

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan \(TWBC\)](#)
Subject: Re: Ref Troy Report
Date: 26 February 2024 14:34:12

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.

Dear Sir or Madame,

Please find below my comments relating to the Paddock Wood Town Council Representations report issued in February 2025.

For ease of reference I have made my observations against the specific paragraphs in the report:-

1.2 I was completely unaware of the Consultation process until this month, February 2024, in addition I have found the process of finding the documents reference in the report to be very difficult

2.2 There has been no attempts made to consult with the electorate ad residents in general.

2.11 There are statement made in documents that require some explanation for an ordinary member of the public e.g. what is "active travel" as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan's Vision and Objectives, "Through sustainable design and the promotion of active travel, Paddock Wood will be future-proofed, responding proactively to the challenges posed by climate change."

4.2 In the NPPF Changes (2023) section reference is made to "local authorities now have greater flexibility". If this is indeed the case shouldn't the specific challenges facing Paddock Wood of flooding carry additional weight? The problems of a sewage system working at almost full capacity will only be made worse by the additional dwellings and the existing problems of a very high water table.

11.3 Refers to the need to provide a Sewage Works Upgrade. Shouldn't this be done before and new dwellings are added to what is already considered to be an overloaded system? There is already considerable bad press about the sewage in the Medway and there are a number of areas where we have seen sewage not being handled correctly. This must be of great concern when Southern Water have confirmed the problems with the treatment works being at capacity.

11.12 Health Provision is already a problem before the new dwellings are built. At least two of the local surgeries are not open for new patients.

11.14 There is insufficient capacity in the existing Cemeteries - again this is a problem associated with the high water levels.

11.15 The lack of an integrated approach means that amenities require access to private transport for access. There needs to be a more joined up approach to ensure that all members of the community have access to sports and leisure facilities.

11.16 As a resident of Lucks Lane I am concerned that the Lucks Lane junction with Maidstone Road is to widened as part of the development in Lucks Lane. I am sure that this will only increase the number of vehicles using Lucks Lane, despite the existing weight restriction. I also fear that this will encourage higher speeds on Maidstone Road.

11.21 As a resident of Lucks Lane I am further concerned that the permitted building work will increase the problems that already exist in relation to water overflowing onto the road at times of high rainfall.

12.10 The Redrow and Persimmon development at Queen Street talks about the need to develop a new sewage works that will deposit a minimum 50,000 litres a day into Rhoden Stream. As far as I am aware there have been no published plans as to the measures that will be put in place to reduce

the risks associated with this plan.

It seems to me that Paddock Wood is bearing a disproportionate burden of the development that is being planned for Tunbridge Wells. Whilst at the same time very specific geographic issues that should limit its suitability and use for significant development.

Regards,

Frank

Frank Kent

