

Having recently reviewed the concerns and queries raised with the initial inspection, we wish to respond to the three points raised on page 24 relating to Speldhurst.

Q1. Does site allocation AL/SP1 represent major development in the AONB, and if so, is it justified? How have the potential impacts of development on the character and appearance of the area, including the AONB, been considered as part of the plan-making process? The volume of proposed housing we would deem a major development and not in character with the area entering Speldhurst from Langton. The proposed site will (if developed) be the first image (eyesore) of the village upon arriving from Tunbridge Wells/Langton, and not portraying the true picture of the desirable village of Speldhurst. This is something we should be protecting.

From the outset we have opposed any building on AONB. Not only is the area AONB, but within this field we have highlighted that there were several wild 'protected' plants, including wild orchids. These were identified and images shared with SPC and TWBC. However a few days after sharing the evidence of the wild orchid's they were dug out. I immediately contacted TWBC Planning and SPC and was requested to raise a Police incident. Upon calling TW Police it was advised that it would be impossible to identify who had carried out the action and there was very little point in raising such a case. I have attached photo evidence for your viewing.

We should be doing everything we can to protect AONB in the so called Garden of England and not building housing on such sites, thus increasing the village footprint and damaging the AONB. Please see point below re 'brown belt'.

Q2. Can a suitable and safe point of access and egress be achieved? From our previous expressions of concerns, the access from the site onto Langton Road is not safe. If you reside where we do, you will hear at least five times per week the horn of a car due to unsafe exit from Ferbies. The proposed site is even closer to the Went Farm bend and thus even more dangerous. This was deemed the case when the previous development was proposed and the Kent Highways report advised that without a 30 metre visible splay both ways, the exit was deemed hazardous. Since then the six trees along the Langton Road within this site have been granted TPO's and thus the visibility splay reduced even further. A new 20 mph speed limit has also been introduced, but seems to have caused more issues, as now cars are overtaken when adhering to the speed restriction. There will be a serious accident soon as the volume and speed of cars increases. Alas such a potential accident will be on our doorstep.

In addition within our deeds it notes that the rear exit to our property was closed down circa 1978 due to safety concerns. The drop kerbs are still visible and I have taken a picture from the property search details from when we purchased the house in 2005.

Q3. Do the exceptional circumstances exist to justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location? We believe not. There are various brown belts sites that could be developed around the Parish and Tunbridge Wells Borough ahead of building new developments on Green Belt land. This was explicitly the preferred option from the Parish Vision survey that was independently conducted and funded by SPC a few years ago, upon

the direction of TWBC to avoid such developments on Green Belt land around Speldhurst. It is immensely disappointing that SPC have not honoured the views of their parishioners and sat on the fence about the current proposal.

In addition to the above, the plans mention the development of Southwood Road, Rusthall as an area to support play areas. This is absurd, as there is no way any child is going to travel from Speldhurst to Rusthall, even by bicycle. It is purely a way of trying to progress the plans by offering assistance to the current amenities in the village (school, play ground, Doctors), which already are not being able to cope with the current population, let alone more developments. It is a lip service suggestion and is never going to assist the demands of amenities to cater for any expansion.

Finally, and I truly hope this will not happen, but should the development proceed, I am keen to see how the development will adhere to the building restrictions in the deeds that do not permit building within a certain distance of our rear boundary.

I hope all the above will be truly considered and the development turned down, once and for all.

Please confirm receipt by return.

Kind Regards
Richard & Angie Larkin
Ingleside, Ferbies