>	
<p>OS27 Mrs Y Tredoux Kemsing Parish Council</p>	<p>New sites: 1-Jubilee Green - The Well Area 2-Kemsing Downs Nature Reserve - Common Field Recreation Ground - Land between the 'Old' and 'New' Childsbridge Lane. - Field North East of Chart View - Triangular piece between Greenlands Road, Noah's Ark and the Railway.</p>	<p>1 These sites are below the size threshold for allocation. It should be noted however, that all open space, that is of value to the local community is protected by CSP SP10.</p> <p>2 These sites are in the GB and therefore are protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given by CSP SP10.</p>
<p>OS29 Ann Smith and Andrew Allan</p>	<p>Support allocation of Beechmont Road/Sevenoaks Common.</p>	<p>Noted See OS17 above.</p>
<p>OS30 Kirsty Payne</p>	<p>Support allocation of GI 281. Additional allocation of parkland from the "hole in the wall" and end of Brittans Lane to Riverhead Infants School.</p>	<p>Noted. These area is in the GB and therefore is protected from development by GB policies in addition to that given by CSP SP10.</p>
<p>OS31 The White Hart Residents Association</p>	<p>GI 265 - All of Sevenoaks Common should be included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>GI 266 is ancient woodland.</p>	<p>The proposal that the Green Belt boundary should follow the property lines of the most southerly properties north of Beechmont Road appears clear when looked at on a map of the area. However, from the ground it is not clear that a strong defensible boundary line exists between the properties and that land that is part of Sevenoaks Common. This is evident from aerial photographs of the area. In contrast, Beechmont Road forms a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>As a result, the Council do not consider that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify an amendment to the Green Belt boundary, under PPG2, can be demonstrated. It is proposed that the land north of Beechmont Road is identified as an area of protected open space. Amending the Green Belt boundary to protect this land from development is not necessary</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
<p>OS33 Mrs P.A.S Kirtley New Ash Green Village Association Ltd</p>	<p>New Ash Green is different. Within the defined settlement, all land that is not owned by an individual householder, utility, public authority or the shopping centre is owned by the New Ash Green Village Association Ltd, approx 31.20ha, and is defined as "Amenity Land", through this has no defined use except where reserved for a special purpose, eg sportsfield. The protection offered under these proposals does not sit comfortably with the situation in New Ash Green, because of the single ownership within the village envelope with its unique control via the VA.</p> <p>The whole of the Amenity Land within New Ash Green (including Northfield) should be subject to a single classification (amenity green Space), save for the woodlands (and orchard) identified in the Appendix of the consultation document (as natural and semi natural), the allotments (allotments and community gardens) and the sportsfield, including the Emco triangle. Dealt with in this way, the intention is clear and the issue of mapping detail should be resolved. The various children's play areas are all on amenity land.</p>	<p>The situation in New Ash Green is indeed unique and the approach has been reviewed in the light of this consultation.</p> <p>Much of the amenity land is the original integral/structural landscaping which defines the character of the village. Some of the areas are small in themselves, being divided by roads or footpaths and therefore falling below the size criteria. However all these areas are in practice visually and functionally linked, and together form significant areas of green open space.</p> <p>Although all the open space in New Ash Green is protected by CSP SP10 it is considered that the mapping should better reflect the planned character of the settlement and that all the open areas should be shown. This will be called amenity green space and include the play areas within these areas and will cover all the areas except for that currently shown as natural and semi natural.</p>
<p>OS37 Cllr Cameron Clark OS25 Alison de Jager Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council</p>	<p>This land is listed in 27 separate entries which is confusing and unhelpful when dealing with the management of open space in the village. The conclusion from this is that the Open Spaces Allocations document fails to give adequate recognition and designation for the unique open space within the urban confines of the village of New Ash Green.</p> <p>Only about half of around 70ha of open space in New Ash Green, almost all of which is under common ownership and managed, directly or indirectly, by NAG VA is identified and there is some confusion as to the overlap between Green Belt protection and the Open Space Allocation document. This fragmented approach to identification of land which is seen by the public as a contiguous whole does not demonstrate a clear intention to protect the important and uniquely distinctive green infrastructure in New Ash Green as a part of the District's network of open space.</p> <p>It would therefore be sensible to ignore all footpaths in New Ash Green when designating open space and by doing so it will be possible to designate perhaps six blocks of land with boundaries defined by the public highways (maybe subdivided into Amenity Greenspace and Natural & Semi Natural land where there is a distinct break in the landscape character) which would</p>	

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
	<p>encompass virtually all the New Ash Green amenity land with the exception of those parts that fall within the Green Belt.</p> <p>There was a proposal to site a new fire station in the parish and the land now identified as GI 798 was put forward as a possible site; it has been safeguarded for that purpose. The recently published Integrated Risk Management Plan of the Kent Fire and Rescue Authority resurrects this proposal as a replacement for the Horton Kirby fire station. It would not be sensible to restrict the options available at this stage by designating this land as open space</p> <p>The Parish Council supports Cllr Cameron Clark's submission</p>	<p>Kent Fire and Rescue Service (KFRS) have identified the need for the development of a new fire station, in line with their Integrated Risk Management Plan. This site had Outline Permission for a fire station and tower granted in 1994 (SE/94/2097) which has now expired. SDC is discussing proposal with KFRS which will be submitted as a planning application in 2012.</p>
<p>OS34 Kent County Council</p>	<p>Former Churchill School site, Westerham. Support the proposed de-designation of the EN9 site and its proposed allocation for residential development . Removal of the EN9 protection for part of this site is necessary to allow the land to come forward as identified in the emerging ADMDPD in compliance with the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Open Space Allocation document makes adequate provision of protected areas of green space within the urban confines of Westerham, and consequently the release of part of the former Churchill School site from the policy is justified.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>OS2 Jo Connah</p>	<p>London Road site at Westerham now appears to have separated into two types of allocations Please refer to the comments made on the Allocations (Options) consultation. The objections covered a number of factors which have not changed, i.e. air quality in Westerham being of the lowest in the Kent region/lack of school places/lack of public transport and the amount of protected wildlife/wild flowers on site.</p>	<p>This site forms part of a housing allocation identified in the ADM DPD. The objectors comments on the loss of the open space and on the housing allocation will be assessed as part of the preparation of the ADM DPD (ref AO159).</p>
<p>OS35 P Watkins Land and Planning Manager Kitewood Estates Ltd</p>	<p>Land at Bouchier Close should be de allocated under policy EN9 as :- The land is not visible from public view points. It therefore has no material visual amenity benefit. It is private land with no public access and therefore provides no recreational benefit. A stage 1 ecological study demonstrates that it has limited ecological value. It does not form part of a wider area of open space or form part of a green corridor. It has no other designations such as GB or SSSI</p>	<p>CSP SP10 defines areas of open space that form part of the GI network. This network includes a variety of types of open space including formal, informal, natural and semi natural . It states that “open space..... of value to the local community will be retained”.</p> <p>The Open Space Allocations states that the retention, improvement and management of informal and formal facilitiesis a priority” and that “Sites have been identified which are important to the visual amenity of</p>

Organisation	Summary	District Council Response
	<p>The original EN9 designation for this site was not challenged when the Local Plan was in preparation and therefore the allocation was included by default. The land is currently the subject of a planning application for a nursing home. This application includes a substantial part of the site to remain undeveloped. This undeveloped area of land is to be given public access rights via a section 106 agreement. If consent is granted this would imply that EN9 policy should no longer apply to this site. This would be consistent with the EN9 de allocation on the land south of Rockdale.</p> <p>If this is not accepted then the Bouchier Close land should be de allocated form policy EN9 if it obtains planning permission. This would be consistent with the EN9 de allocation on the land south of Rockdale.</p>	<p>the locality or provide informal recreation/playspace and wildlife habitats”.</p> <p>The fact that the site is not open to the public does not prevent it making a valuable contribution to the GI network. The site is part of the existing network of wildlife habitats and corridors which run through the towns and villages in the District linking these areas with the wider countryside. This open area in middle of the built up area of Sevenoaks town is an important “green lung”.</p> <p>The allocations are based on current land uses. Applications on these sites will be judged on their merits and a balanced judgement made on the impact of the loss of the open space against the benefits of an individual scheme. It would not be appropriate to remove the designations in advance of any application being determined.</p>
<p>OS36 OS32 DS No. 5 (Jersey) Ltd Development Securities</p>	<p>The Core Strategy sets out clearly the Council’s aspirations for Swanley Town Centre - ‘to regenerate and transform Swanley town centre with a high quality new shopping, business and housing hub with an improved environment and public spaces’.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that to enable and deliver the desired redevelopment , a regeneration scheme will need to include some (or possibly all) of the Open Space allocations currently identified as GI 136 (Recreation Ground) and GI 131 (Recreation Ground Play Area).</p> <p>Seek the deletion of open space allocations (GI 135 & GI 131) to allow the sites to come forward without any conflict with CS as part of a town centre extension. Through the redevelopment scope will exist to ensure open space/play space lost will be replaced elsewhere or replaced in kind.</p>	<p>In the Core Strategy The Council supports in principle, the redevelopment of Swanley Town Centre. This policy stance would be take into account when determining any proposal for the centre, this would include a judgement about the impact of the loss of the open space. The open space allocations reflect the current use of the land and it would not be appropriate to remove those designation at this time.</p>
<p>OS38 Mrs B Ide Shoreham Parish Council</p>	<p>Supports inclusion of land at Bowers Road GI 669 as amenity greenspace.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>OS10 John Isherwood</p>	<p>Support protection in Edenbridge.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>OS39 Otford Parish Council</p>	<p>Request the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Otford Village Green (693). This is assigned as Amenity Green Space but a critical part of the green on your map is covered by the number "6" of the area designation. Would like this area, although small, to be clearly defined as it is currently incorrectly enclosed by a property fence. 2. Chalk pit and area siting the Otford Scout Hut. (698). This total area is designated as EN9 but only partially as Natural & Semi Natural. Suggest complete area be designated N & SN. 3. Land behind Castle Farm and adjacent to area 697. Request that this area is designated as N & SN. 4. Footpath and adjacent green areas leading from Pilgrims Way West to the Charne, be designated EN9 . 5. Green wide verges bordering the footpath on the north side of Pilgrims Way West from the iron bridgewestward to the Wickham Cottages. Request this is designated EN9. 6. Green wide verges on the west side of the Sevenoaks Road from just north of Warham Road to the Otford Parish Boundary with Sevenoaks. . Request this area is designated EN9. 7. Area bordering Bubblestone Road . This land overlies remains of The Bishop's Palace and it's out buildings and should be classified as Natural & Semi Natural area as is Palace Field (692). 	<p>Policy EN9 has been replaced by CSP SP10 which protects areas of open space of importance to the local community.</p> <p>Agreed Amend.</p> <p>Agreed Amend.</p> <p>Agreed Amend.</p> <p>While this is an important area it is too small to be allocated.</p> <p>Agreed Amend.</p> <p>While this is an important area it is too small to be allocated.</p> <p>Agreed Amend.</p>
<p>OS1 Coal Authority OS5 Highways Agency OS15 Kent Constabulary OS28 The Theatres Trust</p>	<p>No comments</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Supplementary Site Allocations consultation (10 sites) March – May 2012

–
and

Supplementary consultation on Broom Hill, Swanley June – August 2012 –

Site Name	No of Comments	Individual / Organisation	Representation	SDC Response
<u>Bovis Manor House, New Ash Green</u>	32	Ash-cum - Ridley Parish Council	Changing to residential will be detrimental to New Ash Green and further move it to become a dormitory for the surrounding area with even less flexibility for future needs, as yet unknown. The approx. density of 50 dwellings per hectare is too dense in view of the need to establish an appropriate setting for the Manor House, a listed building.	Noted re loss of employment space, but site not allocated for employment and updated employment forecasts (2011) indicate additional B1 (office) space not required in the District. Not a highly accessible location. On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		Kent Highways KCC	In principle this site could accommodate a residential development proposal, Will require would be the need for widening of the existing access corridor and some associated clearance of visibility splays. Lack of public pedestrian provision across the site frontage - would need a link to adjacent footways east and west of the site. Need to improve direct pedestrian links to bus stops with a further need to improve pedestrian facilities/crossing points at the junction of North Ash Road and Ash Road immediately west of the site What type of housing/facility is proposed as described as being suitable for older people and people with special needs. The site contains a 19th century grade II listed building. There is general archaeological potential for prehistoric and Romano-British finds based on archaeological discoveries c. 270m south of the site	Highways comments noted and will need to be incorporated into any planning application on the site Site could accommodate a range of housing types, including housing designed for older people –determined through planning application process Noted

				On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		Moat Housing Group	Fully supports a residential development that would support the requisite amount of affordable units. It is well placed and served locally and is where residents would choose to live	Noted On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		Bovis Homes Ltd – site owner	Fully supports and endorses the conclusions and recommendations	Noted On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		Kent Wildlife Trust	Mitigation and or compensation for any increased pressure on the ancient woodland complex should be considered within the policy formulation for this site. This could be in the form of increased management for the woodland complex or alternative natural habitat to link the woodlands within the locality.	Noted – TPOs now identified on site plan. Any planning application on the site would need to identify any ecological impacts and propose commensurate mitigation. On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		Environment Agency	Data indicates that part of the proposed residential site may lie in an area that is susceptible to surface water flooding	Noted On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		District Councillors - Ash and New Ash Green Ward and County Councillor	Importance of retention of employment opportunities. No need for additional residential. Planned community that has already exceeded its size (development is complete) Bovis have no financial interest in the centre and therefore cannot guarantee re-provision. Limited residential may be acceptable if no alternative employment use can be found, subject to conditions related to design, protection of listed building and trees, car-parking,	Noted re loss of employment space, but site not allocated for employment and updated employment forecasts (2011) indicate additional B1 (office) space not required in the District. Not a highly accessible location. Noted. SDC working with neighbourhood plan working group and landowners to bring forward regeneration of village centre On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through

			access and inclusion within village covenant	a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.
		Local Residents Comments, including: Knights Croft Residents Society New Ash Green Village Association Limited Over Minnis Resident's Society Punch Croft Residents Society Friends of the New Ash Green Centre Alison Smith Andy Taylor Chris & Frances Carter Claire Pearsall David & Maggie Wilkinson B Yaxley Bruce Glen Calow J Clifton-Gould JP Bell	<p>Extra traffic, noise and pollution</p> <p>Must provide sufficient on-site car-parking provision - must not include any parking areas belonging to Knights Croft, Punch Croft, Over Minnis or The Shopping Centre</p> <p>Needs considerable road widening alongside safer pedestrian crossings and routes to the centre</p> <p>Loss of privacy</p> <p>Development must respect the surrounding neighbourhoods</p> <p>Density too high</p> <p>Harmful effect on the unique residential and visual amenity of New Ash Green.</p> <p>Result in over use of local services/ amenities i.e. primary school and doctor's surgery</p> <p>No mention of the possibility of affordable housing</p> <p>Give consideration to provision of housing for older people and those with special needs</p> <p>Viability is questionable</p> <p>Loss of local employment - the provision of new employment uses New Ash Green Village Centre seems unattainable. Bovis Homes has no power to deliver this.</p> <p>Links to the existing footpath network</p> <p>Retain and preserve the Manor House and its setting</p> <p>Provide for an agreement between the developer and the Village Association to include the property in the Village Management Scheme</p>	<p>Noted -</p> <p>On the recommendation of the LDF Advisory Group, the site is left as non-allocated land which will allow consideration through a Neighbourhood Plan or through planning applications for the site which would be considered on their merits.</p>

		Edward &Thea Prentice Keith & Loulette McDowall Ladybird Studios Mr K Bolton Stuart Richardson T/A Pizzalands		
<u>Currant Hill Allotments, Westerham</u>	16	Westerham Town Council – site owner	Confirm that as community land we could not and would not progress any change of use without consulting our community. The time table to achieve this after consultation is likely to run more realistically into the Plan's long term phasing. Have had to move somewhat faster in our preparation for this due to the proposed change of use of the KCC land and consequent preservation of a future vehicular access to the allotment site	Noted. Amendments made in relation to phasing, and reference to further community consultation. Cartographical amendments in relation to access notation
		Sport England	Object to the allocation of the land adjacent to Currant Hill Allotments, Westerham (Former Safeguarded Land) as a replacement allotment site	Noted. Letter sent to Sport England 22 May setting out why the land to the north of the allotments is not considered to fall under the definition of a playing pitch or playing field. The Council has been working with Westerham Town Council (who own the site) to identify suitable replacement allotment land and a number of options were proposed. The Council is committed to the view that replacement allotments need to be of equivalent or greater value, in terms of their size, location, accessibility and quality, in order to maintain the supply of allotments for the local community. The most suitable site for the replacement allotments is considered to be an extension of the existing allotments into the field immediately to the north of the allotment site, which is currently leased to Churchill School, on a short-term, one year rolling lease. The school is aware of this proposal and has confirmed that it can accommodate the loss of the field without prejudicing its activities. The field is rarely used and is not laid out or delineated as playing pitches. The school uses fields to the north and west of their buildings for their playing fields, and the field to the north is delineated as

				<p>playing pitches.</p> <p>The proposal is therefore to re-allocate the lower southern portion of the allotment site for a small residential development and to re-provide equivalent allotments on the land to the north of the existing site. The land to the north of the allotments is not considered to fall under the definition of a playing pitch or playing field.</p>
		Environment Agency	Flood modelling and historic records indicate that the roads immediately south and east (South Bank and London Road) of the site may be affected by flooding which could impact on access/egress to the site	Noted – to be considered at detailed planning application stage.
		KCC Kent Highways	<p>Churchill Primary School is in close proximity to this site. The development will need to be mindful of the presence of the school and to avoid impacting on their daily routines. This site is on the edge of a medieval town. Low level archaeology is anticipated</p> <p>Access onto London Road north of Rosslare Close - width and visibility appear to exist to allow a suitable access to be created at this location onto London Road. Rysted Lane as pedestrian access</p>	<p>Noted – to be considered at detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>As set out in allocation, main vehicular access to site to be via adjacent site and London Road. Rysted Lane to serve only as pedestrian/cycle access.</p>
		Kent Wildlife Trust	Site biodiversity surveys will be sought to ensure any biodiversity concerns are adequately mitigated and biodiversity enhancement will be required on the adjacent replacement allotment site and within the development in the form and linked Green Infrastructure	Noted – to be considered at detailed planning application stage. Biodiversity surveys referenced in allocation
		Moat Housing Group	Support if the allotment could be moved	Noted
		Natural England	Site surveys must be completed, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by any proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted	Noted – to be considered at detailed planning application stage. Biodiversity surveys referenced in allocation
		Cooper Estates Ltd	We find that there are fundamental policy principle and site constraint matters which are either in conflict with existing adopted CS and Government planning policy and/or there is substantial and significant uncertainty. It is not clear that the replacement allotment use can be delivered or	Comments noted. Objection is related to the notation on the site that it may be suitable for housing for older people, which is considered appropriate, given the site's location in close proximity to a range of services.

			is appropriate for the intended use; it is thus an unsound basis on which to proceed to confirm a residential allocation for the land in question. The NPPF states that plan allocations should be “realistic” (Para.154) and deliverable (paragraph 182).The proposed residential allocation of this site including the aim of providing elderly persons or special needs housing is neither realistic nor deliverable given the absence of any credible policy basis and the other constraints referred to above. The proposed allocation should be deleted.	The Town Council own the potential replacement allotment land and have agreement from the school for this proposal. Reference in allocation to seek permission in relation to the Allotments Act and reference added in relation to further community consultation.
		Local Residents Brigitte & Geoff Tidy C Davies Mr & Mrs Everest Mr Don Pickett James Calvocoressi Jeremy Wilson/Kristine Mitchell Jo Connah Ms Clare Moran and William Hayes	Concerned with the site access - would it mean a new roundabout as the road is already fairly busy and this will just add to the congestion? Access road is very narrow and is the main access road to the Churchill Primary School. Already concerns about vehicle activity and dangers to young children attending the school Additional vehicle activity with new properties Loss relocation of the allotments / biodiversity / impact on wildlife	Allocation confirms access is to be via London Road (not Rysted Lane). Kent Highways Services have confirmed that width and visibility appear to exist to allow a suitable access to be created onto London Road. Any scheme would need to re-provide allotments of equivalent value, as set out in the allocation
<u>Station Approach, Edenbridge</u>	21	Edenbridge Town Council	Edenbridge Town Council - Support	Support noted
		Environment Agency	Data indicates that part of the proposed residential site may lie in an area that is susceptible to surface water flooding	Noted – to be considered at detailed planning application stage.
		Southern Water	Have not identified any current capacity constraints for the Station Approach site, however, it is not possible to reserve or guarantee future availability of this capacity. Capacity is allocated on a first come first served basis	Noted
		KCC Kent Highways	This site is fringed by a Roman road with potential for contemporary roadside features to be present. Gasworks and brickworks sites may be of industrial interest. Low level	Noted – to be considered at detailed planning application stage.

			<p>archaeology is anticipated</p> <p>The northern part of the site is likely to be more suited to B1 (Business) than B8 (Storage and distribution) as Station Approach is not really suitable for intensive use by large HGVs. Station Approach is constrained by parked cars lining both sides of the road, leaving just a 3m-wide lane between them. Access to and from Station Approach can sometimes also be limited by traffic queues in the High Street.</p> <p>Residential areas would be best accessed off Greenfield. It should be noted that some safety enhancements such as signing and lining are likely to be required at the junction of Greenfield and Forge Croft. It should also be noted that there appears to be a significant level difference between the site and Greenfield. An alternative access could be off Forge Croft by the substation</p>	<p>Highways comments noted and to be reflected in any planning application for the site.</p> <p>Noted re access to residential area. Land at Forge Croft by the sub-station is protected open space (EN9) and therefore not suitable for access.</p>
		Kent Wildlife Trust	<p>Recommend that a buffer of natural habitat such as rough grassland be incorporated into the design of the development adjacent to the railway corridor to safeguard this important corridor and the species which use it</p>	<p>Noted – buffer referenced in allocation</p>
		Network Rail – site owner	<p>Considers that the existing employment provision could be retained on the site without restricting housing to only half of the site and believes that given the site has a number of other constraints that the policy does not look to dictate the exact ratio split of the site for the different uses. This reference should therefore be removed from the relevant site plan It is accepted that the goods shed is in relatively good condition. However, as no conservation/heritage assessment has been carried out, it should not be a specific condition of development that it is retained. This matter can be addressed through the development management process to allow for full consideration to be given as to whether the structure is worthy of retention. Without any evidence that this building has significant value (which would require its retention), this reference cannot be included within a local plan policy Due to the requirement to include landscaping buffers along the site boundary, the site specific constraints such as the significant change in levels and the current economic climate,</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation provides development guidance, but the detailed split of the site can be determined through the planning application process. Core Strategy policy SP8 sets out that the employment capacity, represented by the commercial floorspace, would need to be maintained.</p> <p>Goods shed considered to be of significant historic interest and further investigation being undertaken to support the retention of this building</p> <p>Noted. Landscaping and access considered normal development costs. Viability (including in relation to provision of affordable housing) can be further discussed at planning application stage.</p>

			<p>there are concerns that the proposed site designation could result in any proposed development being unviable and not deliverable</p> <p>Whilst Network Rail supports the on going regeneration of Edenbridge Town, if this site is to be used more efficiently it is requested that the policy includes some degree of flexibility that could allow residential development of the full site, if it can be demonstrated that a mixed use development is not financially viable</p>	<p>Noted. Core Strategy Policy SP8 sets out that redevelopment of employment sites for purely residential can be considered if it is demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of their take-up in the plan period (to 2026) which provides the flexibility as requested.</p>
		Moat Housing Group	<p>Perfect for an affordable housing development in size, location and nature</p>	<p>Noted. Affordable housing will be sought in line with Core Strategy policy SP3</p>
		Cooper Estates Ltd	<p>The Council has allocated land at Edenbridge under Policy LO6 of the Core Strategy to provide appropriately for the development needs of the town.</p> <p>It is considered that a more appropriate approach for the site allocations document to take would be to bring forward planned development on that land rather than seeking to squeeze some residential development onto a site of this nature for the reasons highlighted above. The residential element of the site allocation should be deleted</p>	<p>Comments noted. Objection is related to the notation on the site that it may be suitable for housing for older people, which is considered appropriate, given the site's location in close proximity to a range of services.</p> <p>Site considered suitable for mixed use development</p>
		<p>Local Residents</p> <p>A and J Varley</p> <p>Alan Wingrove</p> <p>Ben Brownless</p> <p>Michael Bedling</p> <p>Howard Johnson</p> <p>I.G Falkner</p> <p>James and</p>	<p>Vehicular access via Greenfield would cause additional traffic congestion in the High Street, Croft Lane, Forge Croft and Greenfield and make emergency access even more difficult. The current access is at a considerably lower level than the properties in Greenfield, thereby causing minimal disturbance to adjacent residential areas</p> <p>Access from Greenfield would be impracticable due to the steep embankment without creating a tortuous zigzag service road</p> <p>Vehicular access should be restricted to via Station Approach</p> <p>Additional on-road parking in Greenfield will make this quiet residential no-through road a more dangerous place for the elderly residents and the children</p> <p>Any development must have ample amount of parking</p> <p>It would increase traffic and noise, and would allow vehicles to travel faster</p>	<p>Concerns related to access, traffic and parking noted and would need to be addressed in any planning application for the site.</p> <p>Noted. Vegetation buffer / screening required to be retained and augmented</p>

		<p>Valerie Mitchell</p> <p>Peter Dix</p> <p>Scott Gasson</p> <p>Stephen Smith</p> <p>J O'Neill</p> <p>Lesley Chapman</p> <p>Tom Burton</p>	<p>The loss of vegetation barrier and mature trees and the wildlife-rich strip of land The triangular grass area should be retained and could provide pedestrian access straight onto Greenfield to make access easier for the town centre and school</p> <p>Almost all of the site is used either for storage, office accommodation or vehicle movement areas. Only at the south end of the site is there any space</p> <p>Value of properties would decrease, would seek to be compensated</p> <p>Single Storey/Bungalow style only acceptable. Thus more suitable to those residents quoted "Older people and those with special needs"</p> <p>Housing in close proximity to a station and track is inappropriate for the elderly and vulnerable.</p> <p>This residential development seems a good use of the land</p> <p>Concerned that this proposal could affect the future ability to extend the platform at Edenbridge Town station which is urgently needed</p> <p>Should remain as an employment site with all access via Station Approach and/or Grange Close to keep the traffic away from the High Street and populated areas of Croft Lane, Forge Croft and Greenfield</p> <p>Environmentally beneficial possibilities such as PV generation, solar thermal, rainwater harvesting, self-contained sewage systems, eco friendly houses etc. Could be an opportunity to only permit an eco friendly development</p> <p>Will put additional strains on over-stretched infrastructure</p>	<p>Noted. Site considered to be able be used more efficiently as a mixed use development site</p> <p>Not an issue considered by planning</p> <p>Design comments noted. Buildings can be designed / orientated so that railway line does not impact on residential amenity. Secure boundary would be required.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Noted. This proposal is being proposed by the landowner Network Rail, who has not raised this as a constraint</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Eco-developments are encouraged under core strategy policy SP2 (Sustainable development) which requires new homes to be Code Level 3 now and Code Level 4 from 2013.</p> <p>Noted. Any impacts on infrastructure will be mitigated via the imposition of a legal agreement requiring infrastructure / contributions</p>
<u>Leigh's Builders Yard, Edenbridge</u>	10	Edenbridge Town Council	Support the proposed changes that Leigh's Builders Yard should become residential rather than employment	Noted and support welcomed. This site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and

				veterinary surgery, and therefore does not need to be included in the ADMP document
		Environment Agency	The site will be located on a 'dry island' and therefore roads in Edenbridge affected by flooding could impact on access/egress to the site. Some site investigation works may be necessary owing to previous commercial uses. However it is expected the risks to controlled waters will be low owing to the non-aquifer status of the underlying geology	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery, and therefore does not need to be included in the ADMP document
		KCC Kent Highways	This site is fringed by a Roman road with potential for contemporary roadside features to be present. Gasworks and brickworks sites may be of industrial interest. Low level archaeology is anticipated. This site appears to be suitable for housing from a highways perspective	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery, and therefore does not need to be included in the ADMP document
		Kent Wildlife Trust	No objections to residential development within this site, providing any recreational pressure on the River Eden LWS is mitigated	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery
		Moat Housing Group	Perfect for an affordable housing development in size, location and nature	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery
		Southern Water	A site specific policy should include the following: The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery
		The Leigh Family – site owner	Fully support the allocation for residential development	Noted and support welcomed. This site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery, and therefore does not need to be included in the ADMP document
		Cooper Estates Ltd	NPPF states that plan allocations should be “realistic” (Para.154) and deliverable (Para 182). The proposed allocation of this site with an aim of providing elderly persons or special needs housing is neither realistic nor deliverable given the extant permission and the other constraints	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery, and therefore does not need to be included in the ADMP document
		Local Residents David Parker Lawrence Neil Barry	The north western boundary of the site should be limited to single storey to obviate overlooking and shadowing Foul and surface water drainage must be discharged via the site access on to Mill Hill.	Noted – this site now has outline planning permission for a residential development and veterinary surgery, and therefore does not need to be included in the ADMP document

<u>GSK, Powder Mills, Leigh</u>	19	Leigh Parish Council	<p>Much more investigation and consultation is required on the future of this site before it can be decided which option is preferable. Do not feel that they have had sufficient opportunity to prepare a detailed response and that SDC has been far too hasty in preparing its recommendations. Propose a period of three months to form a working party, to consult with the residents of the area and to consider all the reports SDC has commissioned to date and those we hope you now agree to commission</p> <p>Suggests a second independent report is commissioned to consider the potential re-use of the site in employment use, considering the need for an employment site in the next two to five years. The decision to change the use of this site forever based on one report is not acceptable</p> <p>A housing development would have a catastrophic effect on the infrastructure: roads, utilities and local schools</p> <p>The 'localised widening to enable free-flowing, two-way traffic' this may not be feasible and would have a large impact on the narrow country road and surrounding Green Belt land. Also recommends the possible adoption of the currently private western access road to the site, which could provide a direct route from Hildenborough to Leigh, avoiding the narrow and tortuous route past The Plough. This would create a much increased level of traffic along the narrow access road to Powdermills, is covered by flood zone 3.</p> <p>Recommends that a sustainability report is commissioned to consider how any development on the site would impact the highway network, schools and utilities. The site is classified as a major developed site but it is not a sustainable location. The Parish Council appreciates that the site is remote and has limited access, therefore it is essential that a sustainability report is prepared, as these same features also make the site unsuitable to a significant residential development.</p> <p>If SDC believe that it is necessary to include a revised brief for the site, propose that the wording is general, and not over specific. The brief should indicate that any development must be sustainable with a balanced mix of usage, recognising its rural location and limiting the number of housing units that could be built to between 25 and 30, stressing the</p>	<p>The Parish Council and local residents objected to the original proposal and SDC has supported a working group of local representatives to explore modifications to the allocation. The allocation has been revised to refer to additional marketing of the site for employment purposes and includes a recommendation that any residential development should be low density and generally not more than two storeys in height. It also states that the woodland areas surrounding the site should be protected and enhanced, via a management strategy, with appropriate levels of public access, and that open space and green buffer zones should be incorporated into the development site. The stakeholder working group has accepted these proposed amendments.</p> <p>SDC is not proposing to commission a second independent report on the re-use of the site in employment use. The URS report (commissioned by SDC) looked at the potential for re-use in employment use in the plan period (to 2026)</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure and highways noted. Further information provided on these issues regarding highways requirements and school capacity.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared by SDC to appraise the site and has been provided to stakeholders</p>
---------------------------------	----	----------------------	--	---

			importance of maintaining the integrity of this small isolated hamlet.	
		Glaxo Smith Kline – site owner	Support allocation – comments on boundary, retention of building 12, accessibility improvements, housing capacity and phasing	<p>For the purpose of any redevelopment, SDC consider that the boundary of the site should be restricted to that of the secure employment site, with the two existing dwellings in GSK's ownership excluded.</p> <p>Retention of building 12 is the recommended approach set out in the URS report. The Council commissioned independent consultants URS to consider the potential for re-use of the site in employment use. Any proposals that does not seek to retain building 12 would need to demonstrate why take-up of this building is not viable in the plan period in line with Core Strategy policy SP8</p> <p>Accessibility improvements and site specific details would need to be determined at the planning application stage.</p>
		Environment Agency	Powder Mill Lane to the east of the site will be affected by flooding which could impact on access/egress. The river corridor must be protected and enhanced as part of the development. Any proposals will need to demonstrate that the river corridor will not have additional light spill as a result	<p>Noted –flood risk is referenced in the allocation and would need to be considered at detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>Area within flood zone excluded from net site area.</p>
		KCC Kent Highways	<p>The primary schools serving this rural area are currently at capacity so this allocation may create a deficit in available primary places. 100 dwellings would not generate sufficient pupil numbers to suggest a new school. However, the existing school facilities are close to deficit with expansion at Leigh prohibited by site constraints. Pupils would have to be schooled out of the area in neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>There is Industrial archaeology potential from the gunpowder mills, and a medieval manor close by to west. Significant archaeology could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval</p> <p>Recommended access improvements include (1) localised widening of Leigh Road sufficient to enable free-flowing two-way traffic and (2) possible adoption of the (currently private) western access road to the site. If</p>	<p>Noted. Further discussions with KCC Education have indicated that a c£235k contribution would be sought towards improving primary education facilities, and this would be used in a 2-3 mile planning radius.</p> <p>Noted, and this is referenced in the allocation.</p>

			suitably improved, it could provide a direct route from the site to Leigh and an alternative route for Hildenborough – Leigh traffic, avoiding narrow and tortuous route past The Plough Public House. Also desirable would be conversion of footpath SR437A (and MU24 as it is called over the border in Tonbridge) to cycle track status	Noted – accessibility improvements would be required as part of any redevelopment of the site.
		Kent Wildlife Trust	To ensure that all recreational pressure is mitigated it will be important that any future policy specifies that the site incorporates a multifunctional green infrastructure which contains corridors of natural habitat, that link into the LWS and that contributions are obtained to ensure the LWS is protected and managed to ensure no impact on biodiversity as a result of the increased recreational pressure. Open space should also be provided on site if at all possible	Noted. GI and open space to be incorporated in any scheme. This was of particular interest to the local stakeholder working group. Allocation has been modified to seek protection and enhancement of the woodland area and habitats, providing appropriate levels of public access, green buffer zones on the edge of the developed site and open spaces incorporated within the development. A site ecology report has been prepared by North West Kent Countryside Partnership.
		Southern Water	New and/or improved sewerage infrastructure is required before additional flows from this site can be accommodated. This should be reflected in a site specific policy.	Noted and would need to be considered at detailed planning application stage.
		Moat Housing Group	Perfect for an affordable housing development in size, location and nature	Noted. Affordable housing would be incorporated in any scheme, but response from Housing Policy team, following advice from WKHA, Moat and an analysis of the latest Homebuy application data from the Zone Agent, 6-8 units of affordable housing are recommended
		Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council	Supports both access routes into the site being retained. The issue of securing a cycle link between the site and Tonbridge Sports Ground should be raised as part of the implementation of the planning permission. While there is a footpath linking these two areas, the opportunity to improve the link as part of the allocation and development of the site should be sought in due course	Noted and cycle route has been raised by Kent Highways services
		Hildenborough Parish Council	Have concerns over traffic management, infrastructure(roads and schools) and flooding	Noted and will continue to liaise with neighbouring authorities on the site
		Local Residents Hunter Seal, Leigh Residents' Association	Concerns over traffic management Pressure on infrastructure, flooding, crime levels, village school, doctors. Parking is an issue in Hunter Seal The narrow lanes, without any pavements and several 'blind' corners, are already potentially dangerous to walkers, cyclists	Impact on local infrastructure and highways noted. Noted – accessibility improvements would be required as part of any redevelopment of the site.

		<p>Ladybird Studios</p> <p>Anthony Pratt</p> <p>Karen & John Muchmore</p> <p>Donna Watson</p> <p>Liz and John Summerton</p> <p>Lynn and Mark Hickson</p> <p>Michael Johnsons</p> <p>Mrs Cooper</p> <p>Starkey</p>	<p>and horse riders and cannot safely carry such an increase in traffic</p> <p>The footpath that runs behind one side of Hunter Seal is well used - to increase the volume of pedestrians/cyclists on this path raises concerns in respect of noise and safety</p> <p>Hunter Seal has an area of woodland which adjoins the GSK site. A development would cause disruption to the wildlife and thus an environmental impact.</p> <p>Any residential development will change this area of Powdermills from a semi rural hamlet to just another housing estate</p> <p>Sevenoaks Council have already reached their quota for housing</p> <p>Any redevelopment on this scale with 'inclusion of accessibility improvements' would drastically alter the rural nature of this location</p> <p>100 houses is too many residents</p>	<p>Noted – accessibility improvements would be required as part of any redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The woodland area and habitats that surround the site should be protected and enhanced, via a management strategy to be developed in conjunction with the local community, which should provide appropriate levels of public access.</p> <p>The housing provision set out in the Core Strategy does not represent an upper limit of the housing to be provided in the District. Sevenoaks has a number of allocated sites where capacity may change or where delivery may take place on a longer timescale and therefore it is necessary to offer a level of flexibility in terms of the range of available sites.</p> <p>Noted. Allocation revised to refer to low density development (not more than 25 dph)</p>
<u>Warren Court Farm, Halstead</u>	10	Halstead Parish Council	<p>It should continue to be used for small business as the employment provided for local people is important.</p> <p>The GB land associated with Warren Court Farm should be designated an Exceptions Site and used for affordable house for Halstead people, in perpetuity</p>	<p>Site identified in Employment Land Review (2009) as last remaining poor quality site – recent (2011) employment forecast suggests reduction in need for light industrial B1c and B1 offices. Retaining status quo of poor quality employment site in the green belt with allocation to expand, not considered positive planning.</p> <p>In relation to exceptions sites for affordable housing, a site selection process would need to be undertaken - site therefore cannot be allocated for this use. Existing uses on the site mean that there are likely to viability issues in terms of whether this site would come forward as an exceptions site for affordable housing.</p>
		Environment Agency	Owing to the presence of an historic landfill beneath much of the site footprint further contamination investigations and	Noted – any remediation issues would be required as part of any redevelopment of the site.

			possibly remediation are required. The site is within a sensitive area with respect to groundwater as it is underlain by a principal aquifer and lies within Source Protection Zone 3 for a public water supply	
		KCC Highways KCC	There is scope for a footway link from the site to the existing bus stop on the west side of Knockholt Road to the north of the site access and for an informal pedestrian crossing facility to provide a better link to the adjacent bus stop on the east side of Knockholt Road. There is scope within the current constraints to provide an access suitable for a residential use There is general prehistoric potential based on nearby finds. Low level archaeology is anticipated	Noted – accessibility improvements would be required as part of any redevelopment of the site. Noted
		Kent Wildlife Trust	The Trust welcomes the aim to buffer the site and provide natural habitat to extend Deerleap wood	Support noted and welcomed
		Moat Housing Group	The parish and LA need to maintain that provision of affordable dwellings in this location is central to any changes or proposals	Noted. Affordable housing is required as part of any residential development
		Mr I Butler – site owner	Whilst welcoming the proposal the area proposed to be allocated is too small and illogical. The proposal, as put forward, will result in the effective sterilisation of the majority of the site. It would represent an inefficient and gross underdevelopment of a site all of which constitutes previously developed land, contrary to the objective of NPPF policy. The capacity of the site as a whole would be far more than 13, facilitating a substantial increase in the yield of affordable housing to meet local needs. To proceed as the Council suggests would represent a missed opportunity. The allocation of the whole site, preferably accompanied by an adjustment in the village confines boundary, as suggested, would enable the benefits of a redevelopment scheme to be fully realised in terms of the environmental improvements and the housing yield, including the affordable element. The future of the environmental improvement land is unexplained	Noted. Environmental improvement area incorporated into site boundary to facilitate management and maintenance. Rear gardens of units with boundary to Deerleap Wood should incorporate woodland buffer in order to protect and extend the woodland area. Site capacity extended to reflect amended boundary.
		Mr Colin Luther – neighbouring site	Support the concerns raised in relation to design, landscaping, and access. Promoting adjacent Deerleap Farm for 3 new dwellings, exceptions site and environmental improvements	Exceptions sites process led by parish council / would need to be a site selection process, but site may be considered suitable due to proximity to village. Sent the Kent-wide Rural Homes Protocol.

				New buildings considered inappropriate development, but there may be scope for extension/replacement of existing/infilling in line with NPPF and Core Strategy policies Environmental improvements welcomed
		CPRE	The need is for affordable housing; removing the site from the Green Belt, and thus its exception status, would exclude that possibility, other than as a part of a substantial and unnecessary market housing scheme. Change of use would deprive the rural economy of local employment opportunities	In relation to exceptions sites for affordable housing, a site selection process would need to be undertaken - site therefore cannot be allocated for this use. Existing uses on the site mean that there are likely to viability issues in terms of whether this site would come forward as an exceptions site Site identified in Employment Land Review (2009) as last remaining poor quality site –recent (2011) employment forecast suggests reduction in need for light industrial B1c and B1 offices. Retaining status quo of poor quality employment site in the green belt with allocation to expand, not considered positive planning.
		Natural England	Restoration of part of the site and inclusion within the Green Belt designation would be welcomed and encouraged as would the buffer zone to Deerleap Wood	Noted
<u>Broom Hill, Swanley</u>	46	Swanley Town Council	Strongly objects to the proposal to include residential development at the Broom Hill site due to concerns regarding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> highways matters as Beechenlea Lane has only a single footpath and in addition traffic congestion and volume as well as non resident parking is already a concern the inadequacy of the local infrastructure to handle additional housing the potential loss of footpath number178, which is also not shown on any proposal plans concerns regarding the air quality in the area <p>The Town Council requests that the site be considered to be returned to the Green Belt or adopted as open space.</p> <p>The Town Council is also concerned regarding the consultation process especially as not all residents within the neighbouring road were contacted regarding this consultation</p>	Concerns noted. Due to strength of local opposition, primarily in relation to concern over access from Beechenlea Lane, impact on residential amenity and loss of green space, residential element removed from site allocation. Footpath to be retained Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land) Noted. All residents of Beechenlea Lane contacted and consultation period extended until 9 August to allow for additional comments. SDC staff presented proposals at residents association meeting

		Environment Agency	Data indicates that the south eastern corner of the site may be affected by surface water flooding. The site lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 and is adjacent to a works site. It should be ensured via normal planning regulations that appropriate site investigations are carried out to screen for any contamination risks from the adjacent works activities	Noted – any flooding issues would need to be considered as part of any redevelopment of the site, via the planning application process
		Highways Agency	The addition of housing to the Broom Hill site further exacerbates our concerns regarding the site’s traffic impact on M25 Junction 3	Noted - residential element removed from site allocation. HA have clarified that this comment ‘is putting down a marker as per normal that any development will need to assess and mitigate as appropriate any impact on the SRN, it is not an objection in principle to any development that may impact on M25 J3’.
		KCC Highways KCC	<p>In principle, the site would be suitable for a mixed development of employment served from London Road/ residential development served from Beechenlea Lane and additional open space. The level of employment use that could be supported by London Road can only properly be assessed modelling the traffic flows at the proposed junction with London Road and beyond as necessary. The best means of access from London Road i.e. a roundabout or a signal-controlled junction should be determined by modelling. A signalised junction would be likely to provide more control of the junction to reduce congestion, and would require less land</p> <p>Due to the proximity of the M25 and the M20, the Highways Agency should also be consulted about the employment aspect of this proposal</p> <p>There is scope to accommodate the 2 small housing sites accessed from Beechenlea Lane but some local improvement works to Beechenlea Lane between the sites and London Road may be required to accommodate the additional vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the additional vehicle movements at the junction of Beechenlea Lane and London Road and to potential mitigation measures to accommodate these additional movements Recommend that any residential proposal here would need to be accompanied by a transport</p>	<p>Noted. Access improvements would need to be agreed with Kent Highways Services (and the Highways Agency) and incorporated as part of any employment land planning application</p> <p>Highways Agency has been consulted – see comments above.</p> <p>Noted - residential element removed from site allocation.</p>

			<p>statement which fully addresses the impact of additional vehicle movements at this junction</p> <p>Public transport links and accessibility are reasonable with bus stops close by on the London Road and the sites being within an approximate 10 minute walking distance of the town centre and train station</p> <p>The accesses to the sites from Beechenlea Lane are likely to require adoption and will therefore need to be to an adoptable standard</p> <p>There is general prehistoric and medieval potential associated with nearby finds. Low level archaeology is anticipated</p>	Noted
		Moat Housing Group	Do not deem this site appropriate for residential development	Noted - residential element removed from site allocation.
		Kent Wildlife Trust	Wish to see some guidelines within the policy regarding the level and location of open space and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement	Noted – allocation includes guidance on the location of open space and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement
		Pro Vision Planning & Design– site owner	<p>The level of 'design guidance' in the consultation document is too prescriptive and definitive on matters of detail for the purposes of an 'allocation' DPD and for the same reasons excludes other possibilities and potentially the opportunity for these to be explored further in a planning application and/or development brief</p> <p>The Council appears to accept that detailed issues are best dealt with at application stage and thus should be omitted from the proposed allocation stage. Support this and the need to remove this contradiction from the consultation document</p> <p>Support the Council's anticipation that the balance and mix of uses and open space etc. "is to be determined through the planning application process". This may be informed by Development Brief, but should not be delayed in the absence of a Development Brief. A Development Brief should not be a prior mandatory requirement or pre-requisite which might otherwise inhibit bringing the proposed allocation forward as a comprehensive proposal in a timely fashion</p> <p>For the reasons explained above there is little real purpose in the proposed allocation plan including the level of detail that is proposed; it should omit these details, annotations and/or</p>	<p>Noted – development guidance intended to assist developers in explaining what form of development is likely to be acceptable on the site.</p> <p>The Council will prepare a revised Development Brief, in accordance with the delivery mechanisms to policy LO4 in the Core Strategy.</p>

			areas. Alternatively it should at least review these to reflect circumstances more accurately and objectively at this stage (as well as increase flexibility) and be clearly marked with a status as 'indicative' only	
		Natural England	Site surveys of existing species is undertaken, during optimal times to determine presence or potential, this will help identify scale and design option for any redevelopment proposal at this site	Noted – ecological surveys will need to be undertaken as part of any planning application
		CPRE	The open countryside, visual aspect of this site is very important to Swanley, to avoid creeping development of the built environment towards the M25. It also provides vital open space for the residents of this part of Swanley. The intrusion of new housing would deplete the remaining area of open space, and the increased pressure of people would devalue what remained. The soil is of high agricultural quality, which might be required in the future, so the land should remain undeveloped. In the present economic circumstances there should be more emphasis on encouraging the use of employment sites now left vacant	Noted - residential element removed from site allocation and allocation includes guidance on the location of open space and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement. Employment Forecast identifies a need for 5.2 ha of B8 (warehousing) use in the Core Strategy period to 2026. Broom Hill allocated in Core Strategy to assist in meeting this need.
		Local Residents/ businesses A.J Forwell Brian Goode D Black David and Brigid Blacker Elaine Strachan G Collins J Lee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been proved on several previous planning applications that Beechenlea Lane cannot take any more traffic • Extra pollution will be caused by the increased traffic • Beechenlea Lane cannot take increased traffic. It is a used during holdups on the M25 and at rush hour as a rat run • Parked cars obstruct the vision of residents on one side coming out of their driveways making it extremely dangerous. This lane is heavily used as a long term and short stay car park • The bend and gradient of the lane makes access onto the road from many existing properties semi blind and hazardous. Any raised volume in residential traffic will increase the danger of road accidents • The local road infrastructure is inadequate to support the additional traffic caused by the development • Proposed entrance is far too narrow to be safe it will become a “danger point” for traffic up and down Beechenlea lane 	<p>Concerns noted. Due to strength of local opposition, primarily in relation to concern over access from Beechenlea Lane, impact on residential amenity and loss of green space, residential element removed from site allocation. Footpath to be retained. Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land)</p> <p>Concerns related to traffic impacts on Beechenlea Lane (congestion / parking / access) noted.</p> <p>Consideration of alternative sites – land at Broom Hill is not in the green belt, although it is green field. Employment Forecast identifies a need for 5.2 ha of B8 (warehousing) use in the Core Strategy period to 2026. Broom Hill allocated in Core Strategy to assist in meeting this need.</p>

		<p>Janet Grant</p> <p>John Bromfield</p> <p>John Nicholls</p> <p>John Sterry</p> <p>K Jefferys</p> <p>Katherine Bull</p> <p>Kathryn Bell</p> <p>Kay Wellham</p> <p>Keri Smallwood</p> <p>M Hennessy</p> <p>ME and SE Bentley</p> <p>Marilyn and Philip Ball</p> <p>Matt Black</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Miles</p> <p>Mr R.J Neaves</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Clements</p> <p>Nigel Sivyer</p> <p>Noreen Forwell</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are enough brown sites and other land which is not Green Belt available for this purpose. • There are alternatives to the land at Broom Hill – Pedham Place farm. There are existing warehouses and office spaces in Swanley lying vacant and ‘to let’ • Pollution from the M25 is mitigated a little by Broom Hill and any attempt to lessen or remove the natural barrier would be detrimental to everyone in this part of Swanley • The area is in one of the Sevenoak’s Air Quality Management Areas • Health Problems - the local population will be put at risk from respiratory conditions if they are living and working in an area of poor air quality. Noise pollution from the M25/M20/A20 will negatively impact on the residents and workers by causing noise stress and cause harm to their health and well being • The 1995 SDC development Brief recommended that the land at the rear of the properties in Beechenlea lane should remain open and undisturbed to act as a buffer from the noise and pollution of the M25 so this land cannot be flattened to accommodate housing • Current utilities and sewerage systems will be inadequate to support such further development. • If the Council thinks there is a need for more housing in Swanley, the proposed increase from 116 units to 250 units on the United House site will cater for this • The 1996 report stated Residential not required. What has changed? • More and more open spaces in Swanley are disappearing • To protect our Green Open Space the Land use must be re-classified as Green Belt and must continue to remain as Green Open Space. • Loss of green open space and wildlife habitats having an impact on biodiversity. If the proposed development goes ahead much of this green land will become covered in 	<p>Issue of Broom Hill acting as an air quality/noise buffer for M25 – noted - Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land), together with biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.</p> <p>Noted – residential development not now proposed. Housing targets for areas do not represent a maximum. The Council’s Core Strategy sets out the amount of additional housing that different parts of Sevenoaks District will be expected to accommodate. Of a total of approximately 3560 dwelling anticipated to be developed in the period 2006-2026, Swanley is expected to accommodate approximately 660 (around 18.5%).</p> <p>Concerns related to loss of open space / biodiversity / habitats / footpaths noted.</p> <p>Residential element removed from site allocation. Footpath to be retained. Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land)</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>Pamela Strachan</p> <p>Ramac Holdings Ltd c/o Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership (Simon Flisher)</p> <p>S Hennessy</p> <p>Sean Bromfield</p> <p>Suzanne Bull</p> <p>T J Osborne</p> <p>Terence Bull</p> <p>West House Transport (S&G) Ltd (Tracey Moseley)</p> <p>Jane Sivyer</p> <p>John Manning</p> <p>Norman Taylor</p>	<p>concrete</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity - In April 2010 the Kent Wildlife Trust objected to identifying this land for development. There is known to be a wide range of flora and fauna here including many different butterflies, birds, toads and badgers. It is one of the few remaining open spaces in our town. There must be less ecologically sensitive sites in Swanley which can be considered for development • This area should not have lost its Green Belt status in the first place • There are many existing and well used footpaths over the Broom Hill site and trust that these will be preserved. Broomhill is the highest point in Swanley • The residential element needs to be removed and the areas where they are marked to be replaced with open space as per the agreement of the Public Enquiry • There will be increased risk of flooding when heavy rain falls in the area because of increased surface run-off with nowhere for the water to drain • The area of the development marked as 'previously developed land' is not 'Brown Field' because it previously was used agriculturally and had a few greenhouses • The proposed residential development in the field adjoining the houses at the rear of the lower end of Beechenlea Lane and the rear of the old Kimber Allen building, the steepness of the land would make this most unsuitable for a housing development • Support development at Broom Hill particularly for Employment. This area needs a Hotel as it is strategically next to Junction 3 of the M25, the A/M20, and only minutes from the Dartford crossing. A second hotel which would offer employment as well as a much needed second facility • Must ensure that the Site Allocation meets the tests of soundness, which includes the provision that "the plan should be deliverable over its period". The deliverability of land at Broom Hill Road, including the deliverability of the access arrangements, must therefore be given clear and careful consideration 	<p>Concerns regarding flooding noted and would need to be address in any planning application</p> <p>Development not now proposed on this land</p> <p>Topography of the site noted - development not now proposed on this land</p> <p>Support noted. Employment elements of the allocation retained. Hotel proposals not included in the allocation, but would be considered as part of any planning application process.</p> <p>Noted – site owner promoting site for development and has proposed access to employment site via industrial estate to the south</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p><u>Broom Hill</u> Additional comments – supplementary consultation</p>	19	<p>Local Residents Barbara Nicholls</p> <p>ME and SE Bentley</p> <p>Nigel Sivyer</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Clements</p> <p>Marilyn and Philip Ball</p> <p>Brian Goode</p> <p>Michael Hogg</p> <p>Terence Bull</p> <p>Maureen Bromfield</p> <p>Stephen & Margaret Partridge</p> <p>Claire Strachan</p> <p>Elaine Strachan</p> <p>Teresa O'Brien</p> <p>Mr R Sydney</p>	<p>Houses are to be built in a known polluted area. More development will add to the air, light and noise pollution in the area. Concern over health risks for new residents and the impact on Air Quality Management Areas, The land should be maintained as a natural barrier or returned to GB and planted with suitable numbers of plants and trees to try and mitigate the high pollution levels</p> <p>Congestion Increase in traffic in the lane for access to a new estate would place an intolerable burden on the lane and local road network. It is a rat run for traffic to escape the grid lock and congestion on the surrounding roads and M25</p> <p>Pressure on facilities Swanley does not have the infrastructure capacity to support more housing. It will put more strain on doctors/schools and the road network.</p> <p>Wildlife This should be a major consideration. The Kent Wildlife Trust has already identified Broom Hill as being a rare habitat for Bats.</p> <p>Local residents are against the proposed development and they are backed by Swanley Town Council. There seems to be several other sites available for development within Swanley</p>	<p>Residential element removed from site allocation. Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land)</p> <p>Residential element removed from site allocation. Employment land access to the from south via existing industrial estate</p> <p>Noted. Residential not now proposed</p> <p>Residential not now proposed, but development is required to address infrastructure impacts via mitigation or financial contributions</p> <p>Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land), together with biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.</p> <p>Noted. Residential not now proposed on site.</p>
		Cllr Roger	I wish to object to proposals to expand both commercial and	Concerns noted. Due to strength of local opposition, primarily in

		Gough Kent County Council	<p>residential use on this site. These proposals will have a significant and damaging impact on the residents of Beechenlea Lane, increasing traffic and pressure on local services, increasing existing air quality problems and damaging a distinctive habitat and biodiversity, as well as residents' amenity. The existing space provides some sort of buffer between the M25 and the houses on Beechenlea Lane; this should not be eroded, especially not by putting more residential properties in an area of poor air quality.</p> <p>As for employment there seems already to be an oversupply in this part of Swanley, and I note that the Council has already revised down many of its requirements (for office and factory uses) between the Employment Land Review in 2007 and the new forecasts in 2011.</p> <p>Local people are unhappy that the site was removed from the Green Belt . I share these concerns. The site should be returned to Green Belt; if that is not possible, it should be designated as open space.</p>	<p>relation to concern over access from Beechenlea Lane, impact on residential amenity, air quality and loss of green space, residential element removed from site allocation.</p> <p>Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land), together with biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.</p> <p>The updated Employment Forecast (2011) identifies a need for 5.2 ha of B8 (warehousing) use in the Core Strategy period to 2026. Broom Hill allocated in Core Strategy (4.1ha) to assist in meeting this need.</p> <p>Western side of site proposed to be allocated as protected open space (natural/semi-natural land). To return the land to the Green Belt, exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated.</p>
		The London Green Belt Council (Cedric Hoptroff)	<p>This site was removed from the Green Belt because it was considered that, exceptionally, there was a need for employment land. It is doubtful that now any employment use is necessary on this site and it should revert to its original Green Belt status.</p> <p>If retaining land for employment uses can be justified, then the SE corner is the most appropriate place. There is no justification for the housing. It is not necessary to meet the requirement and is unsuitable in traffic terms as it would put undue pressure on Beechenlea Lane.</p> <p>The description of the land where the housing is proposed as 'PDL' is inappropriate. It appears that any building was not substantial and, in any case, has largely disappeared; the land having been reclaimed by nature.</p> <p>The parts of the site not required for employment use should be Green Belt.</p>	<p>The updated Employment Forecast (2011) identifies a need for 5.2 ha of B8 (warehousing) use in the Core Strategy period to 2026. Broom Hill allocated in Core Strategy (4.1ha) to assist in meeting this need.</p> <p>SE corner of the site considered to be the most appropriate place for employment – as indicated on the allocation plan. Residential development not now proposed.</p> <p>Residential development not now proposed on this site.</p>
		Natural England (David	The provision of enhancements and improvements to existing habitats/ green belt and to the public rights of way are	Noted and support welcomed.

		Hammond)	welcomed and broadly supported, The allocation of open space is also welcomed. It is advised that site surveys of existing species is undertaken, during optimal times to determine presence or potential, this will help identify scale and design option for any redevelopment, and identify opportunities for enhancement and improvements.	Ecological surveys will need to be undertaken as part of any planning application
		Highways Agency	No further comment	Noted
		Environment Agency	No further comment	Noted
<u>United House, Swanley</u>	28	Swanley Town Council	<p>Strongly objects to the proposal to increase the residential capacity at the United House site due to concerns regarding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the over intensive nature that such a large development would bring and that the original proposal of 116 units be maintained or a housing density similar to that of the High Firs estate • the loss of an employment site in the town, in an area with high unemployment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highways concerns regarding the volume of traffic that would arise due to a site of this size as well as the inadequate single access proposal for emergency vehicles • the loss of the existing buffer that the site currently gives residents on the High Firs estate from the Swan Mill industrial site 	<p>Concerns noted.</p> <p>Density proposed at 75dph and site to accommodate a range of housing types (i.e. houses and flats)</p> <p>The site is allocated for mixed use including employment following the findings of an employment study. The existing owners intend to relocate their business within Swanley.</p> <p>Kent Highways Services have not raised a concern regarding transport impacts and access to this site Allocation notes that the design, layout and orientation of the scheme is important in ensuring a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent commercial use.</p> <p>An open space buffer has been included as part of the allocation.</p>
		Environment Agency	Data indicates that part of the proposed site may lie in an area that is susceptible to surface water flooding. Historic land uses for industrial purposes mean that site investigation (and possibly remediation) must take place. The site is underlain by sensitive aquifers and falls within Source Protection Zone 3	Noted – any flooding/contamination issues would need to be considered as part of any redevelopment of the site, via the planning application process
		Highways Agency	The proposed increase in residential development at United House, represents a potentially material change to the agreed levels and given our concerns with the Broom Hill site this further enhances the need for detailed assessment at M25	Noted –highways capacity issues would need to be considered as part of any redevelopment of the site, via the planning application process

			Junction 3	
		Kent Wildlife Trust	Recommend retention of the tree lines along the boundary. The 1.91 ha of constrained land could be used as semi natural open space which would go some way to delivering the deficit currently present at Swanley as well as providing an important asset to the GI	Noted
		KCC KCC Highways	<p>There is general potential for prehistoric activity based on flint tool finds, and Romano-British cremation recorded from the area. Low level archaeology is anticipated</p> <p>In principle the site would be a suitable site to accommodate this proposal subject to the following widen and/or reconstruct the primary access road to the site from Goldsel Road to provide a carriageway and footway, There is a need to secure a secondary means of emergency vehicular access to the site from the highway network - one potential option being the further widening of the primary access road to accommodate a carriageway dualling arrangement</p> <p>Visibility at the junction with the B258 is slightly limited to the south Furthermore, the primary vehicular access is a straight route following a fixed alignment and would therefore require significant traffic calming measures to limit vehicle speed. Scope for local bus routes and cycle routes to be reviewed</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Highways comments noted and issues would need to be addressed in any future planning application</p>
		Moat Housing Group	This site would be ideal for residential development however the proximity of the industrial units needs careful design to be considered (noise, pollution etc.)	Noted. Allocation notes that the design, layout and orientation of the scheme is important in ensuring a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent commercial use. An open space buffer has been included as part of the allocation.
		High Firs Primary School	<p>Want to ensure consideration is given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - access to the school needs to be considered to maintain safe access for pupils and staff - the impact to the school intake needs to be considered in terms of the existing and future catchment area - an assessment is required to understand the environmental impact of increasing the density of the development - the direct impact to the school property needs to be 	<p>Noted. Allocation sets out that any proposals must address proximity and any impacts on the neighbouring school</p> <p>KCC Education will make recommendations in relation to school infrastructure in relation to a planning application e.g. by seeking contributions to improve school facilities.</p>

			considered as this development adjoins the school perimeter	
		United House-site owner	Consider a higher density can be achieved, however appreciate that the final form and scale of development will be considered in detail as part of any future planning application. Support the comments within Appendix 1 in relation to the site, and note that careful consideration will be given to the adjoining uses in designing the scheme	Support noted
		Swan Paper Mills – neighbouring site	Should remain for a mixed use development with the predominant part of the site and certainly at least 2 hectares. Should be retained for business use in order to provide an appropriate buffer to the Swan Paper Mill Company Ltd boundary, consistent with the Council's initial assessment and consistent with its stance at the Core Strategy examination	Noted. Allocation notes that the design, layout and orientation of the scheme is important in ensuring a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent commercial use. An open space buffer has been included as part of the allocation. The site has been allocated for mixed use included employment following the findings of an employment study. The existing owners intend to relocate their business within Swanley.
		Local Residents A F Webb Ann Buchan D Isted Darren Francis David Blaikie Francis Patrick J Bryan K Jefferys Kevin Searles Long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any buildings or residential properties on the site should be no more than 2 storeys Concern over the effect on existing properties on Pinks Hill or High Firs i.e. - privacy, security Only 116 units at 75 dwellings per hectare should be built. <p>The proposed density is too high</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the dwellings consist of private housing for sale only. <p>There should not be any socially mixed housing. The site should not be made into a mixed-tenure estate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic - Goldsel Road is a busy local road with existing traffic problems, particularly at peak times. These will only be exacerbated by high density development and associated traffic generation Traffic safety Goldsel Road is already an accident black spot to increase the number of vehicles exiting from one access from 250 new homes is going to make the situation worse Land should not be allocated for houses if there are clear opportunities to sustain, improve or expand a key local business Any significant increase in the number of dwellings in this 	<p>Design comments noted. The allocation notes that the site should accommodate a range of housing types (i.e. houses and flats).</p> <p>75 dph is recommended, but the overall number of units is 185 taking account of the open space buffer and employment allocation.</p> <p>Affordable housing will be sought on all sites in line with Core Strategy policy SP3</p> <p>Highways comments noted and issues would need to be addressed in any future planning application</p> <p>The site has been allocated for mixed use included employment following the findings of an employment study. The existing owners intend to relocate their business within Swanley.. The existing owners intend to relocate their business within Swanley.</p> <p>Noted. Any impacts on infrastructure will be mitigated via the</p>

		<p>Mark Price Haworth</p> <p>Michael Crawley</p> <p>Mr R.J Neaves</p> <p>Mr Woodger</p> <p>Phil Stevens</p> <p>Robert Alexander</p> <p>Shan Phipps</p> <p>Susan Fagen</p> <p>Tracy Mihill</p>	<p>part of the town will place greater pressure on the local primary school, and may necessitate significant upgrades to the existing local infrastructure e.g. water, sewage & other utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development on this site will decrease the valuation on properties, especially if it has a large proportion of HA units Could an area be kept as a wildlife area Expect that a playground and some trees or other planting be a requirement Increased air pollution Drainage problems on the Greenacres and High Firs Problems with the main sewer on the Swanley bypass by the Goldsel Road bridge not able to cope with the present housing 	<p>imposition of a legal agreement requiring infrastructure / contributions</p> <p>Not an issue considered by planning</p> <p>Site should include open space / landscaped areas, and retention of the pond at the southern end of the site</p> <p>Any environmental issues would need to be addressed as part of any planning application on the site</p>
<u>Land rear of Premier Inn, Swanley</u>	6	Swanley Town Council	Supports the proposal that the Premier Inn site remains as solely employment use	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Site no longer allocated.</p>
		KCC Highways KCC	<p>There are no highway objections to this proposed allocation</p> <p>There is general prehistoric and medieval potential associated with nearby finds. Low level archaeology is anticipated</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Site no longer allocated</p>
		Kent Wildlife Trust	No objections	<p>Noted</p> <p>Site no longer allocated</p>
		Moat Housing Group	This should not be considered for affordable development	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site no longer allocated.</p>
		Local Resident Mr R.J Neaves	Support the change to Employment land at the rear of Premier Inn from Residential as local unemployment is high	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Site no longer allocated</p>

<u>West Kingsdown Industrial Estate</u>	3	West Kingsdown Parish Council	Happy with the proposal being made	Support noted
		KCC Highways KCC	There are no highway objections to this proposed allocation There are no existing ecological site designations, appear limited habitat opportunities for protected species and no known remains within 500m. Low level archaeology is anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval (Grade 4).	Noted Noted
<u>Other Comments</u>	15	Colin Luther Associates	Land adjacent should be considered in the same way as Warren Court Farm. This would mean an amendment to the GB boundary and the construction of a proposed 3 new houses and a care home or affordable housing, with environmental improvements.	Exceptions sites process led by parish council / would need to be a site selection process, but site may be considered suitable due to proximity to village. Sent the Kent-wide Rural Homes Protocol. New buildings considered inappropriate development, but there may be scope for extension/replacement of existing/infilling in line with NPPF and Core Strategy policies Environmental improvements welcomed
		Royal Mail	Royal Mail's Edenbridge DO/ST Given the site's Town Centre location and the range of uses in the immediate surrounding area, we remain of the opinion that this site provides a good opportunity for comprehensive residential mixed use development in the future. Therefore, should Royal Mail no longer require their site, this site would provide a good opportunity for future comprehensive residential mixed use development therefore request that the Council includes their Edenbridge DO/ ST site for residential or residential led mixed-use development including retail uses Notwithstanding our promotion of Royal Mail's site for inclusion within the Council's ADM DPD we would like to reiterate that should their site come forward for redevelopment in the future, the relocation/re-provision of Royal Mail's existing operations would be required prior to any	The site falls below the 0.2ha threshold for site allocation The delivery office falls within the town centre boundary and on the primary frontage (central area). Core Strategy policy L06 seeks to protect a mix of retail and service uses in the town centre. Saved local plan policy EB2 seeks to maintain A1 uses at ground floor and Draft Policy LC3 (Edenbridge TC) sets out that within the central area, A1 uses will be maintained (and other A class and retail uses). The aim is to focus retail development on the central area. It is acknowledged that the sorting office is sui generis. Residential mixed use development including retail uses may be appropriate on the site, but as the site is below the threshold, this should be progressed via the planning application process.

			redevelopment of that site	It is welcomed that any Royal Mail services would be re-provided before any redevelopment of the site
		Savills	<p>Seven Acres, Crockenhill, Swanley</p> <p>The strong tree boundary separates the housing on Seven Acres from the open countryside to the east</p> <p>It is considered that there are currently a limited number of available sites within the village, and by allowing small scale development adjacent to the village boundary this will avoid putting pressure on the existing urban area to accommodate future residential development</p> <p>The topography of the site and surrounding landscape is such that it relates back to the existing built form of the village, and development of the site will have a negligible impact</p> <p>The site itself currently provides open amenity space of no significant value. There is an abundance of open space in the local area which provides amenity space of value for the local community. It is therefore considered that the site does not contribute to the openness and distinct character of the Green Belt surrounding Crockenhill</p> <p>The site is entirely suitable to accommodate small scale residential development.</p> <p>A minor adjustment should be made to the Green Belt boundary to exclude the site identified on the enclosed plan</p>	<p>The proposed land for development is in the green belt and is therefore not suitable for residential development. The Core Strategy has set out that 3300 housing target will be met within the built confines of existing towns and villages within the District.</p> <p>The Council has a policy related to rural exceptions sites for affordable housing (SP4). If the landowner is interested in this form of development, the parish council should be contacted, as this process needs to be endorsed by the parish council, who would then undertake a local needs assessment and site selection process, in conjunction with the district council.</p>
		Sevenoaks Town Council	<p>Land at Greatness Park Cemetery, Seal Road, Sevenoaks (Sevenoaks Town Council) promoted</p> <p>Sevenoaks Town Council reiterates representations seeking the removal of a section of Greatness Cemetery's frontage from the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>Town Council does not seek to "release" any land from the Green Belt, rather it contends that the site is afforded</p>	<p>The site is in the Green Belt where there is a presumption against development. The Core Strategy sets out that Green belt land will not be released to meet development needs up until 2026. The release of the site for development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and the Sevenoaks Core Strategy. The site is of a significant size and scale therefore the consideration as a minor GB amendment would not be appropriate. The site provides an important break in development and views into / access to the green belt north of Sevenoaks.</p>

			protection inappropriately and erroneously, and as such the Town Council seeks remedial modification to the boundary line. Such a modification is not in conflict with the NPPF, or the Sevenoaks Core Strategy. The site in question makes up less than 0.0015% of the Sevenoaks Metropolitan Green Belt, occupying approximately 0.5 Hectares.	Cemeteries are also considered to be an important part of the wider Green Infrastructure Network.
		Calford Seaden LLP	Land Adjacent Dawson Drive / College Road, Hextable, Swanley, Kent – promoted for residential development.	<p>This proposal relates to the open amenity land adjacent to site of the Manzoori clinic, within the confines of the village of Hextable</p> <p>Although this site was not designated as protected open space within local plan policy (EN9), it has been identified as amenity open space as part of our Open Spaces Study (2009), and the Council's Core Strategy and emerging ADMP seek to protect open space that is of value to the local community.</p> <p>Therefore the proposal to allocate this land for residential development is not accepted</p>
<u>General Comments</u>		Cooper Estates Ltd	Comments regarding amalgamation of Allocations and Development Management policies into one document and related SA, specifically in relation to policies on housing for the elderly. Comments on sites which have been recommended as being suitable for housing for older people.	<p>Noted. Allocations and Development Management Plan combined into one document, to provide a more concise and efficient plan, in line with the intentions of the NPPF to streamline policy documents. Several rounds of consultation have been undertaken on this document, which have been accompanied by SA reports.</p> <p>The Policy on New Residential Care Homes (previously Policy H5) has been deleted since it was worded as a negative policy that sought to restrict the location of these uses. The Council strongly supports the provision of housing to meet the requirements of people in special need of help or supervision where they are fully integrated into existing communities and located in sustainable locations. The housing allocations proforma now identify sites that are particularly suitable for housing specifically designed for older people (including those with special needs).</p> <p>Core Strategy policy SP5 is supportive of housing developments to meet the need of older people in sustainable locations. Sites</p>

				that are suitable for providing house for older people have been identified.
		Bexley Council	No comments	Noted
		Hopgarden Lane RA	Re-iteration of concerns over proposals for Hopgarden Lane	Noted. Following consultation the proposed allocation for the site has been amended and the number of units reduced in order to reflect the site constraints. The site capacity has been reduced for both sites (School House reduced by 18 units and Johnsons by 16 units) in order to better reflect the character and density of the neighbouring area and to reflect the site constraints, such as TPO trees, topography and open space. The design guidance in the allocation now suggests conversion of the existing buildings or replacement on a similar footprint, and a small number of units (4-6) at the lower end of the sites.
		Southern Water	Southern Water is the waste water service provider for the south of Sevenoaks District. Identified and assessed, with respect to sewerage capacity and infrastructure crossing the sites, the three residential sites which fall within this area, and further site specific comments provided on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leigh Builders Yard, Edenbridge • Station Approach, Edenbridge • Glaxo Smith Kline, Leigh 	Comments on specific sites noted
		Thames Water	It will be essential to ensure that the introduction of a portfolio of Local Development Documents (LDDs) does not prejudice adequate planning for water and sewerage infrastructure provision as this is an essential pre-requisite for development. It is essential to ensure that adequate water and sewerage infrastructure is in place prior to development taking place, in order to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment, such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses, or water shortages with associated low-pressure water supply problems.	Noted and water/sewerage infrastructure for individual sites will be addressed via the planning application process
		Environment Agency	Recommend that you ensure that there is clear evidence within your document showing how you have carried out the sequential test to identify the above sites for proposed development over those that have not been taken forward	Noted. SHLAA assessed site constraints, including whether any percentage of the sites fell within a Level 2 or Level 3 flood zone. Sites that had large constrained areas were removed from consideration at this stage.

		KCC	Keen for employment land to be retained where feasible, however it is understood that some of these site have become unviable and maybe more suited to a mix of uses particularly where they can facilitate the regeneration of a site	Noted
		Kent Police	No comments	Noted
		KWT	Welcome the fact that previous consultation comments have been incorporated into the design guidance. Value the close working relationship established between KWT and Sevenoaks District Council during the LDF process. Detailed comments on sites provided. Where employment has been changed to residential there is likely to be a greater impact on the surrounding natural habitat due to recreational pressure. This is particularly pertinent if no other areas of open space occur within the locality.	Noted and support welcomed Detailed comments on sites noted in the specific sections
		Natural England	Biodiversity and the natural environment can lead to various opportunities, not just for wildlife activity and connection, but also health, recreation, contributing to climate change adaptation and improving quality of life This could be made explicit in the Site Allocations document, helping to ensure the borough's green infrastructure is designed to deliver multiple functions Open spaces and public realm should seek to incorporate "soft" landscaping and green infrastructure, where appropriate, as part of a sustainable approach to development. In some cases the development of sites and the operation of policies can have limited impact on the natural environment	Noted - allocations reference biodiversity and natural environmental protection and enhancement where applicable and this is supported by Core Strategy policy SP10