

## Survey Monkey Comments

### Q1 Do you agree with the Vision?

Replies 46; Yes 38 (85%); No 5 (11%); Other 2 (4%)

I agree with the sentiment of the vision statement but not its fundamental assumption that it is possible to 'enhance the special qualities of the parish's landscape and built heritage' by agreeing further development projects. I agree that we should embrace sustainable change along the lines presented but I have little confidence that proposals agreed by TWBC will meet these criteria, despite the laudable efforts of the Neighbourhood Plan

### Q2 HOUSING H1. To ensure that the scale of development is appropriate to the site, complies with the NPPF Neighbourhood Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and respects the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Design Guide (HWAONB) Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (H1)?

Replies 46; Yes 38 (83%); No 8 (17%); Other 8

At present TWBC do not appear to be respecting the HWAONB which they have laid down.

The policy does not consider the cumulative effect of several developments within the local area, but not necessarily within the BandM parish, on matters such as increased traffic and extra load on infrastructure.

But the horse has bolted with the oversized development in Matfield, but hopefully future developments will be constrained.

In some cases no development is the most appropriate response, development as a default is the wrong starting point.

It talks about the requirements for EACH development. Where is the control over the overall number of developments (including those of under 10 units)? Presumably H3 (density of housing) covers this but will there be a control over mass development in B&M unless the two sections are combined? Also there is no mention in the plan of the wider infrastructure implications and what is being done to alleviate the issues that building a large number of properties in the area will bring. The plan talks of over 12,000 new homes for TWBC. With 4000 planned for Capel and 3000+ in P.Wood + a quantity in B&M what about the following: 1. Schools. In particular secondary schools. Mascalls and the schools in both Tonbridge and T.Wells could not cope with an extra 1000+ pupils (very conservative estimate - 12000 homes with say just 25% having one child of secondary school age = 3000 - thats three large new schools needed). 2. Can the hospital and doctors surgeries cope with a minimum of 12000 extra people but more likely 30000 extra people. 3. P.Wood Station car parking. It's nigh on impossible sometimes to park at the station for a 10am train Mon - Fri (pre-pandemic). With 7000+ homes in the catchment area for P.Wood station a proportion will be using the trains and needing to park. Once things are back to normal is there provision to expand eh available parking at the station. 4. Supermarkets - Can the existing supermarkets cope with the increased volume of people - parking and speed through the tills. Waitrose in P.Wood, Tesco at Pembury and Asda in Longfield Rd are relatively small outlets with limited parking. This leaves the options of having to drive across TW to Sainsburys, added to the already existing traffic chaos in TW or to

Tonbridge, or to Kings Hill. 5. Roads - particularly access from the A21 going south where there are regularly lengthy traffic jams now the improvements between Tonbridge and Longfield Rd have been completed (simply these improvements have just moved the problems of traffic jams further along the A21 to Kippings Cross).

Respecting the HWAONB design guide is crucial to preserving the parish's character.

No mention appears to have been made of the 22 Rydon homes on the Maidstone Road to the east of the Standing Cross junction.

I agree with the objective but not the associated policy which opens the door to development of an inappropriate scale.

**Q3. H2 To focus new development within the Limits of Built Development (LBD defined by TWBC) to limit encroachment on the AONB. Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (H1 H2 H3 H11)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 35 (76%); No 11 (24%); Other 12**

The boundary limits for Brenchley could be adapted to include the land to the north east of Holly Bank and East of Brenchley Road and to the south of Glebe House. This land is bounded by the village roads and surrounded by housing being adjacent to the current limits of the Built Environment. It is not suitable for agriculture (and has not been used as such for many years) and would follow many of the policies set out in this document, providing much needed housing in a sustainable way. The site was put forward in the 'call for sites' and was judged to have many benefits as follows; • sustainable, being close to the village school, bus stops, surgery, dentist & village shops • clearly within the urban centre of Brenchley • surrounded by development on all sides • contained by the road layout of the village • relates more closely to the village, rather than the countryside

In relation to the site of Brenchley & Matfield School- Although difficult to discern the very small scale maps in Figure 13 of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, it seems that the Limit to Build dotted line has been drawn so as to exclude the whole of the play area and the (Northern) grassed playing field/sports activity area. These are no longer agricultural areas and have not been for over 50 years. It is very important that this Plan recognises the ability of the School to use this other land for possible building, although, doubtless it would always wish to retain plenty of room for recreational use. The School should be allowed flexibility to build at least for educational purposes rather than be constrained as suggested in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore recognise either at H2 or elsewhere that this flexibility should be allowed for

I agree with this objective and policies but I do not think that the limits as they are drawn in the consultation document may not reflect the needs of the school. The limits as drawn appear to exclude a significant part of the school grounds. I am not sure if this would have any impact on the school's ability to put up new buildings for its educational purposes (not houses) but if it would I do not think this is sensible without having entered into a proper discussion with the school to ascertain its potential future needs. So I think the limits should be re drawn to include the whole school site. I do not know of any plans to put up new buildings on this site. In addition, given the recent history, I do not think it is right without being explicit about the intention to limit potential development on the school site to draw the map in a way which would preclude any further attempt to build a new

school on a new site funded by the development of the whole of the old site. I emphasise I currently know of no such plans (and would expect to if they exist). Finally, given the current use of the whole site I think it would be wrong to limit development of this site in this way. Any such proposal would need to fulfil all of the other policies you have suggested. I think such a proposal would need to persuade the community and the operators of the school on its merits should any such proposals be tabled in the future but to seek to exclude now a significant part of the existing school site seems wrong in principle.

Essential to safeguard the countryside in the high weald.

I say this only in relation to the site of Brenchley & Matfield School. Although difficult to discern the very small scale maps in Figure 13 of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, it seems that the Limit to Build dotted line has been drawn so as to exclude the whole of the time act play area and the (Northern) grassed playing field/sports activity area. These are no longer agricultural areas and have not been for over 50 years. It is very important that this Plan recognises the ability of the School to use this other land for possible building, although, doubtless it would always wish to retain plenty of room for recreational use. The School should be allowed flexibility to build at least for educational purposes rather than be constrained as suggested in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore recognise either at H2 or elsewhere that this flexibility should be allowed for.

Any further housing development should, in my opinion, be into the Brenchley village as that is where all the infrastructure currently resides (Doctors, dentists, post office, shops and cafes). The proposed LBD is too small for Brenchley. All other objectives are excellent.

We need houses so some might need building on an ob

However, development on 'The Triangle' which in essence was a borderline planning application, has started and we should be concerned that the aspect of AONB is being ignored.

Have you considered development on the old golf course to the west of Pixot Hill which is outside the AONB? Whilst it may act as a buffer between the parish and the edge of Paddock Wood it might be a less sensitive area for development if developed in accordance with the design and sustainability policies outlined elsewhere in the plan.

Have you considered development on the old golf course to the west of Pixot Hill which is outside the AONB? Whilst it may act as a buffer between the parish and the edge of Paddock Wood it might be a less sensitive area for development if developed in accordance with the design and sustainability policies outlined elsewhere in the plan.

The boundaries of the LBD may well need further attention given the developments taking place

**Q4. H3 To retain and enhance the character of the parish. Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (H1 H2 H3 H9 H11)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 44 (96%); No 2 (4%); Other 3**

Character is a subjective concept. It is important that this approach is flexible enough to include features that will help support the village to evolve in ways that make it fit for the future, particularly

with regards to sustainability and the green agenda.

More distinctive seriously zero carbon buildings would enhance and give a distinctive 21st century character to the the villages . Let's not root character in the past.

**Q5. H4 To limit coalescence of the villages so as to maintain the character and identity of each village and hamlet within the parish (H2)Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (H2)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 41 (89%); No 5 (11%); Other 3**

For reasons given above the village boundary of Brenchley could be adapted to include the specific site detailed

I agree, in part, though this parish council (B&M) indicates that we should be joined up.

Essential to help with more transport services for the future.

**Q6. H5 To give priority to smaller units of 1,2, and 3 bed properties rather than larger properties in order to meet identified housing needs (based on a 2021 Housing Needs Survey for the Parish) and maintain a sound demographic mix in the parish.Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (H4)**

**Replies 46; Yes 38 (83%); No 8 (17%); Other 12**

Each site should be considered on its own merits and the meet the character of its surroundings. A broad mix of housing should be included for all requirements within the Parish.

Would depend on site and context but broadly agree

Housing for key workers, young people and renters is hard to come by in the villages currently.

This policy needs to be applied to windfall site applications too.

The First Homes scheme seems like it might fill a gap and it's good to see that the houses would have restrictions to keep them in the affordable housing market but will this be administered by the borough council and will the local parish council have any say on who gets the options? I found it a little unclear between the Housing register and the First Homes scheme and when I looked on the TWBC site, I didn't find a place where you could register to be considered for buying through the first homes scheme. Is this going to happen in our area or is it just a hope?

The parish's demographics are heavily skewed to the retired. For the village to be sustainable, younger families need to be encouraged. 1-3 bed houses may encourage this: 4+ bed housing won't.

Over time household size and make up can change

Making village or hamlet housing more accessible should not be the primary objective. Often towns are more appropriate to accommodate this size of dwelling. Increasing density can only lead to harm. Eg increased traffic.

However, there is a case to be made for multi-generational properties where more elderly or disabled residents can be accommodated in downstairs facilities.

We need big houses as well

**Q7. H6 To meet the housing needs of the increasing population of older residents Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (H5)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 39 (85%); No 7 (15%); Other 6**

Yes but unless you provide housing for younger people and families this is not a choice -

Important to keep older residents integrated into the parish and not isolate them in a separate designated site

People down sizing should be priority to build on land

Older residents have a majority of the housing stock. New houses need to be available to and affordable for the young.

The parish suffers from house "blocking" where the elderly are unable to find suitable properties in the area in order to downsize. This is an incredibly inefficient use of property. This policy could help open up family homes to "younger" families, although affordability would still be an issue.

**Q8. H7 To deliver a range of affordable housing with priority for local people with family or work connections to the parish Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (H6 H7)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 42 (91%); No 4 (9%); Other 7**

It is crucial that local people are supplied with affordable housing.

I agree provided the priority for local people is strictly adhered to , which has not previously been the case in our general area.

I think the percentages you indicate may well be sensible at this point of time in the plan but if there are a number of developments leading to the provision of these sorts of numbers I think you may need to preserve the flexibility to lower these percentages or the provision of "affordable houses" could become disproportionate and this might artificially push the prices of existing housing stock higher. See above comments on house size. I also think that the rural exception site policy may need to be more flexible and reflect the overall pattern of new developments in the area or by implication you may have affordable housing on sites least suitable for people who can't afford to run two cars.

This is essential

The local connection should be set in stone and retained so that when the houses are sold or leased to new tenants they also should have a local family or work connection.

There needs to be a system whereby rented properties are available within a development; and part-buy/rent need to be maintained in perpetuity for the community, otherwise the whole concept of 'affordable' is lost/undermined.

Must be for people with family or work connections to the village and not just those who have got to the top of the HA waiting list because they have enough points.

**Q9. H8 To meet the essential housing needs of rural enterprises and local agriculture Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (H8)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7%); Other 3**

Considerable numbers of agricultural workers are housed in caravans which are unsightly and can be sited in inappropriate positions, even though they are effectively permanent housing

Not sure what this means given much migrant labour . Travellers have never been given much welcome in the parish.

Yes this is essential

**Q10. H9 To ensure that windfall, infill, conversion and extension developments are consistent with maintaining the character of the parish**

**Replies 46; Yes 41 (89%); No 5 (11%); Other 8**

It is important that 'infill' in particular is considered by TWBC as in my view it is detrimental to the area.

There has been a considerable increase in conversion of older agricultural buildings recently to generate revenue. These old buildings are then replaced with much larger prefabricated structures leading to an increase in overall area of development rather than siting the new buildings close to or on the same site as the old ones.

Very much so. Burford Place is an example of where this hasn't really worked despite good intentions

I think it should be on architectural merit -

It's to diverse anything should be allowed

So called windfall developments should contribute towards the housing need targets. No reason not to include them as they meet need in exactly the same way as new build but with less environmental impact.

Good design is more than a pastiche of the past. There should be scope for and acceptance of high-quality contemporary design that reflects on and uses the development of current and future sustainable designs and the best of new technologies. A listed 400 year old house will undoubtedly have had extensions and additions over time, each using then-current latest developments. If change had not embraced, we would all still be living in mud huts with no running water or electricity.

**Q11. H10 To secure through Section 106 Legal agreements indirect benefits to the parish (such agreements oblige developers to contribute towards community facilities to mitigate the effects of**

**development . A list of identified needs within the parish are in the Plan) Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (H10)?**

**Replies 46;                    Yes 46 (100%);                    No 0 (0%);                    Other 7**

It is very important that developers are obliged to contribute towards the especially where drainage and road maintenance is concerned.

As long as this is not used as a way to "buy" approval for developments that would not otherwise be permissible

However, care must be taken with generous mitigation measures from developers with deep pockets

Priority for a playground in Matfield

No mention of any identified need in settlement of Petteridge. As a resident I met with a parish councillor and outlined the need for proper play area provision for Porters field play area which currently just has a few bits of derelict wooden play equipment that was installed many years ago by the high weald partnership. There is an increasing number of families with young children in Petteridge as older people move away and no provision for either primary or secondary age children and young people.

And it would be hoped that developers might also contribute in other ways for the community benefit.

Should also include the maintenance of existing off road public footpaths.

**Q12. H11 To ensure good practice in construction Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy?**

**Replies 46;    Yes 46 (100%);                    No 0 (0%);                    Other 5**

Increased inspection required to ensure quality. There are far too many problems with new homes being built in many cases to minimum specifications. Building control needs to be strengthened to help maintain developers to an acceptable standard and quality.

How will this be enforced?

But good luck with getting that respected. I suggest you start lobbying now for a dedicated planning officer for developments in the parish. After all the portfolio holder lives in the Parish.

Will this also apply to sites of <10 units? there was continual noise and dust from the Tibbs Court site during the demolition process.

**Q13. DESIGN D1 To Ensure development conforms with the rural character of the villages and their positioning within the AONB Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (D1 D2 D3)?**

**Replies 46;    Yes 42 (91%);                    No 4 (9%);                    Other 9**

So far, Standings Close is an 'eyesore' to the rest of the village.

Nothing is mentioned of the source and future recyclability of building materials. There have been a number of examples in the area of large agricultural buildings being erected without planning permission due to the agricultural exemption which would not have been permitted in that position if they had required full planning. The agricultural exemption should not preclude siting of such buildings conforming to the plan

This is to be subject to exceptions, such as where it is desirable to build within the AONB, balancing all other relevant factors.

Again architecturally innovative projects should be considered

but encouraging innovative zero carbon design and build.

Who cares what it looks like if someone wants it

Good design is more than a pastiche of the past. There should be scope for and acceptance of high-quality contemporary design that reflects on and uses the development of current and future sustainable designs and the best of new technologies. A listed 400 year old house will undoubtedly have had extensions and additions over time, each using then-current latest developments. If change had not embraced, we would all still be living in mud huts with no running water or electricity.

Again, development at The Triangle rather undermines this aim.

I agree with the principles for Connectivity and Permeability, Green character, density etc. However, if we say that we want design and colour to match/fit in with what is already here, are we allowing for enough diversity to encourage innovation, new designs and ecologically suitable housing? I don't consider lots of mock tudor housing for example as a plus.

**Q14. D2 To ensure quality development that meets the needs of local people Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (D4 D5)?**

**Replies 46: Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7%); Other 0**

No comments

**Q15. D3 To ensure development meets the highest standards of sustainability, including addressing the important issues of climate change and environmental degradation. Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (D6 D7 D8)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7%); Other 4**

there now appears a conflict between addressing climate change with better insulation and reduced heating costs often results in small houses and apartments being very hot in summer and the now increasing problem of covid 19 type diseases where ventilation is vital.

What climate change. Look up little ice age 1850s

Where possible subject to cost and technology boundaries

All new & extended properties, whether residential or industrial, must encompass aspects of renewable energy.

**Q16. BUSINESS and EMPLOYMENT B1 To protect and enhance existing employment sites Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (BE1)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 38 (83%); No 2 (4%); Other 6 (13%)**

If a scheme proposes the conversion of an "amenity" business to yet more residential accommodation there should be a mandatory requirement to try to retain the amenity by some alternative scheme, if need be by means of a locally funded community interest group that would run the amenity as a social enterprise and not necessarily for profit. Examples would be local pubs, Post offices and shops. eg When it was known that The BULL in Brenchley was to be sold there was significant interest in forming a locally crowd funded not for profit community interest group to ensure that the village pub was maintained at the heart of the village with plans for a business enterprise unit upstairs, having already lost the Rose and Crown some years earlier. Although the BULL can be considered a business it does not bring much employment to the village and, although the Little Bull is fantastic, the loss of the pub has been keenly felt.

Yes but how do we address the problem of transport in rural area being serviced by ever larger vehicles.

Yes, in principle, depending on the nature of the businesses.

If a site becomes no longer commercially viable it should become residential

Agree in principle, although development of redundant farm & industrial buildings has meant an increase in windfall sites coming forward. However, aspects of flooding/highways etc. must be observed when this type of application is made.

**Q17. B2 To promote new business investment through improved infrastructure and facilities and networks that reflect modern modes of working Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (BE2 BE3)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 40 (87%); No 2 (4%); Other 5 (11%)**

If you are hoping for more business investment, more infrastructure is needed eg roads etc.

Broadly, although still in keeping with character of the area

I strongly agree with this policy but do not think there is enough emphasis on ensuring availability of electronic infrastructure for both businesses and housing.

Within reason

Local sites with decent broadband would be great

**Q18. B3 To encourage diversification in agriculture and land-based enterprises and investment in small scale tourism Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (BE4 BE5)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7%); Other 5**

What agriculture? Matfield appears devoid of places to be considered. Brenchley is more 'blessed' with agriculture.

Provided due consideration is given to noise and transport implications

Broadly, but depends on type of agriculture and tourism - specialist organic fruit farming may be in keeping with character of area but the previously proposed large scale chicken farming in nearby Horsmonden would not be appropriate

Whilst I agree with this objective I also believe that the existing freedoms for development of new agricultural buildings need to ensure they do not affect badly the policies you are promoting in this document and that erection of such buildings cannot be a back door to avoiding planning controls.

Essential for agri businesses to survive, but will often increase travel of all types

**Q19. B4 To encourage energy efficiency in non-residential buildings Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (BE6)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7%); Other 2**  
AND residential buildings!

All industrial buildings should now be required to adapt by installing solar roof panels, vertical wind turbines (rather than windmills), rain water retention, etc.

**Q20. B5 To allow small scale individual and community renewable energy projects Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (BE7)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 42 (91%); No 4 (9%); Other 2**  
Yes - but not private wind turbines in gardens.

must be considered in context

**Q21. LANDSCAPE and ENVIRONMENT LE1 To conserve and enhance the AONB and its setting Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (LE1 LE2 LE3 LE4 LE6 LE7 LE8 LE9)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 42 (91%); No 4 (9%); Other 5**

This is my main concern! Fernham have not adhered to the AONB or Village Limit in their development of the Island site.

This is to be subject to exceptions, such as where it is desirable to build within the AONB, balancing all other relevant factors.

But subject to such a policy not being used to stand in the way of building and using the various sustainable energy schemes envisioned elsewhere within this plan.

yes and no- LE4 fig 21 contains significant omission. See comment on LE3.

But already undermined by development at The Triangle.

**Q22. LE2 To conserve historic landscapes, conservation areas and heritage assets Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (LE3 LE4 LE5)?**

**Replies 46;                      Yes 43 (93%);                      No 3 (7%);                      Other 2**

But subject to such a policy not being used blindly to stand in the way of worthwhile developments such as building and using the various sustainable energy schemes envisioned elsewhere within this plan.

yes and no- LE4 fig 21 contains significant omissions. No recognition of the typical drovers route with characteristic sunken lane and woodland verges along Petteridge Lane, High Tilt Lane , Hatmill Lane and Cryals Road. These and the ghylls should have locations specified and mapped within the policies as they are vulnerable to opportunistic developer proposals pending the finalisation of the TWBC Local Plan.

**Q23. LE3 To retain important views Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (LE4)?**

**Replies 46;                      Yes 42 (91%);                      No 4 (9%);                      Other 4**

Very much so.

I think this is an important policy but I think there are some additional views ( eg form Marle place road) which should also be preserved.

But subject to such a policy not being used blindly to stand in the way of worthwhile developments such as building and using the various sustainable energy schemes envisioned elsewhere within this plan.

yes and no- LE4 fig 21 contains significant omissions.No recognition of views from the western side of Petteridge Lane over the ghyll valley towards ancient woodland at Porters Wood and the orchards South of the developed western edge of Matfield. Similar views at 6 on Cryals road are recognised despite being less wooded and more agricultural and not including the traditional farm buildings of Goshen Farm and the traditional small holding at the foot of the ghyll. Otherwise agree with objective.

**Q24. LE4 To conserve green spaces Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (LE5)?**

**Replies 46:                      Yes 42 (91%);                      No 4 (9%);                      Other 4**

I understand the 'Island Site' was scheduled to have a 'play area'; is there any other play area scheduled instead?

This is to be subject to exceptions, such as where it is desirable to build within the green spaces, balancing all other relevant factors.

But subject to such a policy not being used blindly to stand in the way of worthwhile developments such as building and using the various sustainable energy schemes envisioned elsewhere within this plan.

Including public footpaths

**Q25. LE5 To conserve and enhance biodiversity Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (LE5 LE6 LE7 LE8)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 44 (96%); No 2 (4%); Other 1**

No comments

**Q26. LE6 To preserve and to plant trees and hedges Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (LE6 LE7)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 45 (98%); No 1 (2%); Other 4**

Dormice, which reputedly live in the hedge adjoining Coppers Lane need a wildlife corridor to move to other areas. They only come to the ground for hibernation. They do not like to move at ground level' - extracted from Natural England org, dormice conservation - so what use, for dormice, is the short length of hedge on Coppers Lane?

Very much so.

Yes please !!!!

Where possible

**Q27. LE7 To preserve dark skiesDo you agree with this objective and its associated policy (LE8)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 42 (91%); No 4 (9%); Other 3**

These decisions need to be taken on a case-by-case basis. Where increased light will improve safety, such as with road crossings, there should be flexibility.

Difficult in the UK being small with a high density of population.

Where possible. But not if it stands in the way of road safety improvements for example.

**Q28. LE8 To control advertisements affecting the villages or rural landscapesDo you agree with this objective and its associated policy (LE9)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7); Other 1**

Roadside advertising of upcoming events can be very annoying and also endangering road safety. The use of agents boards to advertise events gives the entirely wrong impression to road users and ought to be discouraged.

**Q29. AM1 To improve sustainable and active travel within the parish, improve Public Rights of Way and create non motorised routes Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies**

**(AM1 AM2 AM3)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 42 (91%); No 4 (9%); Other 7**

I agree especially with the need to create new, and improve old, no-motorised routes. Please see comments below.

A safe motor vehicle free route linking all the local villages and Paddock Wood is ESSENTIAL to the future of the area. I use my car for short local journeys which I would strongly prefer not to do (I regularly cycle off road) because A- the main roads are too narrow and there is too much traffic to be safely used on a bike, particularly if you are cycling with children. B- the road surface on all the local roads is so bad that there is a high likelihood of falling off your bike due to a pot hole. I support the principle that "Developments that do not enable easy access to a choice of safe, sustainable travel (including walking, cycling and public transport) will not be supported" but this can ONLY be applied once adequate public transport and safe walking and cycling routes are in place.

I agree with all of your comments. I am keen to cycle more and use my car less. This is constrained by the quality of the road surfaces and the level of risk to life with cycling on certain roads. It is not only the link to MATfield which would benefit from a non motorised link but the ability to cycle to Paddock Wood ( and catch the train or go to school) but also links to Horsmonden (local grocer) and other villages would benefit from a safe cycling (or riding) route. This might benefit from coordination with other villages' plans. I find cycling on the Horsmonden road between Brenchley and Horsmonden ( or even Spout Lane) to be dangerous as a result of the poor quality of the road surface. The absence of a 40mph (contrast the road into Goudhurst) limit means that vehicles pass cyclists at speed. The idea of non motorised routes is a good one.

Elsewhere active travel is proving to consist cutting settlements in two and restricting access for residents to adjacent areas.

PROW yes, why is it conflated with the others?

However, from Matfield to Paddock Wood is not for the faint-hearted on a cycle or considering walking!

In improving public rights of way can something also be added about stopping certain dog walkers letting their dogs foul the public footpaths without clearing up after them. More people would be encouraged to use the FPs with their children if dogs mess was not encountered on a regular basis.

**Q30. AM2 To reduce the need for private car use by increasing transport services and improving pedestrian safety Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (AM2 AM3)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 43 (93%); No 3 (7%); Other 9**

Urgent need to improve pedestrian safety.

The public buses, which pass my door, are never full, about 5 - 6 people on a double-decker bus.

Safety, particularly of children

But the car will be essential in rural areas.

Public transport is really tricky to navigate

Improving pedestrian safety should include more enforcement of the speed limits, particularly on the Brenchley Rd between the villages and on the Maidstone Rd between Matfield and the A21. The speed limit of 30mph is not adhered to and whilst ANPR speed cameras, I note, are in the plan they tend not to work. People simply brake, travel past the camera at the required speed and then speed up again. Add to this the danger that somebody spots the camera late, has no idea of the speed they are doing and then brakes sharply tends to cause more accidents than it stops. Speed ramps tend to not work either for the same reason as above + those with company vehicles don't care what speed they go across them at. More regular involvement of the police with the issuing of speeding tickets and licence points would help to cut the issue if it becomes known that there are regular police speed traps in the villages (get them to try from 6am in the morning on a working day through rush hour - they should earn enough to cover the overtime. And then come back the very next day and they'll probably catch all the same people again!)

Need to have 30 mph limits in smaller settled areas such as Petteridge Lane where despite many young families and no pavements national speed limit applies. Also applies along Cryals Road which like Petteridge Lane is often a short cut when A21 congested. No appetite for street lighting but speed is a read danger to life for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. Children are driven to school in Brenchley from this area despite it being walkable for this reason.

**Q31. AM3 To improve road safety by encouraging lower speeds and better traffic management on development sites and in surrounding areas Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (AM3)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 46 (100%); No 0 (0%); Other 10**

I strongly agree with this objective and its associated policy, but particularly believe that the proposed reduction in speed limit from 50 mph to 30 mph along the B2160 north from the village outskirts to a spot close to Invictas does not go far enough. The lower speed limit should extend at least as far as Prall's Lane and then become a 40 mph limit to beyond the garage, preferably down to Mascall's school. The road has little or no pavements and verges, and those that there are are being eroded by heavy traffic. It is dangerous for pedestrians and for residents trying to get into and out of their drives.

Traffic going along B2160 through the village does not adhere to 30mph limit, especially gravel lorries and other large vehicles.

Very much so

Thank you! The absence of limits on some rural roads renders them unsafe for cyclists, riders and pedestrians. I strongly support "sensible" limits. Why do you have a 20mph limit in roads in TW whihc have easily enough room for cars to pass in different direction with good visibility and no limits on some of our lanes and even major routes such as the Horsmonden road.

Specifically, any area of 40 mph speed limit , should be dropped to 30 mph. The junction of Pixot Hill and Brenchley Road/ Crook Road, is particularly fast, noisy and dangerous. Brenchley village should be 20 mph. Traffic calming measures should be implemented where ever possible. For example: electronic light warning signs and sleeping policemen.

Please this should be enforcing not encouraging. The speed limit is the law and it should be followed. Encouraging suggests breaking the law is OK.

Definitely something more permanent needs to be done on the B2160 through Matfield. If there was ever a good reason for the installation of speed cameras, this is it. A pedestrian crossing at either the Standing Cross or the Village Hall points is long overdue

Need to have 30 mph limits in smaller settled areas such as Petteridge Lane where despite many young families and no pavements national speed limit applies. Also applies along Cryals Road which like Petteridge Lane is often a short cut when A21 congested. No appetite for street lighting but speed is a read danger to life for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. Children are driven to school in Brenchley from this area despite it being walkable for this reason. Situation worsens since construction began on High Tilt Lane with addition of heavy lorries and plant serving the site.

But not trying to simplify the issue but blanket reduction of speed limits.

The flow of traffic through Matfield on the Maidstone road needs to be looked at on a wider scale. I would suggest many cars and vans travel from well over 5 miles away simply to join the A21 at kippings cross the north to M25 and Surrey / south and west London etc.

**Q32. AM4 To provide E-charging points and adequate parking in new developments for bicycles and cars Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (AM1 AM4)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 42 (91%); No 4 (9%); Other 7**

You have rightly identified that thoughtless parking causes major inconvenience in many areas of the villages, including Petteridge as shown in your photograph. Some retrospective action also needs to be taken eg Permanent residents/locals parking only in some areas. I am not picking on the BULL conversion but it is a prime example of problems caused when inadequate thought given to the application, the business should not be permitted should have dedicated parking spaces out of sight of the village centre. When the house is let to a large group they often park thoughtlessly in the village centre causing obstruction. The Poet in Matfield also cause similar problems Discouraging the use of roads such as Broad Oak for day long parking for eg groups of walkers or cyclists which means that locals can not park to access the village shops. Disabled parking places needed in the centre of both villages close to shops

The provision of charging points for electric vehicles is going to be very important. I would hope we could include such points in the centre of Brenchley and Matfield and in addition possibly use the Memorial/village hall car parks?

Cycle lanes too would be great and a proper route to link b and m to allow walking and cycling safely between the villages

E charging points are a waste of time but good cycle routes are important

No. Insufficient power available on the grid to power vehicles as envisaged by government policy. We will all be reading by candle light at this rate. Policy not matched by development of sustainable energy sources to replace fossil fuelled vehicles and residential heating. Woodburners and oil fired heating is essential to many homes on the periphery of the two settlements.

However, the KCC guide on 'Noddy's Guide to Parking Spaces' is inadequate! Very few households, apart from possibly the elderly, do not have a vehicle or two or three. Most developments have a lack of visitor parking, which only results in roadside parking in other areas thus causing much annoyance to all concerned.

I note from the plan however that the table on parking spaces for new developments does not provide adequate parking spaces. A one bedroom property does not mean one car. Young couples would be buying these sort of properties, because that will be all they can afford, and they will both have a car. Two parking spaces are required. Also at the other end of the scale larger properties are most likely to be occupied by families whose children will still be at home after the age of 17 (for some time these days) and they will have cars as well as one each for Mum and Dad. 2.5 parking spaces for a 4 bed house is simply inadequate. Also what about parking for existing developments where there was originally no provision for parking simply because of the age of the properties. Is something to be done about this? e.g. Porters Wood in Pettebridge.

**33. COMMUNITY, LEISURE and RECREATION CLR1 To help maintain and improve education, health and care services in the parish Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (CLR1)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 46 (100%); No 0 (0%); Other 2**

This should include supporting the local school to provide first class facilities, to encourage local families to choose the village school instead of transporting children out to private schools. This would help improve community cohesion as well as reduce traffic.

Not sure how you could cater for this in Matfield. No surgery (and Brenchley is full), no dentist, no school either primary or secondary. Much more thought needs to be given locally and nationally to infrastructure being in place before residents.

**Q34. CLR2 To help improve community health and well-being through support for a wide range of sports, play and leisure activities within the parish Do you agree with this objective and its associated policies (CLR2 CLR4)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 46 (100%); No 0(0%); Other 1**

Perhaps install outdoor fitness equipment in public spaces.

**Q35. CLR3 To provide natural and amenity green spaces in developments and contributions towards equipped playgrounds in the parish Do you agree with this objective and its associated policy (CLR3)?**

**Replies 46; Yes 45 (98%); No 1 (2%); Other 4**

Ongoing provision of finance needs to be made for maintenance of these spaces

Provided they are managed to not provide an antisocial environment.

Developer contributions should also be sought towards cost of maintenance of such play areas going forwards as for a small parish with limited precept these can be an unmanageable burden.

**Q36. OVERVIEW Are you supportive of the approach of the Steering Group and the draft Neighbourhood Plan document?**

**Replies 46;                    Yes 41 (89%);                    No 5 (11%)**

Thank you to the Steering Committee for all their hard work. But has TWBC listened to any of their comments at all? - I fear not!