

Green Spaces:

My intention is that the ten sites referred to on page 22 should be listed as local green space - the 7 sites referred to as being proposed by TWBC and the 3 sites that the NP was proposing to designate. However the revised Table 7.1 and the map only show 6 of the sites and do not refer to Hook Green Common meadow, the second Brewer Street Allotment, the common land at The Down and Hook Green and the riverbank adjacent to the rear of Brewer Street. If these other areas are to be designated then they need to be shown in the table and on the map. Can these be amended.

The original green sites were sent into TWBC as draft sites and after further discussion we have decided that there is only 5 greenspaces that meet the specifications set by TWBC PS Local Plan LGS

Methodology https://tunbridgewells.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/388043/Local-Green-Space-Designation-Methodology-update_2021.pdf

Many of the sites including The Down, Hook Green Commonland and Lamberhurst Green - were previously proposed for designation in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan for their recreational value and richness of wildlife. However, in accordance with the revised methodology for Regulation 19, the sites are considered to be already sufficiently protected under other local and/or national designations and Policies (i.e. Common Land)

The South Allotments in Brewer Street – the Parish Council requested that be removed from the list as further uses of the land were being considered.

In the case of Coggers Hall we can no longer find sufficient evidence to designate this as a green space.

Turning now to Policy L3 the policy itself refers to the six key views but overleaf 12 are listed . I assume that the 12 views are to be covered by the policy as key views and I can list them in the policy. However I wish to clarify firstly with reference to View 4 which is referred to on page 28. In the Key Views Evidence paper it shows the position in what appears to be the centre of the field and the public footpath appears to run along the western edge of the site . If there is no public access to that viewpoint I do not consider that it can be protected as a key view. Can you clarify whether the public can legitimately access that viewpoint to enjoy the view as shown in the photograph. On the matter of the Key Views document in terms of View 8, am I right in thinking that the public footpath runs at the opposite end of the row of properties on Sands Road rather than as shown which appears to be in someone garden, Incidentally I also think the document has the wrong title for View 6 which is correctly described in the policy. .

On reflection, all 12 valued views should be detailed in Policy L3, all the views can be enjoyed by members of the public on PROWs or public highways. Specifically, view 4 is on a very popular PROW near the Scotney estate on the previous papers we sent you this was shown incorrectly and a revised copy is attached. View 8 is from another popular public footpath that runs from Sand Road to the School. We are happy to revise the title of view 6 which has multiple viewpoints.

There may be some other issues that crop up as I write the report but in the spirit of pressing on quickly I thought I would raise these issues with you Graham immediately .

Can this email and your response also be put on the website in the interest of transparency.