

Organisation / Name / Date	Appendix 2 Summary of key issues raised in stakeholder responses
<b>Swanley Town Council</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept need for regeneration</li> <li>• Report doesn't sufficiently address road, rail, infrastructure and sewerage issues</li> <li>• Concerns about data, lack of consultation with landowners and impact on the local community</li> </ul>
<b>Hextable Parish Council</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly object to development on Egerton Nursery in the Green Belt between Hextable and Swanley (must maintain separate communities)</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Plan indicates that direction of future development should be north and east towards Wilmington – previously developed sites available</li> <li>• Objects to any nursery site in Hextable being developed – would set precedent as there are a number of nurseries all in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Strong resistance from residents to development on prime agricultural land that is still being farmed in the village</li> <li>• No objection to development on the footprint of the closed Oasis School (previously developed land)</li> <li>• Objection to development on the Oasis school playing fields (off College Road) as they are used for sport and recreation for residents and would close the small Green Belt gap between Hextable and Swanley</li> </ul>
<b>Crockenhill Parish Council</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals lack a timescale or sequence of events</li> <li>• The whole Vision is too ambitious</li> <li>• The present infrastructure is currently failing and could not cope with an influx of additional homes/people/vehicles etc</li> <li>• Agree that Swanley needs updating and improving but not extending on the scale proposed</li> <li>• There is a need for new residential units for the local community – want to keep it as a community and not create urban sprawl</li> <li>• People have been drawn to this area for its rural feeling and Councillors believe there is a strong need to retain the Green Belt and green spaces</li> <li>• Current ideas will not enhance the area but are more likely to detract from its appeal</li> <li>• Essential that any development goes hand in hand with the essential infrastructure</li> <li>• Should be part of any permission that essential services are provided</li> </ul>
<b>Swanley Village Residents' Association</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At a Residents' Association committee meeting (14 November 2016) concern was expressed that the Vision threatens to eradicate the green wedge between the town of Swanley and the separate hamlet and conservation area of Swanley Village</li> <li>• Ironical that the proposed engorgement of a village is encompassed in a plan that masquerades as the creation of a Garden Village</li> <li>• Earlier letter (11 September 2016) set out a number of developments within the village that the committee and villagers consider to be potentially achievable in keeping with the character and identity of Swanley Village</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development on the agricultural land between Beechenlea Lane and Archer Way is considered entirely unacceptable</li> <li>• The stretch of high quality land represents the separation between Swanley Village and Swanley Town and housing development on this field would mean eradication of this essential green wedge – it also provides a route for villagers to walk around the village without using the narrow lanes which are dangerous to pedestrians</li> <li>• Objection to any development proposal that merges Swanley Village with Swanley Town</li> <li>• SDC accepted the separateness of Swanley Village in its Conservation Area review in 2003; in its recommendation to the Local Government Boundary Commission review in 2015; and when it excluded Swanley Village from the Master Vision</li> <li>• Essential that this historic settlement continues to be surrounded by countryside and recognisable to inhabitants from past centuries</li> </ul>
<b>KCC (Growth, Environment, Transport)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the new vision and its attempts to address specific policy (e.g. bringing prosperity, supporting local economy)</li> <li>• Transformation growth could put too much pressure on services – public sector cannot fund this</li> <li>• Concerned about the use of CIL in securing optimal funds towards infrastructure in the Master Vision – further engagement needed with the DC about the CIL charging schedule</li> <li>• Concerned about the restrictions in place for section 106 funding with CIL contributions now in place</li> <li>• Wish for communication regarding any infrastructure requirements or sources of funding</li> <li>• Encourages improvements to highways and transport service infrastructure</li> <li>• The green link between Hextable College Road through to the park and town centre is supported</li> <li>• Provision of residential development around Swanley Railway and town centre is supported</li> <li>• Further detail on the road network and traffic management action areas is required</li> <li>• Proposed parking provision and management strategy is supported</li> <li>• Capitalise on the introduction of the Oystercard 2016 – bus and rail integration, cycle and pedestrian links (in accordance to County Council's Active Travel Strategy)</li> <li>• Access to bus stops requires improvements</li> <li>• Master Vision does not present any detail in relation to current traffic movements or potential future travel demand</li> <li>• Investigation required to identify potential impact and measures for sustainable transport as well as highway improvements</li> <li>• Scenario 1 (minimum growth comments): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally accommodating of the local transport and highway networks</li> <li>• Capitalise on opportunities offered by U+I proposal to recognise ambitions set out in Master Vision</li> <li>• Real time parking direction signage, car club, additional cycle parking, pedestrian and cycle route improvements and signage should be considered</li> <li>• Quality bus partnership could lay the foundation for sustainable future growth</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Scenario 2 (medium growth):</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to improve the operation of the slip roads around junction 3</li> <li>• New housing sites south of Hextable may have a safety impact on College Road and Swanley Lane</li> <li>• Junction improvements on Bartholomew Way and London Road</li> <li>• Quality Bus Contract, improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes and road crossings in Town Centre and Station is encouraged</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 3 (transformational growth): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KCC supports this as long as the sustainability measures are achievable – new rail halt and relocating the station could do this</li> <li>• Complementary pricing of parking will be necessary to ensure people favour public transport</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In July 2014 the South East Local Enterprise Partnership secured a funding package from the Government’s Local Growth Fund – specifically for improvements to the existing Swanley Railway station – in addition to CL and s106 contributions</li> <li>• The funding proposed by SDC for the development must be secured before proceeding</li> <li>• Do not envisage the closure of the Oasis Hextable Academy to be ‘temporary’ – expanding Orchards Academy to 6 forms of entry will cause a number of issues.</li> <li>• Discussion around St Mary’s CE School and Orchards Academy to become one site depending on land ownership, the cost and availability of a site</li> </ul> <p>Primary Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 1 – primary schools in Swanley and Hextable are currently experiencing high levels of demand</li> <li>• Hextable Primary School recently enlarged – potentially expanded by a total of 2FE</li> <li>• KCC considers the forecasted primary demand could be managed entirely through the expansion of existing schools – indicative cost of £5 million (£2.5million per 1FE expansion)</li> <li>• Scenario 2 – would require a total provision of 3FE; one new 2FE primary school and 1FE expansion – the total indicative cost being between £9 and £10 million</li> <li>• Scenario 3 – two new 2FE primary schools and 2FE expansions would be required. Total cost provision is approximately £19 million</li> </ul> <p>Secondary education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closure of Oasis Hextable Academy has increased demand in north Sevenoaks</li> <li>• Orchards academy and neighbouring schools can accommodate the local demand until September 2019</li> <li>• Any additional demand that emerges as a result of new development would require funding</li> <li>• Scenario 1 – expansion of existing Secondary Education provision - Orchards Academy is restrained at 4.2 ha and an expansion of this school would be expensive - there is a need for a feasibility study for costs</li> <li>• Scenario 2 – a larger expansion with a greater increase in cost needed</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 3 – provision of a new 5FE secondary school would be needed costing £35 million (excluding land costs). Re-use the existing Hextable site in order to meet demand (KCC cannot confirm the availability of this site for education)</li> </ul> <p>Property and Land Ownership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns around the outdoor sports hub on the former Birchwood School site and the proposed redevelopment of the Oasis Hextable Academy site (want to discuss with SDC to identify alternative options)</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the movement of St Mary's CE Primary School to redevelop the site – replacement of the youth hub</li> </ul> <p>Minerals and Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-2030 in the Master Vision</li> <li>• Consideration given to identify and safeguard mineral reserves – specific regard to Policy DM7: Safeguarding of Minerals</li> <li>• County Council's waste management facilities will be close to operating capacity - additional capacity will be required</li> <li>• Further discussion needed on mitigation projects and quantum of additional demand</li> </ul> <p>Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration needed of specific biodiversity elements and landscape connectivity – it has been identified that open spaces can have ecological benefits alongside recreational facilities.</li> </ul>
<b>KCC Property</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting the redevelopment of two former school sites (former Birchwood Primary School and Oasis Academy)</li> <li>• Believe both sites are suitable for housing growth – to facilitate housing need and generate inward investment for the Swanley and Hextable areas</li> <li>• Welcome the Master Vision's ambitions</li> <li>• Birchwood school site has already had a planning application considered for residential development (ref: SE/14/03793/FUL) – was refused at Planning Committee</li> <li>• Birchwood School a part previously developed site</li> <li>• Favour the medium growth option as best follows the principles of sustainable development</li> <li>• Number of redundant agricultural, nursery and education sites that could be utilised to help meet development need and not undermine the function of the Green Belt</li> <li>• A review of other Greenfield land parcels that no longer contribute to the open character of the Green Belt would also help</li> <li>• Promoting too much development in Swanley and Hextable would likely have a detrimental impact upon the smaller villages – detract from other regenerations e.g. New Ash Green</li> <li>• Medium growth scenario needs to have better regard to the re-use of resources/previously developed sites e.g. Birchwood School</li> <li>• Deliver the sports hub on other areas of Green Belt land with less housing potential</li> </ul>

<b>Orchards Academy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a central part of the community the School recognises the need for investment in the future growth of Swanley and in general are in support of the Master Vision</li> <li>• In the last two years the school has been ranked in the top 10% of schools nationally for progress and in turn are seeing a surge in the numbers applying. However, the school buildings are not capable of taking large numbers so there would need to be substantial investment in the school to accommodate a potential influx of new families to the area</li> <li>• Working alongside outside agencies such as Supajam and Walk Tall Orchards are also providing education for those pupils who would have fallen into the NEET category so are providing a service to the Local authority as well as pupils</li> <li>• As well as investment in the school buildings Orchards would also welcome the addition of a sports centre on site that could be shared between the school pupils and local community. This has been shown to work well in other areas</li> <li>• Orchards concerns are that without investment in the school and a large influx of new families; people would be forced to send their children to school out of the local area and instead of enhancing the vision of community it would instead create division</li> <li>• Further investment in infrastructure is of course required with the immediate need for a better bus service to the more rural parts of Swanley</li> </ul>
<b>St Mary's CE Primary School</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Governing Body confirm, for the purposes of Sevenoaks Council's master vision for Swanley, that it is the intention to increase the size of the school and nursery from one to two form entry, as soon as this becomes possible</li> <li>• Understand that this may necessitate building onto the existing school, or starting a new school building whilst using the existing school building; and that any new build, using the same site, may involve two stories. Not an intention to share the site with housing, for example, at any stage. Consider the site size to meet present needs.</li> <li>• Aware that the adjacent site (known as St Mary's Youth and Community Centre) is also designated for school use, but has not been used as such since 1993. Would appreciate increasing present site to include this site, and understand that this would mean that further building was not necessary</li> </ul>
<b>Dartford Gravesham Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledges the preferred scenario being Transformation Growth – increased population and CIL contributions</li> <li>• Need sufficient health facilities to accommodate an increased population</li> <li>• Options for an integrated health and wellbeing facility for the current 2 GP practices</li> <li>• Facility needs to be properly resourced with appropriate CIL contributions</li> <li>• Requested contribution of £360 per resident equates to a contribution of £3,888,000 (possible increased contributions)</li> <li>• Congestion in town centre has severe impact on GP and nursing staff – prevents timely access for visits</li> <li>• Provide solution for the new medical facility</li> </ul>
<b>The Oaks Partnership (GPs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the new development in Swanley</li> <li>• Population growth in Swanley will need to take into account the need for increased health facilities</li> <li>• Support the building of a health and wellbeing centre from the two Swanley town centre surgeries (the Cedars and The Oaks)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on wellbeing would be ideal to prevent ill health and indeed improve existing health problems</li> <li>• Wellbeing approach can allow the population to receive timely appropriate interventions rather than over-medicalising</li> <li>• As part of a wellbeing centre; direct access to community support resources for social and psychological help can provide people with support before a person even needs to see their GP</li> <li>• Volunteer sector and commissioned community resources have a key role to play in this</li> <li>• We would welcome the health centre being part of a leisure centre</li> <li>• Health and wellbeing centre would need to be large enough to house community services, commissioned health services (GP services, community nursing, physiotherapy, podiatry, school nursing, speech and language therapy and health visitors)</li> <li>• Concerns about the proposed position of the health and wellbeing centre off St Mary's Road and particularly traffic congestion</li> <li>• Key issues with gridlock around the roundabouts and the pedestrian crossing/lights</li> <li>• Urge improvement of access into Swanley with increased housing supply</li> <li>• Struggle with not being able to leave the CCP car park directly onto the B258 like before - a give way protocol and sign would allow people to go straight out back down the high street, rather than going around Asda – significantly help faster access for home visits and general use</li> <li>• Central position of a health and wellbeing centre is the most supported – accessible from London and M25</li> <li>• Moving to the current White Oak site would not be supported by The Oaks or The Cedars due to current traffic congestion (access to M25 would be even further away)</li> <li>• Consideration of a site nearer the M25 may be supported but public transport and public consultations must be considered</li> <li>• Central position in Swanley may also be supported but accessibility would need to be considered</li> <li>• Current Oaks surgery or in the immediate vicinity would allow current levels of access</li> <li>• Staff wellbeing is important; noise control, natural light in the building for all rooms and enough ground floor access for the elderly population – if the centre was to be part of the major town centre planning</li> <li>• Car parking costs are a concern – disincentive to work in the town centre (staff leaving because of increased costs)</li> <li>• Not enough car parking permits or being able to use an electronic facility to pay for parking for regular workers</li> <li>• Green spaces are essential – good safe link through the Swanley park would be supported</li> <li>• Having plenty of trees – important for our health and mental health (please give consideration in any planning application)</li> <li>• Concerned about the loss of Green Belt land within the Swanley and Hextable area as they would have less than the rest of the Sevenoaks District</li> <li>• Better access and utilisation of the Green Belt for exercise and leisure would be supported.</li> <li>• Medical advances are likely to make more available primary care – with an ageing population there is a need to plan for increased demand as well as population growth</li> <li>• Space within a facility needs to be flexible to allow adjustment in change of use</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>South Eastern</b>	<p>Scenario 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KCC has secured funding towards rebuilding the station in its current location but time is limited and cannot be carried forward for other schemes; however would be an improved gateway to the town</li> <li>• Widened footpaths and cycle routes will create better access to the station from the surrounding area and bring it closer to the community.</li> <li>• The scheme is realistic in terms of deliverable benefits, value for money and can be delivered within the restraints of the funding conditions</li> </ul> <p>Scenario 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional station 'Halt' would increase journey time for residents living in the North Kent towns travelling into London.</li> <li>• Availability of train paths is unknown and would be a significant risk in this scenario</li> <li>• Increased dwell times will impact train performance and punctuality</li> <li>• Would be an expensive option for limited benefits – will need full station facilities with full staffing but the station would only receive stopping services from the North Medway Towns</li> </ul> <p>Scenario 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most expensive option with the added complication of the junction to the Otford line joining the Victoria line</li> <li>• Limited information in the Master Plan for this scenario and its impact on the railway</li> <li>• This proposal will struggle on economical grounds as you are creating a station only served by the North Medway route</li> </ul> <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than provide a Halt or a new station, which would have huge risk, incur delays - Scenario 1 would be the most realistic deliverable scheme –ensure better aesthetics and security</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian access and cycle routes to the station with improved street furniture and lighting</li> <li>• Improved bus service provision and access to the current station from developments – Scenario 1 would bring the current station closer to the community</li> </ul>
<b>Network Rail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the preparation of the Master Vision and supports the key principles of maximising rail links and investing in transport infrastructure</li> <li>• Support is given to the development and the promotion of development and growth in the area</li> <li>• Supportive of increasing railway patronage – however, need to recognise the significant costs and operational impacts of new railway infrastructure</li> <li>• Supportive of the design work that South Eastern have undertaken on behalf of KCC but this covers the extent of Network Rail's involvement with this station</li> <li>• This design report only covers the redevelopment of the existing station, not wider areas identified in the Master Vision</li> <li>• Would welcome further involvement in the preparation of the document and input on railway infrastructure and development</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of maximising rail links to London and Kent – look to work with the Train Operating Company, the Local Authority and other stakeholders to do this</li> <li>• Support the high level objectives of the proposed improvements to the station design and its environments</li> <li>• Relocation of the station is very expensive and needs to be properly estimated – the impact on the operational timetable needs to be assessed and agreed</li> <li>• Too early to promote the relocation of the station – need to know if it is feasible or viable</li> <li>• Welcomes further discussion for the relocation of the station</li> <li>• Halt station would increase the journey time – Network rail trying to decrease journey times, therefore would need significant agreement with industry partners.</li> <li>• Railway and regulatory issues need to be considered and represented in the Master Vision document</li> <li>• Welcomes working with third parties but has no budget for the development works</li> <li>• Scenario 2: would appear costly and the decking over the railway is difficult – generally not possible in areas with high land value (e.g. Central Land) so will be problematic in Swanley where funding is limited</li> <li>• Considerable work to be undertaken to establish the costs for each option</li> <li>• Happy to discuss this further</li> </ul>
<b>CPRE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme is dependent on the release of Green Belt land which CPRE cannot support</li> <li>• The test of the five purposes of designation was ignored in this case</li> <li>• 1500 consultees were against development that impacted the Green Belt</li> <li>• The DCLG Secretary of State said Green Belt is ‘absolutely sacrosanct’</li> <li>• The DCLG paper of Locally-Led Garden Villages says that planning freedoms will ‘continue protecting the Green Belt’</li> <li>• Priority should be given to sites within the existing urban area – would not jeopardise the separation of settlements nor air quality</li> <li>• Would the scheme result in a more self-sufficient Swanley or just cheaper housing for south London?</li> <li>• Rather than focussing on the M25 and A20 congestion the focus should be on the access to Swanley (Major blockages on the B258 and B2173 need to be considered).</li> <li>• Bevan Place Roundabout needs a separate study, including air quality</li> <li>• Concentrating leisure and social facilities in the centre will worsen traffic congestion</li> <li>• Weakness that neither public transport nor parking are under public control</li> <li>• No green spaces should be sacrificed for development – a mistake to move the leisure centre to open space</li> <li>• Absence of sufficient parking for the Leisure Centre would disadvantage the users</li> <li>• Graveyard has been identified as a green space though it cannot properly serve for recreational purpose</li> <li>• Not clear how far the Vision is consistent with U+I development plans for the centre</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development on green spaces diminishes the sense of openness</li> <li>• If there is to be major development at Swanley, more green space must be allocated, not less</li> <li>• Development proposals should aim to make better use of under-used facilities e.g. playing fields.</li> <li>• Would like to be kept informed about progress on the consultation</li> </ul>
<b>White Oak Bowls Leisure Ltd</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report ignores the railway which cuts the town in half – regeneration will increase the disparity between town centre and poorly located places</li> <li>• Opposition to development on recreation ground. Solution: a deck over railway</li> <li>• Not enough proposed parking spaces for the increased number of residential and retail units</li> <li>• Concerns about the absence of affordable housing</li> <li>• Concerns about the provision of medical clinics for Hextable residents</li> <li>• Propose College Road nursery (brownfield site) for development instead of Green Belt</li> <li>• More information needed regarding Garden Village; design brief, social housing provision, leisure, health and employment</li> <li>• Railway halt will clog the new residential streets with traffic</li> <li>• New care home must still be affordable and provide sufficient parking</li> <li>• More parking must be considered elsewhere for station with the loss of Bevan Place car park and relocating near town centre – 200 additional spaces (multi-storey)</li> <li>• Leisure site (Hilda May Avenue) should remain for its current use</li> <li>• Entrance to Swanley lies closer to the motorway intersection than proposed in the plans</li> <li>• Hextable Gardens should remain as an open space</li> <li>• Swanley recreation ground (St Mary's Road) should remain as an open space</li> <li>• Hotel not suitable on recreation ground – need for adequate parking</li> </ul>