

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan \(TWBC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Consultation on TW BC's response to the Inspectors Initial Findings Letter on the Examination of the New Local Plan  
**Date:** 25 February 2024 16:26:32

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

To Tunbridge Wells Borough Council,

Please find below my opinions on the Colts Hill Bypass and my support of the plan and my passionate objection to the Green belt alternative suggestion of widening the road.

I live with my young family in Colts Hill Oast, Colts Hill. We find the road to be extremely busy and dangerous as it currently is and would welcome the development of the Colts Hill bypass. We have a dog that we walk from the footpath and often crossing the road and walking the mere 200 yards to access it can be quite a frightening experience for my 3 children and myself. Exiting our driveway onto the road is a constant source of anxiety and it is a wonder that an accident has not happened yet. Lorries drive at a dangerous speed along the road, and widening the road is only going to increase the noise pollution, air pollution and potential for fatal accidents. All of the properties along Colts Hill will have the same issue with leaving their driveways into an increasingly fast moving path of traffic.

It is not entirely clear whether your current consultation ending tomorrow extends to the Colts Hill Bypass. However, as you have attached the draft report on the Colts Hill Bypass as one of the supporting documents, I would like my response included as one of the consultation responses.

I note what the report says about the development of the Colts Hill Bypass meeting the definition of an inappropriate development. However, it is clear from the report that local transport infrastructure can be appropriate in certain circumstances especially where the harm is outweighed by other considerations. I see that in this case any harm to the Green belt would be moderate and the impact negligible.

In contrast, we live on Colts Hill and would be severely impacted by the alternative suggestion to widen the A228 by 4 metres. The plan would almost certainly mean the destruction of our barn (which is a workshop and also protects us from the noise of the road) and our annex (which is part of our home and where our children play). It would completely devalue our property price as it is inconceivable that anyone would want to purchase a home on an even busier road than the A228 already is. We are concerned about worsening air quality for our daughters and them living even closer to a main road without the barrier the barn provides. Any decision to widen this road would be a clear breach of the Human Rights Act 1998 including our Article 1 Protocol 1 right to property and our Article 8 right to respect for private and family life, which includes our home. I cannot see that the public interest in this case overrides our rights given that the impact on the Green belt has

been deemed negligible.

Given the impact on our family and others locally (including various listed buildings), we cannot see how it could be a rational decision to move to the alternative suggestion. We only bought our house in 2021 and would not have bought it if there had been any serious suggestion that the road would be widened. We therefore firmly object to the alternative proposal set out in the report.

Thank you,

Liz Blightman

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]