To which part of the Proposed Changes to the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 – 2038) as set out in the Development Strategy Topic Paper Addendum does this representation relate?

Appendix D: Proposed changes to policy STR/SS 1 The Strategy for Paddock Wood, including land at east Capel

Which part of the plan does your comment relate?

Policy

What is the reference number?

STR/SS 1

Do you consider the Proposed Changes to the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 – 2038) would make it:

Yes No

Legally Compliant Not Selected Selected

Sound Not Selected Selected

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Changes to the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 - 2038)(as set out in the Development Strategy Topic Paper Addendum) are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Proposed Changes to the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 – 2038) (as set out in the Development Strategy Topic Paper Addendum) please also use this box to set out your comments.

Not being a legal expert I am not able or qualified to detail exactly whether the Proposed Changes are fully legally compliant or not but I have been reliably informed by our local Town Council in Paddock Wood that many of the consultations with the local Council that were supposed to take place regarding any changes in the original proposals seem to have been completely ignored and these changes have been put forward with little or no consultation with people locally who would be affected by the changes and would have vaid opinions to offer as to their suitability and whether there might be additional viable options. It appears that high level decisions are being made without local representation which is entirely wrong and in my opinion, immoral. By virtue of the binning of the Tudeley Plan due it not standing up to scrutiny by the inspector and similarly the axing of 1,000 of the properties originally destined for Paddock Wood on similar grounds, it goes to say that any amendment to the Plan without local consultation is also unsound and needs to be revisited in order that it stands up to scrutiny with local invovlement not purely from the Borough Council which will not necessarily comprise of anyone living in the locality.

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to the Proposed Changes to the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 - 2038) Incorporating the Proposed Changes set out in the Development Strategy Topic Paper Addendum, legally compliant or sound, having regard to the Matter you have identified at Section 5 (above) where this relates to legal compliance or soundness. You will need to say why this modification will make the Proposed Changes to the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 - 2038) legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. I think I have already answered this in sufficient detail above in that there appears to be a lot of the required liasion with the local Council that has been lacking in these changed proposals which as far as I can see, is a statutory requirement. This reeks of negligence. In the changes, there appears no consideration for the improved and expanded infrastructure required to service the new houses being built which I would have thought is common sense and should be a primary consideration rather than a 'nice to have' add-on at the end. Living in Chantlers Hill in Paddock Wood, we have witnessed the massive number of houses going up in Green Lane, Church Road and Badsell Road. We have no objections to the building of new houses in and around Paddock Wood as we understand the housing need in the South East BUT, having lived here for 30 years, there have been NO improvements to the medical services, NO improvements to the road network, NO improvements to the schools, NO improvements to the water and sewerage systems and NO improvements to the town centre which is in an extremely poor state. We find it incredible that all these houses are put up BEFORE any of these services are dealt with. What do the existing and new residents do in the meantime? Common sense would say that money should be spent on this first before the building starts but we all know where the money is, yes, it's in the building and sale of new residential houses. Another example of putting profit before welfare. In addition, and it has been apparent in the number of 'To Let' boards in evidence shortly after some of these properties are sold, they are being bought by landlords, probably with 'backhanders' to the developers so are not available to local people. I would also like to see more starter properties being built, rather that four and five bedroomed houses, so that young people have a chance of owing their own home and there being restrictions put in place to stop people buying the houses for investment purposes and then renting them out at extortionate rents for greed. Again, where is the morality in all this?

Please use this box for any other comments you wish to make.

To re-iterate my comments from above and in summary, the infrastructure for all these new houses is massively lacking and it is a ticking time bomb before all this blows up and existing services cannot cope and if you ask the doctors surgery for example, I am sure they would say we are virtually at that point now. The existing services in place BEFORE any of this building started are EXACTLY the same as they are now and there are hundreds of new houses finished and occupied. I do not know how many new families/people are now living in Paddock Wood than were here 5 years ago but there are many and the services provided in the way of medical provision, water systems, schooling etc. etc. has not changed - is that fair on them or the existing residents for that matter?

If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearings stage when it resumes?

No, I do not wish to participate at the examination hearings