

## WS24

### Susan's Hill, Woodchurch

#### (Land east of Woodchurch Village Life Museum)

#### Housing – 90 dwellings

#### 50 responses

1	Do not support – rural in nature and more sustainable sites should be brought forward first
2	Far too large – completely out of keeping with the scale of the existing village
3	Too large. This would double the size of the village. Infilling would be a major risk.
4	Access into Susan's Hill is extremely tight. This would not be safe. Too many properties for this area (90 dwellings!)
5	Has very bad access
6	No – too many
7	Too many
8	Too many houses
9	The road situation is [even worse] – very narrow, leading onto busy direct route to Ashford
10	Far too large for present infrastructure – surgery, school and especially sewage will be overwhelmed. Sewage already a problem, especially in Plum Tree Close.
11	Far too big. Access via very small road onto <u>corner</u> of main road through village.
12	Too large for village – road far too small.
13	Please get your drawing correct. Road will not support additional traffic from proposed 90 houses. Sewage problems.
14	Access to the site is poor and dangerous for 90 houses. The road would have to be improved which would not be in keeping with the village. Also the junction at Susan's Hill is on a 90 degree bend – and is steep gradient – with potential for an increase in accidents. 90 houses in one estate would not be in keeping with the village.
15	Do not support. Outside of the village envelope. Road is single track – road narrows at bridge. No footpath. No. of proposed houses would create strain on village resources, eg doctor, school. Negative impact on rural aspect of lane. Sewage issues.
16	A development on this scale would be the same size as the current lower village. It would totally spoil the dynamics of the village and be totally out of character with the green and open appearance of the village. The current sewage system can not cope and there is no money or plan to improve it.
17	Would not support. 90 dwellings with access onto Susan's Hill would be inappropriate. The lane is narrow and the increased volume of traffic would be hazardous coming into the village or using Boldshaves Lane as a run to Redbrook Street. There is already

	an increased flow due to the Leo Trust at Boldshaves.
18	This development is totally unsuited to the existing infrastructure in Woodchurch. The site proposed is greater in size than that part of the village encompassed by the v-shaped development between Front Road and Lower Road. Woodchurch is a well balanced village at the moment and such a large development would upset the infrastructure and management of the village. A definite NO.
19	NO. There are already too many sites available for development. How long would it be before Woodchurch is annexed to Ashford, and no longer a village for people to live in and enjoy. Nothwithstanding the fact that people do need to be housed, do we really need to concrete over the South of England?
20	This site would appear to be disproportionate (number of dwellings) in scale to the size of the village. Traffic increase in this road may impact on safety and natural beauty currently available to existing residents.
21	This looks absolutely huge! How would infrastructure cope? Also the rural feel of area will be completely ruined.
22	The size of site would swamp the village of Woodchurch as it's massive! It would severely damage the rural feel. Too suburban.
23	I would not support this under any circumstances. A development of this size would completely alter the character of the village. It would create a huge traffic problem in Susan's Hill, especially at the junction with Bethersden Road.
24	NO – it is a grade 2/3 agricultural land-site and would almost <u>double</u> the size of the village. Susan's Hill is a <u>narrow</u> rural lane leading to a dangerous junction on a bend. It is not condusive to this enormous development. What about schooling, water? etc and impact on neighbouring <u>rural</u> properties which were outside the last village plan. There was a covenant on this field when it was sold by R Orpin to G Weller, stopping the land near the road being built on.
25	Don't want it, don't need it [plus expletive]
	No, we don't want it. No need to extend the boundaries of the village. Don't need large development – it will destroy what people want to live here for.
26	No to big – stuff it where the sun does not shine
27	An estate of 90 dwellings would not be suitable for a village development. It would be an ugly entrance to a beautiful village.
28	Apart from the fact that the boundary to the northwest is drawn incorrectly on the overview map (Craylands is <u>not</u> included in the original submission) this proposal is far outside the village and would constitute development of an intrusive and alien manner in the open countryside. Susan's Hill is already struggling with the weight of traffic as it is, and 90 dwellings would exacerbate an already difficult situation.
29	Because it is in a good location, but not the size of the development.
30	It is too large an area of outstanding beauty to destroy with housing. New jobs are not created for the area in the long term. New leisure, infrastructure is <u>not</u> needed in a quiet village. We need to be left to be a quiet village and not developed.
31	Ridiculous number of houses on what should remain an agricultural piece of land for future generations.
32	90 dwellings is over intensification onto narrow road – Susan's Hill. The only drainage is a ditch along the east side and one

	between the land and Susan's Hill. Flooding is bound to occur unless extensive work is done. Sewage also would require a great deal of restorative work, ie the pumping station would need enlarging. I would support a few houses along the side of the road.
33	Far too big. A much smaller proposal might be acceptable.
34	This working farm field situated on Susan's Hill is a rural part of Woodchurch on a fairly narrow country road with no paths. The idea of it being put forward as a building site for 90 dwellings is beyond understanding and I certainly would not support development on this site. It is in the middle of farming land with just the original farm house, dairy (now converted) and barn (also converted) opposite the site. There is one gate entrance to the field which is opposite the said buildings and it is impossible to imagine the amount of traffic that developing the site would engender and endanger children walking to and from school, and to busstops on top of the hill to other schools; besides all other pedestrians who regard this as a country walk. The amount of development of this site is too much for a village the size of Woodchurch. I trust the Borough Council will consider these comments.
35	The site in question is approximately 20 acres and is prime agricultural land. It is well cared for by the owning farmer and regularly produces bountiful harvest crops. Therefore, it is well suited for the purpose intended. This is part of the Kentish Garden of England. In bad times, eg both world wars, it helped feed the nation. If treated wisely, it could do so again, in the uncertain world food situation and rising world populations. Susan's Hill, the country road, is unsuitable for the traffic that would possibly be incurred. Also, the village primary school would be unable (in the present format) to deal with the children which would ultimately follow. Their safety would, therefore, be at great risk.
36	WS24 could be a possibility with big investment in roads, ie Susan's Hill road through to Swaines Road and circle at the dangerous 'Windmill Corner'. Also a road directly from the site parallel to Front Road so traffic does <u>not</u> have to use Front Road to Tenterden – road to join Appledore/Tenterden Road.
37	To build 90 houses on such a site is nonsense. Susan's Hill and the road through to the B2067 is little more than a lane in places. A new road would need to be built first.
38	We would not support development on this site. Development on this large site , largely isolated from the village and serviced only by a narrow lane would no doubt lead to it being described as the SUSANS HILL SATELLITE CITY. Woodchurch has developed over the last few centuries in a way that has been measured,sensible, sustainable and successful. Looking at the maps that were supplied at the village hall it seems that WS 24 would, at a stroke, introduce an area for development that amounts to about 20-25% of the total footprint of the village to date . This immediately rings warning bells that neither the ABC nor developers would be be able to resist the onset of a new Woodchurch "suburban" complex and the local community would be unable to control it. How many years has it taken us to create and succesfully absorb 90 new properties into the village ? We should resist moving any faster than this and even then consider very carefully before agreeing to a development that could lead to a discouple in the village and an upset to the balance of the village dynamic. ACCESS to WS 24 is problematic in two directions. Increased traffic into Woodchurch is likely to cause considerable problems at the

	<p>junction of Susans Hill with Bethersden Road. Perhaps more importantly increased traffic from WS 24 moving in the Tenterden direction would cause problems along nearly 2 miles of the narrow lanes through to Brook Street. The cost of infrastructure improvements in both directions would be extremely expensive. Provision of adequate SEWAGE and drainage facilities to WS 24 represents both another substantial cost burden and a difficult civil engineering challenge. It is difficult to make suggestions that would make development on this site acceptable.</p>
39	<p>I strongly oppose the size of this submission. The proposed number of dwellings would not only radically alter the village housing structure, it would have a hugely detrimental effect on village society in general. Clearly some infilling along Susan's Hill is necessary and to be welcomed, but to increase the housing stock by what must be almost a third would seriously unbalance the village. Though aware that the process is at an early consultative stage, as a general point I am concerned that no provision of local needs housing has been clearly identified from the outset. Sustained organic growth rather than imposed, developer controlled building, <i>has</i> to be the best way forward for our fabulous village.</p>
40	<p>I would not support a development on this site. This is an area of natural, rural beauty and should be preserved as so little of the countryside surrounding our village has been. This housing development threatens to disturb the peaceful area and would increase the traffic on the road which is too narrow to support any more houses. We must preserve our countryside before there is none left! The village will be unable to support this growth, especially the school which is already over-subscribed which is also the case for the surgery. We should not be ruining the village community that is so unique to where we live by not being able to offer children places at the school or patients in the surgery. The field in which this development is meant to take place is popular with walkers and is beautiful to look at. Building anything on this site would be completely wrong.</p>
41	<p>No I would not support development at this site. This is a beautiful rural area outside the village that should be preserved – the road is narrow with no good access. It would disturb the setting of listed buildings in this area. It would cause increased traffic on a small road and disturb a peaceful area – the museum is in a rural setting. We should preserve our countryside around the village. Building anything on this site would be wrong but to build a large housing estate is outrageous. The village can't sustain that growth. We are a big enough village at present. There are not many villages like this left – we need to maintain our small rural villages. The fields are used by walkers and for agriculture and are beautiful to look at. We don't want this destroyed.</p>
42	<p>No I would not support development on this site. Woodchurch is a beautiful rural village that is very unique to other areas in Kent, surrounded by stunning fields and a peaceful atmosphere. This aspect of the village should not be destroyed! The road is not big enough to house this estate, and with very limited space to develop the road it would be extremely unwise to start building any houses on the road, let alone 90! Furthermore, if this sort of development begins to happen in rural areas soon the amount of agricultural work will begin to decrease rapidly. Why not build this sort of development in already urban places such as Kingsnorth, Ashford. Why poison such a beautiful rural area, changing everyone's lives who live here?</p>
43	<p>I would not support development on this site – the impact of a proposed 90 homes would impose considerable impact within the</p>

	village and access to and from the site onto a country road (Susan's Hill) to the junction of Bethersden Road.
44	I would not support a development here as the width of this lane would not support the amount of vehicles that would need access to develop it. In addition, the infrastructure of the sewage works would not support it, and the sheer weight of traffic using this country lane would be dangerous in an already dangerous junction as you come out of Woodchurch village. It seems more sensible to use existing infill in an already built up area rather than develop a green field site. It is also twice the size of other proposals in the village. I believe it would be a danger to children getting off the school bus and walking down a lane which already is used as a rat run and more traffic will only increase it. The village infrastructure of the school would not be able to support this amount nor the doctor's surgery or the sewage systems.
45	The site is overlarge for short term needs and would involve residents walking along a narrow lane with no pavement to reach village services.
46	<p>Ahead of the Parish Council meeting this Friday, 23 May 2014 I would like to voice my strong objection and opposition to the site proposal on Susan's Hill, Woodchurch (site reference: WS24).</p> <p>I was born and have lived on Susan's Hill my entire life and think it is an utter disgrace that such a development has even been contemplated. This road is wholly unsuitable for such an extensive development and infrastructure aside, seems not in keeping with the spirit of the village which has grown organically over the years and stayed very much true to its history and culture of being a close knit community instead of folding to the lure of development and encouraging new residents who have no connection with the village whatsoever.</p> <p>The road on which the development is planned is extremely narrow and already overrun with cars. This not only puts motorists at danger - there is a blind spot as you approach the narrow bridge just before the site and I have had several near misses with drivers coming far too fast the other way, but also children who play on the street, elderly residents who walk to the village from their houses and animals - people frequently walk their dogs/ride on the road. As I mentioned, I grew up on this road and learnt to ride, cycle and drive on the road - adding such a magnitude of new residents and therefore road traffic would endanger lives. The turning onto the road from the Bethersden road is dangerous - there is a blind bend which has seen many accidents and in the winter the road gets very icy and is never gritted other than by the residents. The turning at the other end of Susan's hill has a dangerous Y junction which again has limited visibility - particularly in the summer when the hedges obstruct view. The road itself is prone to pot holes - only this January the entire road almost collapsed at the bridge due to flooding.</p> <p>In addition to my concerns surrounding the effect of the development on Susan's Hill itself, I also believe that the infrastructure in the village would not withstand such an influx of new residents. The school and GP are already oversubscribed. Adding that much strain on resources would not be good for the village which has to date only just coped with the growth it has seen. It is one of the few villages in the area that has remained truly picturesque and undeveloped - many of the houses and buildings are extremely old and to erect 90 new builds would not fit with the aesthetic of the village or the culture of the village which has a very close knit community of generations who have grown up and lived in the village.</p>

	<p>There were factual errors and omissions in the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø the GP surgery is not within 400m of the land; and</li> <li>Ø the submission tries to imply that the land is much closer to the centre of the village than it actually is.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the following considerations have not been given sufficient weight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø there is a public footpath which goes through the proposed site;</li> <li>Ø there is a listed building opposite the site as well as several in the surrounding area which would be spoilt by this development;</li> <li>Ø the land is in the 'green belt' it is grade 2/3 agricultural land – and has always been used for arable crops;</li> <li>Ø It is not infill as it is surrounded by other agricultural land; and</li> <li>Ø when sold to the present owner the field had a restricted covenant which forbade building on it on the area adjacent to Susan's Hill;</li> <li>Ø who is it that is going to buy these houses? There is not a huge demand for property in the village.</li> </ul> <p>I would like to point out what a vehement opposition there was to the proposed solar farm in the village – so much so that the project was halted. This would have had FAR less (if any) an impact on the village and yet there was a real public outcry. How can you possibly suggest that such plans which would wholly impact on so many more of the residents in the village is viable for consideration.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you consider in earnest the points which I have raised as I cannot stress the extent to which I object to this proposed development. I will be following up with the Ashford Borough Council planning department and if necessary, Damian Green.</p>
47	<p>Having attended the exhibition at the village hall, I have had an opportunity to reflect on the Susans Hill site submission.</p> <p>I would not be in favour of any development of the field for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Any development would be outside of the village settlement.</p> <p>Any development would affect the setting of a listed building ( ie Brickwall Farm Grade II listed).</p> <p>Any development would affect the rural amenity that the village enjoys by having open countryside just outside the village settlement.</p> <p>Any development would adversely affect highway safety. The lane is narrow with no footpath and further narrows at the bridge. Development would increase traffic along the lane having a negative impact on those living further up the lane who walk or cycle down to the village.</p> <p>Furthermore the junction at the top of Susans Hill going into the village is a difficult junction with an adverse camber and traffic coming round from the Bethersden direction. In winter there have been many accidents when ice has affected this junction and more traffic would increase the risk of incident.</p> <p>Having consulted the Parish Council minutes of September 201 I am aware that prior to the site submission being made to Ashford</p>

	<p>Borough Council, the Parish Council had discussed the site for low cost housing; the minute reads, <i>The Parish Council is investigating the possibility of increasing the number of local needs houses in the village. The preferred site, adjacent to Woodchurch Museum on Susans Hill, has been identified. A drop in session will be held with English Rural and Action with Communities in Rural Kent early in the New Year.</i></p> <p>As well as my comments being passed to Ashford Borough Council I would ask that they are also passed onto the parish councillors. Please note that my objection , for the reasons given above, would be for any development of the field, including for low cost housing.</p>
48	<p>We have noted the referral of various packages of land for potential development in Woodchurch. Some appear to be small, in-fill type locations; not ideal, but we can see that it may be necessary. However, the extensive piece of land at Susan's Hill seems unsuitable. The road could not sustain the increased usage and one has to question whether the infrastructure of the village (water, sewage, school, doctor etc) would be able to cope.</p> <p>As farmland, does permission for building come from the borough council or from a higher authority? Would such a proposal be sanctioned? We would hope not. We would not wish to stop anyone living in our beautiful village, but the sheer scale of that <u>potential proposal is not in keeping with the surroundings and surely would be over-development on a grand scale.</u></p>
49	<p>I strongly object to a development of this scale and find it both upsetting and depressing that it should even be contemplated. On a practical level access to the area is entirely inadequate and further development to the road would need to take place to make it wide enough and safe enough, part of the land is also low lying and prone to flooding from memory. The village does not have the infrastructure to cope with such an increase in population in a short space of time, it does not have the number or size of facilities (GP and school) and recreational facilities needed, the surrounding roads are small and Front Road and Lower Road are already very busy. I understand that some growth in housing stock is to be expected and welcomed even, but on this scale it's effect would be catastrophic, changing Woodchurch from a pretty rural village to something like a commuter suburb in fairly short order. New development has been small scale and mostly sympathetic, it is a larger village than it looks but has managed to maintain a rural village feel despite this, a careful balancing act that could be tipped quite easily. If such a development were to go ahead it would take away my reason for living here, I cannot see how it would be absorbed without destroying the character and life of the village.</p>
50	<p>We wish to point out that the proposed area WS24 off Susans Hill includes the Museum site which is in freehold ownership of the Woodchurch Museum Trust. We assume that this is an error on the part of the applicant. If it is not an error, then whilst there would be nothing to stop someone who is not the owner applying for planning permission, we wish to make it clear that the chances of others developing our site are zero. (from Curator, Woodchurch Village Life Museum)</p>

## WS25

### Land in Lower Road, Woodchurch (north of the Granary) Housing - 10 - 15 dwellings

#### 13 responses

1	We support development of this site, so long as preference is given to smaller housing, ie terraced and semi-detached for young families and local people
2	Would seriously impact on the 'green heart' of the village and destroy many of the rural views which residents prize highly
3	Infilling on land with drainage problems
4	Most certainly not, because Kirkwood Avenue would become a rat run and for the reason why WS28 was refused permission ON APPEAL the same objections would apply. Further meetings, involving the residents of Woodchurch, should be held before any of the proposals are progressed.
5	OK
6	Intruding onto village green
7	We are against any development on this site. This one of the few bits of green laying between Front Road and Lower Road. Houses built on it would spoil the outlook.
8	This would make the centre built up and the green and open feel of the village would suffer. The sewage system cannot cope and it would increase flooding at the bottom of Front Road.
9	The problem of sewage/drainage is already a problem. Part of the plan gives access to Kirkwood Avenue, which is a small minor road. The part of the proposed development giving access to Front Road is on a bend and is on a hill. Very dangerous for cars leaving the proposed site. I am totally opposed to the new plan.
10	Not happy at all with the project. We live just opposite and being very concerned at the noise and the growth of dwellings as suggested. Our village should stay as it is with the greenage all around.
11	Probably accept if not executive houses.
12	Approx 28 years ago an outline plan was submitted for this site. Kirkwood Avenue was considered unacceptable for access. Access would only be from Lower Road.
13	I reside at 12 Kirkwood Avenue and WS25 would potentially affect my property in two ways. To the rear of my garden (NE of my property) lies a small one acre field which is bounded by tall hedges on all sides and appears at present in WS25. Please see the



enclosed photo (shown on letter to be submitted to ABC). What is not immediately apparent when looking at the proposals is the change in levels across this field. Kirkwood Avenue is on the side of a hill (as can be noticed when you walk between Highview on Front Road and Kirkwood). All the properties in Kirkwood Avenue are low rise retirement bungalows. This small one acre field means that any development would be constrained by the small size of the field and consequently any new dwellings would have to be relatively near the existing development. This means that there would be an unacceptable loss of privacy and enjoyment of the properties in Kirkwood Avenue. All the properties backing on to this section of the field are bungalows and consequently they are not overlooked at all, their privacy is maintained. The change in levels between the existing development and the proposed development, mean that the new properties would by the height advantage, be out of scale and keeping. They would loom over the existing properties. Kirkwood Avenue may not be in the Conservation Area but it benefits from it. This would be a loss of amenity to all the houses that back on to this particular parcel of land. My rear garden is 21m (70ft) long and has a change in level of 77cm (2ft6"). The small field to the rear is 56m (184ft) wide and if you assume the gradient is the same (it looks it) there is approximately a 2.05m (6ft 7") change in level between the far side of the field and my kitchen floor. Add to that the fact that houses will be built (because of central government requirements for land use bungalows are deemed to use land inefficiently), this means that the impact in Kirkwood and the visual appearance will be incongruous and out of scale to the rest of the village and dwarf the bungalows in Kirkwood. Thus creating an overly urban appearance of houses being on top of each other (unnecessarily so). My second point relates to wildlife. My garden is a wildlife haven and I am confident that the rear field plays a large part in that ecosystem. If the small field I am referring to is left untouched, it would maintain a vital wildlife corridor to the rest of the remaining undeveloped space in the centre of the village.

In view of the above, I believe that the small field to the rear of my property is unsuitable for housing designation.

With regards to the general development of WS25, I feel very strongly that Kirkwood Avenue should not be opened up as a highway and should remain a cul de sac. The existing road in Kirkwood is not to modern highway standards as it is very narrow. Parked cars are difficult to navigate around with the limited traffic experienced already, particularly for larger vehicles like bin lorries and oil deliveries. My neighbour's car was damaged as a result of the limited space available for larger lorries trying to navigate around parked vehicles. Linking further homes to it would exacerbate an existing problem. Linking it through to Lower Road would create an unnecessary rat run through a presently very peaceful, quiet road of retirement bungalows. It would be completely out of keeping with the existing neighbourhood. In terms of pedestrian links, between Lower Road and Front Road there are already four (the green, the footpath immediately to the south of Kirkwood which runs alongside the Paddocks, Green Lane, another footpath between Lower Road and Front Road and the meeting of the two roads by the doctors surgery.) With a link every few hundred meters it is not necessary to create anymore.

**WS26**

**Land to the west of Lower Road, Woodchurch**

**(site 2)**

**Housing - 10 dwellings**

**9 responses**

1	Do not support - rural in nature and more sustainable sites should be brought forward first
2	Would seriously impact on the 'green heart' of the village and destroy many of the rural views which residents prize highly
3	Infilling on land with drainage problems
4	Intruding onto village green
5	Very good
6	Any development here would affect the appearance of the green making it look very enclosed. It would also make it more flooded and sodden than it already is in that area.
7	In principle would accept housing suitable for young families/first time buyers.
8	Would take away an even bigger chunk of open space we have in the triangle, ie Lower Road, Front Road and the green.
9	This proposal would totally destroy any concept, not only of the Woodchurch Conservation Area but also the 'Green Heart' of the village positively identified in decades of Kent Structure Plans as unique to the village landscape.

## WS27

### Land south of Rectory Close, Woodchurch

### Housing – 12 dwellings

### 31 responses

1	Do not support – rural in nature and more sustainable sites should be brought forward first
2	No obvious access other than past the school which is already dangerously congested
3	There are serious problems regarding access
4	Infilling on land with drainage problems
5	No support for WS27, but yes for WS28. The suggestion that WS27 would only take 12 dwellings is dishonest and misleading. WS28 is 25-35 and more realistic. Were WS27 to be set at 25-35 too there would be more resistance. Is access to WS27 suitable? It is already restricted residential with high school traffic during the day. WS28 on the other hand would go straight out on the main Bethersden Road, if developed as a cul-de-sac.
6	Access via Rectory Close – not adequate due to school. Access which is part of no. 11 Rectory Close (is this not owned by the people who own this property?)
7	WS27 already has problems with heavy parking and traffic problems due to the school and would prove very dangerous to children. WS27 has poor access via a very poor junction to the Bethersden Road. There have been numerous accidents on this bend.
8	No – too close to school
9	Too near school
10	Would seem to meet most of my ideals
11	No access at present. If access is obtained there will be far too much traffic in an already congested area and extremely unsafe in the area outside the school.
12	Access traffic during school hours.
13	There is no access to the field from the road. It's busy enough at school times.
14	No. Major interference to already overcrowded close, particularly at school times. Safety could be tested. The probability that it would not stop at 12, as the field is large enough for more. Adjacent fields could also be contemplated. Junction to Bethersden already at risk twice a day.
15	No. Access to the site is not suitable. This would increase volume of traffic past the school which is already congested. The access point is tight/narrow and a 90 degree bend. The topography of the site is on a crest of the hill which looks over towards Isle of Oxney. This means it can be seen from miles around. There is a regular used footpath which dissects the site in half diagonally.

	Would the village be able to support high development – infrastructure, schools, roads etc – without major investment?
16	I wouldn't support development on this site. I live on Rectory Close and it's busy enough at school times without extra cars. I also back onto the field in question and the view would be ruined. I don't think planning on this site should go through due to access issues too.
17	Not support. Biggest concern is re the school. Traffic is bad at start and end of school day. Increasing traffic will have serious safety impact on children. The outlook from here is a beautiful sight and should not be disturbed.
18	This site is not viable. The volume of traffic to our school would create absolute chaos! Great potential for injury to children aged 3 – 11 years.
19	No No No. Too much traffic past school, no good access for all the heavy traffic to pass school and all our lovely houses.
20	There are already problems arising between the residents of Rectory Close and Woodchurch School. Further development using the entrance from Rectory Close is not acceptable. This proposal should be refused on the grounds of access.
21	Totally unsuitable because of access by the school gates where there is already maximum aggravation between the residents and parents at drop off/pick up time and dangerous problems on the bend by Susan's Hill.
22	No. There is already a huge problem with school access and irresponsible parking. Has anyone considered flooding and/or water shortages?
23	I cannot support the use of this site. Access to the site is through Rectory Close, past the school. There is already a daily traffic problem there, and the addition of a number of houses will only exacerbate the problem.
24	This site is totally NOT GOOD: no access, spoils a lovely (precious) view.
25	There appears to be no easy access to the site.
26	What is access (vehicular) to this site? Via Rectory Close is NOT an option. Mains drainage from this site is not currently available as existing system is at maximum capacity.
27	I own 22-26 Front Road (facing the green). This site is at the back of our house which we bought because of the rural views to the front and the back. Development on this site would radically alter the character of the setting of my house and my neighbour's.
28	Completely unsuitable site. Where is the access? Are we really prepared to put house building before the safety and happiness of our children and existing residents?
29	No. Sloping land – quite flat. 12 dwellings not too intense. Access through Rectory Close. Very busy at school times. There are too many houses envisaged.
30	Probably accept.
31	Close to village but access via Rectory Close is unreasonable due to narrow road and the congestion already caused by the school. The suggested development would more than double the traffic through Rectory Close to the detriment of all.

**WS28****Land between 82 and 120 Front Road****(POLICY WOOD1)****Housing – 10 -12 dwellings or 25-35 dwellings****18 responses**

1	Very poor site lines for emerging traffic/land is on a height so new properties would be very dominant unless single storey
2	The issues over scale, density, access and road safety which caused a previous development to fail here all remain
3	Most certainly not, because Kirkwood Avenue would become a rat run and for the reason why WS28 was refused permission ON APPEAL the same objections would apply. Further meetings, involving the residents of Woodchurch, should be held before any of the proposals are progressed.
4	No
5	Too many houses (10/12 OK)
6	The village road network at present is patently insufficient and can scarcely take what is 'there' now. Recently the Inspector turned down an application. The new submission is for more housing than before.
7	Dangerous access onto a blind corner
8	Access Front Road, congestion.
9	Front Road has issues with stationary traffic. This site will increase the risk of accidents. As a general opinion on all the sites, where is the infrastructure going to come from? Surgery full with cars, school, transport links and rural jobs. Or is this another case of people driving out of the village to commute and offering nothing?
10	Support – understand there is existing planning permission for this site.
11	The proposed development for the existing WOOD1 was refused at appeal for being too overbearing. WOOD1 also states that any development should be linear. This is a difficult elevated site on a blind bend. To propose any extension of the site to the rear is not acceptable on the grounds of road safety. Recently there have been two serious accidents at this site caused by parking on the bend. There are also problems with sewage disposal and surface water run-off. If 10 houses were refused, how can 30+ be acceptable?
12	The current WOOD1 site is a ribbon development proposal. There is no reason to change that. This is an elevated site on a blind bend with problems. Any development would 1) be very visible and dominating to the conservation area 2) cause huge and

	dangerous overspill parking problems on Front Road, 3) dangerous access to site – previous applications have been withdrawn prior to this point for this reason. The current WOOD1 is 0.62h – not the 0.47 h as in the recent submission which is only to avoid the need to build affordable housing.
13	A <u>single</u> entrance to a small ‘estate’ would be more appropriate in this position – ie not on a bend and on lower ground.
14	Flooding will take place. Access to Front Road will not be good enough to avoid accidents. Sewage not suitable as each house has to have its own cesspool. The houses will be built on a bank which will close in the open aspect over to the West. One or two houses might be acceptable along the line of Front Road.
15	No – this has been fought out before – it is in a prime position on the skyline and could ruin the current aspect.
16	This application has already been rejected twice owing to the hazardous access to Front Road on a near blind bend. Please let it remain so.
17	Any access to and from this site would have limited vision. Front Road is a busy road.
18	<p>Although I shall not be able to attend the Parish Council Meeting on 23rd May, there are a couple of points I would like to make, based on what I have been able to read on the matter and the printed information on the letter. I still feel that this Site is not suitable for this sort of development. It is too high in itself, is on high ground, exit is on a bend in the main road, though the one exit instead of several is an improvement. It spoils the whole rural and village aspect to this area and even these 10 houses would alter the apparent character of the village..... further development in time to come would damage this main approach beyond redemption.</p> <p>I feel that, while the point I made with regard to mothers’ parking was valid on the last application for this Front Road site, it does not have the same impact now, as it will be possible to pull right off the road onto personal property when returning home..... Any child would then be in the garden of its home and it would be the responsibility of a parent to make sure that this area was safely enclosed.</p> <p>Parking would be greatly improved if the shaped piece of garden beside each garage was laid as owners’ hard-standing. It seems likely that owners of houses of this better standard will have two cars and such a parking arrangement will be necessary to accommodate the second.</p> <p>I feel that the houses should be built for the main living area to face the afternoon sun and the garden, which will avoid the ‘face to face’ effect of the centre houses in each block. The chimneys are an attractive feature of the design. Perhaps the finishing details of each house could vary slightly....tiles, window size....half boarded walls ... tile hanging..</p> <p>I share the concerns about sewerage, draining etc., and the Developers should have to address this.</p>

**WS29****Land to the west of Lower Road, Woodchurch****(site 1)****Mixed - 1 dwelling, business & holiday let****10 responses**

1	We would support part of this site but not adjacent to the green 'avenue'
2	Would seriously impact on the 'green heart' of the village and destroy many of the rural views which residents prize highly
3	OK
4	Intruding onto village green
5	Very good
6	Development here would lead to overspill parking on Lower Road. This road already has parking problems. It is a route from Tenterden to Ashford used by many lorries and cars.
7	The two property option is an excellent idea.
8	In principle would accept housing suitable for young families/first time buyers.
9	I do not agree with any house being as a holiday let.
10	Though an encroachment of the Conservation area, I would give this site provisional support within strict guidelines.

**WS31****Harlackenden Farm Buildings, Plurenden Road, Woodchurch****Mixed - 45 dwellings and other uses****5 responses**

1	No - too many
2	Too many
3	Too far from existing village
4	I think there are derelict pig buildings here, so some housing might improve the general site.
5	Might be acceptable for a smaller number of dwellings.



**WS69****Bournes Field, Woodchurch****(Land to the north of Bournes Place)****Housing – up to 10 dwellings****13 responses**

1	The best of a bad bunch
2	OK
3	Suitable provided it's the only approved site
4	Road network? Non-existent.
5	No. The area is/was classed as a conservation space and should be retained as the boundary of the village on the eastern side. The development of the houses in Bournes Place should not have occurred as they are totally out of character with the other houses on the green. To add further modern houses will compound the present disparity. There is very restricted access to the site. If Bournes Place is considered as access, serious safety issues will arise for residents. Provision of utilities could be a major problem.
6	Would not support development due to access. There is no access into Bournes Field, only right of way through farm gate – and access into the lane would be too dangerous. Overall there are too many houses planned for the village to support.
7	No – visually would impair the approach into Woodchurch.
8	The proposed housing on this site is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and which has been designated a conservation area. In itself this makes any development of this land unsuitable. The increased traffic generated from this proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and ambience of The Green, the focal and centre point of the village. The entrance point to this site is too narrow and will not safely accommodate 2 way traffic flow on/off the site. As my property sits at a lower level adjacent to this site, I am concerned that run off from a developed site will cause flooding in my garden. In addition my natural pond whose boundary falls within the proposed site may not be able to cope with the increased water flow into it. I am also concerned that it could become contaminated during any pre or post proposed development which will inextricably cause permanent damage to the abundant wildlife it supports. This includes hedgehogs, moorhens, ducks, sloe worms, grass snakes, herons, to name but a few. In short this is not a suitable or appropriate site for development.
9	The proposed housing is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and also within a Conservation area. It would spoil the area, with increased traffic along The Green. This road is a focal point from the Green. With anticipated increased risk of flooding, with climate change, how would the drainage and sewage systems cope with increased housing. The village was at saturation point

	<p>earlier in 2014. Also how would the local school cope with additional pupils? In general, there are far too many houses planned for a small village.</p>
10	<p>The proposed housing is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and also within a Conservation area. It would spoil the area, with increased traffic along The Green . This road is a focal point from the Green. With anticipated increased risk of flooding , with climate change, how would the drainage and sewage systems cope with increased housing. The village was at saturation point earlier in 2014. Also how would the local school cope with additional pupils? In general, there are far too many houses planned for a small village.</p>
11	<p>I wish to raise the following points in objection to the proposal to build up to 10 houses on the land submitted for consideration – I feel that this land should not be considered at all for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development is literally JUST outside the conservation area boundary</li> <li>2. The proposed development would severely devalue the properties in Bournes Place and destroy the vista to the rear of our properties</li> <li>3. Major works would need to be carried out as the existing drainage system would not cope</li> <li>4. The access to the proposed properties will only allow for one car's width which is not ideal and also there are always cars parked on the road in Bournes Place and more traffic would not be practical</li> <li>5. There would be extra traffic on to The Green road which is a minor road</li> <li>6. Surely we should preserving green spaces within the village</li> <li>7. The view from the public footpath would be obliterated</li> <li>8. There is some doubt as to the ownership of the common land including the access to the driveway to Bournes Field that is currently under investigation with the Land Registry which would void any possibility of the land being used for development</li> <li>9. I feel that any site for consideration should have access directly onto a main road as this would have less impact on any other residents</li> <li>10. Considering this land for affordable housing could never be such, bearing in mind central village location and any developer would only build high value, large luxury houses for maximum profit</li> <li>11. When the present owners of this land applied for permission to convert the Barn just a few years ago, they mentioned at the Parish Council meeting that this was their inheritance and that they would never consider developing the land</li> </ol>
12	<p>I live at 1 Bournes Place, Woodchurch and have very strong views against this plot being considered. When I moved here with my young family, one of the attractions was the location, that being a safe place for my 3 young children to play. As you would be aware, Bournes Place is a small cul de sac with 8 houses in it. As most families now have at least 2 cars per household(that certainly being the case in Bournes place, most having 3), I feel that the small access road would not be able to cope</p>

	<p>with the extra congestion of cars.  Most of the houses have to park cars on the road so it would be very unsafe having an extra 10 and most probably more cars, passing through when we can only just about manage the amount we have at the moment.  Another major factor that needs to be considered is the access to and from the green. With Bournes place' entrance half way down the green, all those extras cars flowing in and out, it would cause congestion along side what is now known as a safe playground for the children to play. This would no longer be the case.  I strongly feel that if this plot was to be considered, that it would be an accident waiting to happen. Childrens safety would certainly be at risk as would that of the elderly who also make use of our village green. Is 10 houses worth risking peoples safety?</p>
13	<p>Too close to The Green which is a children's play area. Both sides of the road through The Green are The Green and children often run across without taking care. (Already the road through The Green should be a maximum of 20mph, even 15mph.... c'mon the PC, there is a nationwide move to reduce speed in residential areas). The suggested development would more than double the traffic through the narrow road that is Bournes Close to the detriment of all its residents.  It would greatly increase the traffic up and down The Green increasing the risk to safety of all those using it.</p>

## General comments relating to site submissions for Woodchurch

### 66 responses

1	The on-going issues over inadequate sewerage for residents at the bottom of the village must be dealt with before further new development goes ahead
2	It would seem inappropriate to allow any further development in the village until a long term solution is found to the problems with the sewerage system which regularly affects properties at the lower end of Front Road/junction with Appledore Road, as well as on Susan's Hill. Woodchurch is a rural village: these plans seriously risk 'suburbanisation' of our community. There is also a significant risk of development 'creep' – before long another developer will want to infill between WS24/27 and/or complete the destruction of the open land between Front & Lower Roads
3	(Site references WS69, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28) Any of these developments would be detrimental to the village as a whole. The constant concept of infilling open space has to stop at some point as Woodchurch no longer is a village. WS24 for 90 dwellings will have a significant impact on all aspects of the village. All sites have issues of impacts on access and general infrastructure. There needs to be vigorous refusal of any of these developments. The quoted numbers of dwellings for some of these sites leads one to believe that many more will be added at a later date.
4	My biggest objection to building in Woodchurch is that Woodchurch is a village. In the past I lived in the village of West Kingsdown which was built on in the years that I lived there. They always maintained that there were 5,000 people in West Kingsdown when I moved there and despite a lot of building going on over the years, no one ever admitted that the occupancy of West Kingsdown was more than 5,000. Britain needs villages as much as it needs towns and cities, but with housing constantly being considered in fairly large numbers for villages the village structure will in time be destroyed – as it already has been in other areas.
5	In all the years I lived in the village I have understood WS25, 26 & 29 to be within a conservation area which has restricted plans put forward for my property (which is opposite WS25) in the past. This has meant that I have enjoyed the peace of the village (not to mention the sunsets which will be blocked!) and cannot see how WS25 (and indeed all the other proposals) will be any form of enhancement to the village, especially the added strain upon the services, such as sewerage, the educational provisions (with the school already bursting apparently), traffic through and around the narrow roads of the village and loss of footpaths for leisure/exercise by residents. I have no desire for our pleasant village to become yet another to be swallowed by Ashford or a commuter feeder town.
6	The on-going issues relating to inadequate sewerage provision at the bottom of the village must be resolved before further development goes ahead
7	Why do we need so much development? I have no issue with a slow but steady build program, but I don't accept the number of

	<p>dwellings indicated on each site is true or honest. This is the thin end of the wedge going in and final numbers are likely to be much greater than the near 200 houses noted across all sites. Will there be a phased introduction over an extended period? Who will village infrastructure be upgraded to cope?</p>
8	<p>Infrastructure is not suitable for vast amounts of new properties (school, doctor's surgery)</p>
9	<p>WS26, 29, 25 – this site is landfill in the middle of the village, which seems most logical. Access is safer than some of the other sites. WS28 – could be a possibility, but the development would have to be in keeping with the village. The two rejections are trying to build too many dwellings with not enough off road parking.</p>
10	<p>WS24, 25, 26, 29, 27 – no, especially WS27. This is a green site of particular beauty to Woodchurch. Housing here, particularly as it is on the hill, would change the rural aspect of the village, as would anything adjacent to the green. Why is more housing required? I feel any large increase in population would spoil the village community.</p>
11	<p>WS25, 26 and 29 look the most suitable sites because they are infill and in the main body of the village. Although I fully understand the need for extra housing in Woodchurch, the proposed growth over the next 15 years of 200 houses is ridiculous! So might be considered but there is not suitable infrastructure in Woodchurch for 200 houses.</p>
12	<p>WS29, WS26, WS25 – these would be infil – some tentative support if sympathetic. But do not support <u>size</u> of these spaces as would change the nature of the village</p>
13	<p>Woodchurch is renowned for its greenness and ribbon development. These proposals are ALL contrary to the style of the village and need to be re-thought</p>
14	<p>WS26 and 29 – difficult to see how 10 houses can access to Lower Road? Re WS29, business + holiday let + one house – what does this mean? Lower Road also impossible to access safely. Seems little consistency in plan.</p>
15	<p>We feel that the density of development proposed will change the character and environment of the village. There is not sufficient infrastructure to cope with the number of the developments currently proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small village school</li> <li>• Doctor's surgery</li> <li>• 1 shop</li> <li>• 1 butcher</li> <li>• insufficient public transport/roads</li> </ul>
16	<p>WS25, WS27, WS28, WS29, WS 69 - I'm not clear how school, doctor's and roads are going to cope with this amount of new housing. Also there has been flooding in the village – making more concrete/housing is surely an issue. Once more – quiet, rural feel of village will be completely ruined.</p>
17	<p>WS24, WS27, WS28 – how can a small village sustain this amount of new housing. The infrastructure, school/road/surgery/drains is unable to cope. Please note there is no gas in the area. There is already flooding due to drainage unable to cope.</p>

18	WS27, WS28 – sites are too big – village atmosphere would be severely affected.
	WS25, WS26, WS29 – No vote. Both of these proposed sites are within the village conservation area, and are at the heart of the green belt of the village green. It will completely change the character of the village. We already have many problems with sewerage, roads, access – how would the council address these issues?
19	WS25, WS26, WS29 – certainly not – both sites are in the green ‘heart’ of the village in the so called conservation area and development would completely destroy the character of the village
20	No. We don’t need anymore houses down this narrow road. Also what about the school – it is not big enough or the doctor’s surgery. We just <u>do not</u> need these houses.
21	WS24 + WS27 – oppose this site as the road is small, narrow and not suited to the increase in traffic that would result. Does the village have the facilities to support such developments.
22	If the sites offered for development all took place, Woodchurch identity as a village would be lost. It is essential that the open aspect of the village is maintained. With all the development that is taking place in Ashford there is no need for quiet villages to be destroyed. Both foul and surface water drainage are also serious issues together with increased traffic.
23	Complete renewal of all main drains. There needs to be provision for more bungalows in the village so people can downsize!
24	WS25, WS26, WS29 – Cars already use Lower Road (far too fast) as a cut through avoiding the A28 from Ashford to Tenterden so I feel that these proposals would add to the traffic difficulties. I understand that traffic calming is not possible because Lower Road is no an A road, but some kind of restraint would be absolutely necessary if more turnings were to come off Lower Road in addition to the Scout community hall. The infrastructure would need to be massively increased if all these were to be allowed. The school would not cope and the drainage system would be overwhelmed.
25	No access to the present drainage system
26	WS25, WS29, WS26 - I would not support the development of the above sites as access to WS25 is on a bend and all the above will have an impact upon the local landscape and sewage and lighting impact on the village. And I would not support other sites ref the above (ie previous point in this entry) and amount of dwellings proposed!
27	All sites are ‘no go’. There is no way of access for sewage waters to connect with the appropriate [word missing]
28	We must maintain the open aspect of all parts of Woodchurch
29	Too many sites with too many houses. The South East suffers from potable water shortage in drought conditions. Sewage system could not cope. School would (most likely) need to expand to educate an increase in pupils. Mains electricity supply probably would no cope. Local road not suitable for traffic increase. Surgery could not cope – already long wait for appointments. Local people should [have] final say.
30	WS27, WS24 – NO – AGAINST THESE DEVELOPMENTS. Both of these developments would completely change the nature of the village, joining Susan’s Hill with Front Road in a suburban approach, rather than evolutionary development. The church would

	change from a historic rural church to a suburban one. As a general comment on all sites, local infrastructure does not support development on this scale. Better to focus on Ashford which already has plenty of development sites and have Woodchurch as it is.
31	WS24, WS25, WS26, WS29 – a much smaller development of suitable design. 90 houses are far too many. The village cannot support that number, especially the school. Access onto such a narrow road as Susan’s Hill is dangerous together with the T-junction towards the village (again, right by the school). Far too much development in Lower Road. Access again a problem.
32	Where will all the waste water go (sewage). Hope it won’t all end up at the bottom of the village as it does now and cause a problem when we get a bit of rain!
33	WS25, WS26, WS29 – far too big. Drainage, access could be difficult onto Lower Road. These developments would overwhelm the village. Can local facilities cope, especially the school?
34	I am concerned that any of these sites will be for 4-6 bed homes, further driving young people out of the village! Will there be money available to increase space at the school, surgery, water etc?
35	WS26, WS29, WS25 – adjacent directly to the green where, presumably, there can be no vehicular access. Access onto Lower Road would be problematic as Lower Road is narrow and already constricted by many parked cars.
36	Naturally all project had very careful planning re access, services, doctors, congestion in most roads.
37	WS24, WS25, WS26, WS29 – Woodchurch is a small village and the reason why most people live here. There are not the facilities nor the infrastructure to support such a large amount of new properties. I will strongly object to such large projects as this will destroy the character of the village. Build in Ashford by all means, but do <u>not</u> destroy our countryside!!!
38	My goodness you guys really haven’t thought this through – much like the divisions in the Middle East! The easy part is [can’t read next bit] – will these people be able to afford these houses at this location – I doubt it – I will oppose all the way to preserve this lovely village. [not included next bit because of language] Lastly what will the residents of the village gain from these developments! I bet you haven’t even included how they may benefit! How about a new village hall. You move the extra people in – you deal with it.
39	Can the village support this amount of development, without changing the character? Is there enough village infrastructure to support this?
40	The present size of Woodchurch is optimal. Any developments would spoil the character of the village. The school, clubs, pubs are all well supported. If Woodchurch became bigger these would become impersonal and would suffer.
41	I do object in general to the proposed sites wanted for development. It is not in keeping with the present village and would increase pressure on the school, the doctor’s surgery and increase traffic. Surely there are brown field sites which would be more acceptable. Imagine the pressure on wildlife which plays a very important part. The present situation is of a much loved village and should remain as it is.
42	I don’t agree with any planning in Woodchurch. I moved here as it was a village and building more houses will change the whole

	dynamic of Woodchurch. The whole thing makes me quite upset. Woodchurch is a lovely village with a village community which would disappear.
43	There are safe access problems to <u>all</u> suggested sites. Why do we need <u>any</u> , when so many new houses are being built in Ashford?
44	Given the existing building in Ashford do we really need more houses in Woodchurch? What's more important – our heritage and the protection of the countryside or the profits of landowners who have no interest in the community. They are only too willing to sell to the highest bidder.
45	If you look at the worst case scenario, 200 plus possible houses. Ridiculous. It will ruin the village as we know it. These may be only plans but they are feasible from a development point of view. 20-30 units max in my opinion. I moved to a village for village life, not another concrete jungle.
46	We moved to Woodchurch to enjoy village life. I understand that more housing is required but the infrastructure needs to be put in place – making the village grow and impacting on its beauty.
47	The current sewage system cannot cope. Southern Water has no funds or plans to improve it. Any developments in Woodchurch would lead to overspill parking on Lower Road and Front Road which already have problems.
48	Any development in Woodchurch could change the character of the village. ABC was committed to preserve the character of the villages. Is this still the case?
49	The proposals put forward will cause further problems on the infrastructure of the village. The sewerage treatment facilities are already on, or near maximum capacity. The village is in danger of losing its identity as a village. If an expansion of the village is deemed necessary it should be carried out on one site not as a series of patches.
50	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would agree to small scale developments alongside the existing roads.</li> <li>2. This would need to be planned in conjunction with increased facilities and drainage.</li> <li>3. This ribbon development would need to be adhered to, to allow for the distance between each dwelling to match that between older dwellings. Thus the open aspect of the village would be maintained and views would not be lost.</li> </ol> <p>All the sites earmarked are too intrusive in this proposed development.</p>
51	WS25, WS26, WS29 – Flooding takes place across Lower Road. Open aspect will be destroyed, particularly when viewed across the village green. Increase in traffic in Lower Road will increase risk of accidents taking place. I would support one or two houses.
52	We have a beautiful village which has had pockets of development over the years, most of which has fitted in. I realise that we cannot stand still and have to accept some growth in the village, which needs to be done sensitively. This is a huge development plan – far too big. There is already a problem with drainage on various sites, and also car parking in the road. Although I have said I may support 5 of the planned developments, I would certainly not agree in most cases with the proposed number of homes. Each suggested area should be vastly reduced in the number of homes proposed.
53	Residents of Woodchurch have moved from 'Rat Race' towns and cities to enjoy the rural environment and quiet this village offers.



	<p>The infrastructure required for these development sites particularly close to the village are not in place and would change the character of Woodchurch. It would need shop/po/clinic/infant school. I certainly dislike the idea of Woodchurch becoming a satellite 'town'. Too many residences planned. Profiteering builders would soon build large houses for 'tribal' families rather than smaller 2/3 bed homes for younger, poorer people. Utilities and roads are not suitable for further development, particularly close to the village.</p>
54	<p>Woodchurch currently has just over 700 properties. The total number of houses proposed is in excess of 200, a near 30% increase. This would completely change the character of the village and is clearly inappropriate. The school, GP surgery, road, water and sewage infrastructure would not be able to cope.</p>
55	<p>I attended the Exhibition and was glad to see such a large number of people attending. We are all very keen that any expansion of the Village is done in a thoughtful manner and takes into account the points made with regard to style, size landscape impact etc., as set out in the Village Statement prepared quite a few years ago. I regard WS 69 as being the least obtrusive Site, being behind well established, though well established modern housing. Any vehicles would come out onto a straight section of road with light passing traffic. Any buildings would not break the skyline, or spoil any view outwards from the village. The site which includes the block of land which could make use of two points of access....Lower Road and out through Kirkwood, would lie well within the present village footprint and avoid congestion of traffic at 'rush hour'. The footpath to the school would hopefully avoid too great an increase in the number of cars used to ferry children to school. The bend in Front Road at this point is in favour of drivers' line of sight coming out of Kirkwood. I am shocked to see that there is any query at all about the suitability of the site on Susans Hill.... 95 house with say 4 occupants would represent a growth in the village population of about 20%. None of the infrastructure as it now exists would manage this extra load. The bend and hill at the top of the lane is already extremely dangerous. The land nearest the road is very damp. The site WS 27 is likewise not suitable, increasing greatly the passing traffic involving the School, and yet another awkward road junction. The entrance proposed onto the site is not sufficient for vehicles to pass.... a pavement for pedestrian safety would be essential. This is the highest part of the Village and any houses would inevitably break the sky-line and add to the already very noticeable mass of housing as one enters the Village. Why, when the Govt., Inspector declared 10 houses near the Police house to be inappropriate, can it be imagined that 25-35 houses will be acceptable? The traffic that this number would generate would be a danger coming out onto Front Road, on a hill where there is a considerable bend. The Inspector noted that in practice this bend gives a more reduced line of sight than it would appear on the map. He also makes the point that a mass of housing at this point would completely change the character of the village when approached from the Tenterden Road. I refer again to the Village Statement and ask that the views expressed are taken into consideration with regard to Landscape and suitable Style, hipped roofs, etc., if and when Planning Permission is sought. I feel that this publication should be recommended to any Developers at the outset of any strong interest being shown.</p>
56	<p>Woodchurch has had a great deal of development over the last 20 years-Bridge Close, Windmill Close, The Paddocks, Woodchurch House (68 bedrooms), Rectory Close, Cherry Orchard as well as numerous infill developments. We can evidence appropriate</p>

	<p>development but need to be careful we don't over urbanise a very rural village that ultimately has poor public transport links. We have no train station and an irregular bus service, meaning that anyone who works must own a car. In terms of housing allocation for the borough, this should be a significant barrier to large scale development in the parish.</p> <p>In view of the above, I feel that careful consideration should be given to the fact that Woodchurch has permitted its fair share of modern development and should therefore be spared excessive further development.</p>
57	<p>None of the sites affect us directly but we are concerned at the possibility of a significant number of houses being built. We are concerned that the rural nature of Woodchurch village will be adversely affected and many existing residents will have their views of the countryside impaired by these developments. Furthermore, we wonder whether the infrastructure of the village will be able to cope with hundreds more houses - specifically in terms of drainage and schooling. We were also concerned to learn from a Councillor, who attended the meeting, that the Council may relax the current rules relating to the provision of what are known as affordable houses. This was a significant factor in the debate about the planning application for houses on Front Road last year - there is a feeling in the village that we don't want executive houses but a genuine mix of types of property. Simon Jenkins, chairman of the National Trust, said on Question Time this week that houses should be built on brownfield sites in and around towns and cities, which is where the accommodation is needed. Why go for greenfield sites and gobble up precious rural landscapes? These will be lost forever. We moved to Woodchurch 3 years ago because of its rural nature and village quality. Building 100s of houses around and in the village seems a retrograde step and we oppose it.</p>
58	<p>The impact of large scale building within the village would impose extra pressure on the drainage/sewage system; lack of spaces for children to attend the village schoole; increase in the number of people wishing to register with the village surgery. What infrastructure would be needed to be put in place - who knows. How much would be "affordable" housing?</p>
59	<p>It seems reasonable that Woodchurch does have gradual housing growth but major development should be for towns/cities not rural villages.</p> <p>There are no local employment opportunities to justify any large development.</p> <p>There should be no significant development in Woodchurch without a major upgrading of the sewage treatment plant which is already unable to cope. It cannot be right that those residents already affected by flooding due to the current inadequate plant are further troubled.</p> <p>Before any development is allowed plans and finance should be in place to ensure adequate upgrading of local services such as schools and GP surgery.</p> <p>Planning Development and KCC should take account of road safety to ensure that any development will have an access road with unrestricted vision and be wide enough for two vehicles passing.</p>
60	<p>The two sites suggested in Lower Road appear to have the most to offer and/or are perhaps the least objectionable.</p> <p>They are connected by existing pavements to village services.</p>

	<p>Services already exist in/along Lower Road.</p> <p>In the past it has been argued that ‘the open view up to the church should be retained but that argument can be applied to any potential development site in the village.</p> <p>Some limited development along Lower Road could remove the impression that it’s simply a country road and result in a reduction of speeding vehicles.</p> <p>a. The proposal of the Bourne field ensures access directly from Lower Road plus a piece of land to be added to the open green site of The Green.</p> <p>b. The proposal of the Ransley field could similarly have wide and safe access from Lower Road (<u>access through Kirkwood should not be supported as that would disadvantage those residents</u>).</p>
61	<p>1. Can the current infrastructure take such any such developments? There were serious sewage flooding issues earlier in the year both on the lower end of The Green and at the lower end of Front Road.</p> <p>2. By increasing the number of houses, there is the probability of losing the intimacy of any village.</p> <p>3. A major attraction of village life is obviously the rural outlook - fields, crops, wildlife, nature walks etc - and once permission is given for one development, there is likely to be the domino effect encircling the whole of Woodchurch.</p> <p>4. If the development of 10 houses goes ahead, traffic will increase greatly through the village and Front Road would be especially affected. As it is, there are often a number of cars parked on both sides of Front Road so this could therefore become a more dangerous road with speeding especially prevalent right by the children's play area.</p>
62	<p>We write to you as (soon-to-be) home owners in the village and to put forth our voice and opinions concerning the various potential development sites. We don’t believe that our opinions are going to be vastly different from those that you will have already heard but thought it prudent to send them on.</p> <p>Ashford Borough Council’s Local-Plan-to-2030 is certainly ambitious and we realise that housing issues must be addressed. However, a large-scale development would not be particularly beneficial for the village and its residents or the area as a whole. Woodchurch is already a large village but the community feel that it has is one of its great draws. It is an active and interesting community with lots going on. We feel that Woodchurch would most certainly lose that community feel if a large site submission such as Susan’s Hill, in particular, be allowed to progress. There would certainly be immense pressure on village amenities such as the school and the doctors’ surgery. The roads and train lines are already overwhelmed, underserviced and expensive to use. The increased volume of people and traffic that even a few homes (let alone 90!) would bring would not be particularly welcome or safe for our families. Local employment would be needed and I am not sure that it is currently even adequate in the immediate area. The loss of the countryside in views as well as natural habitats is an obvious victim of development but one that should not be taken lightly. Various agencies are constantly telling us that England is at real risk of losing what it is so rightly known for: its amazing countryside and the way in which it is looked after and protected. We must remember that the countryside is not just for</p>

	<p>those that live in or around it. It is vital for everyone to enjoy but especially those that live in cities and towns and do not have the opportunity to engage with nature on a regular basis.</p> <p>There are definitely some site submissions and their development ideas that smack of greed. We really hope that Ashford Borough Council is able to see past these and take into account the concerns of residents and arrive at a mutually beneficial conclusion.</p>
63	<p>I do not support any further development in Woodchurch. The village has been subject to in filling and expansion to the extent that it has already become too large. If I wanted to live in a large urban area I could have chosen to live on one of the large estates in Ashford, but I want my family and I to live in this village in the heart of the garden of England. Any further development will spoil this lovely place and raise the question of why should we put up with the disadvantages of living in a remote village.</p>
64	<p>I have received the email regarding the future proposed development of Woodchurch and would like you to know that I totally agree with everything other villagers have said. We do not need high cost, large houses. We need affordable housing with some bungalows. We also need somebody to recognise that our drainage and general infrastructure does not appear to be adequate and there would seem to have been no full survey of this. I say that in view of the Architect (<i>of the current plan for developing 82 - 120 Front Road</i>) having not considered his plans for drainage yet (at least that is what he said at the Friday meeting).</p>
65	<p>Any change to our village will be opposed by those who are frightened by change as documented by the comments viewed on the website. Change can and should be managed and can if managed correctly and sympathetically be positive for the village. This village has a distinct north/south divide which is unhealthy socially and in terms of diversity. Where do you want all of your , young doctors, nurses, teachers &amp; tradesmen/women to live ? Everyone wants local services, doctors, teachers and services etc....perhaps there should be a ghetto area built out of sight somewhere in the deprived areas of East Kent and the good folk of Woodchurch can continue to live in what they believe to be their rural idyll. It is going to happen, like it or not folks !! Get on board or you're going to see something that really is objectionable !!</p>
66	<p>It is clear that the proposed sites and the vast number of dwellings proposed will have quite an impact on the village.</p> <p>Firstly the sewage system: this last winter we had raw sewage running down The Green to join up with Lower Road. This made for a very unpleasant walk to school - especially for the children who love to jump in puddles, I have to explain that the water bubbling out of the drain covers like fountains was in fact water from other peoples toilets and the smell was quite potent.</p> <p>So the proposed sites:26,28,29 and 69 will just add to this issue and I can't see that the builders will do anything to address this as it will eat into their all important profit margin and would take a lot of road works along Lower Road to improve the situation. Another comment mentioned that the water companies were unable/unwilling to rectify this problem.</p> <p>By concreting over these fields would move the flood waters, from the roads, to potentially flood the houses and bungalows opposite, all of which lie below the road level.</p> <p>The sewage problem will not improve, cannot be brushed under the carpet and even if ignored long enough will not go away!</p> <p>The 'powers that be' have decided that they wish us all to live in tightly packed concrete jungles, living in each other's pockets. When look at the newer estates and 'cul-de-sacs' the houses are built very close together, with very little off road parking</p>

and very narrow roads; these don't allow for visitor parking.

As a residence of Lower Road, where there is a lot of on road parking, it is sometimes impossible to park outside my own home, the new sites will just over spill on to the main roads of Lower Road and Front Road. Both these roads are very busy and very fast, I don't think many of the vehicles stick to the 30mph limit and walking along The Green one does take their life in their own hands. Adding to the traffic in the numbers proposed is just un-realistic.

Even a modest 3 bed house will have a minimum of 2 cars, when the offspring of the parents become teenagers they will need their own transport. Children are staying at home with mum and dad longer before they can afford to get on the housing ladder, before we know it each house could have a minimum of 4 Cars, with only enough parking for 2 cars - where will these cars park? The buyers of these houses will not consider the fact they can only park 2 cars off the road or the fact that the road outside their house is too narrow to park when they are choosing their new home. It will just cause a lot of ill feeling amongst the neighbourhood.

When driving around the village, local villages and towns there are a lot of abandoned, unused and derelict buildings and sites. Wouldn't these sites, that have become an eyesore, be a more suitable location to improve to add more suitable and beautiful accommodation. I'm sure the local residence would welcome improvements to these areas. Before encroaching on green belt and conservation areas.

Have the planners actually driven past all the proposed sites at all times of the day. Driving past the school at drop off and pick up is just an accident waiting to happen. Adding to the traffic to these areas is a bad idea on so many levels. The junction to Susans Hill is quite a blind spot; to add more cars to this junction would be suicide.

Increasing the traffic though Rectory Close will only infuriate the residence further at the school drop off and pick up times. The new residence will not consider the impact of the school run to the access to their houses and will complain endlessly when they do realise. The potential buyers who do see the problem will be put off - making these new houses difficult to sell...More empty houses....just what we need.

The current residents of Rectory Close already complain about the limited access to their homes during school run times, all these houses were built long after the school was - none of these complaining residence had the foresight to see that there could be an access issue at certain times of the day.

A bit more realistic consideration needs to take place.

I can see that the planners/developers have started unrealistically big so when a revised smaller proposal is put forward we will all 'jump for joy' - we are not that stupid.