

Our Ref: DJ/HO/30072

**Mr D Carter  
Planning Department  
Ashford Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Tannery Lane  
Ashford  
Kent  
TN23 1PL**

20 May 2009

Dear Daniel

**Proposals for Mixed Use Development, Land at Ashford Road, Hamstreet**

Further to our recent telephone discussions and emails, I enclose as requested one copy each of:

- Site survey photographs, drawing no. 1484-01
- Survey of vegetation, drawing no. 1484-02 Revision A
- Master Plan Strategy Option 1, drawing no. 1484-04
- Master Plan Strategy Option 2, drawing no. 1484-05
- Blank copy of questionnaire made available at exhibition for residents to complete
- Our report on 29 completed questionnaires handed in at the exhibition.

The purpose of the exhibition was to give local residents the opportunity to comment on the emerging proposals for the proposed site at Ashford Road, Hamstreet; we are conscious that the village workshops which have taken place so far have been by invitation only, and also that full details of the proposals submitted to your authority would not necessarily have been made available to participants at the workshops.

The exhibition was publicised by an advertisement in the Parish newsletter, in addition notices were displayed a couple of days before the exhibition, both on lampposts, and in suitable local facilities including shops and the public house.

The exhibition was attended by approximately 50 people, many of whom stayed for a considerable time, to discuss the proposals with myself, my colleague Eoin O'Connor, and Julian Bore of Lloyd Bore Landscape Architects.

The questionnaire did not seek a specific response from local residents on whether or not they favoured the principle of development in this location, although an open question was provided, to allow comments on this, or

any other matter. We considered that such a response is best made in the wider context of the proposals for the village as a whole, which will be put forward in due course in the Tenterden and Rural Areas Site Allocations DPD.

The information gathered from the questionnaire responses will be of great value to us, in formulating the finer detail of proposals which will be submitted to your authority, as part of your formal consultation, these proposals will be in the form of a single preferred option which will of course remain subject to further consideration on matters of detail.

You will note from the questionnaire results document that 29 questionnaires were completed and left at the exhibition itself; of the total of 100 which have been printed, 51 were taken by residents attending, either to complete themselves after the event, or to pass additional copies to friends or neighbours in the village. We will allow a couple of weeks for any further questionnaire responses to be completed, and produce a short supplementary note.

At this stage, you will note the comments of local residents with regard to the type of houses considered appropriate (greatest favour shown for 2 or 3 bedroom homes, and housing for the elderly; 6 persons commented that they did not wish to see any houses provided).

Affordable housing was supported by the majority of respondents (24 for, 4 opposed); from discussions, residents did raise the matter of whether it could be guaranteed that such housing would be made available for residents of the parish, or immediately surrounding area. This is a matter of detail on which we would appreciate further discussions in due course.

The outline proposals include an area for local employment; we indicated a preference for office use, which is also reflected in the questionnaire responses, you will also note that light industrial workshops were supported by a minority of persons attending. Residents also made a number of other suggestions concerning facilities needed in the village.

With regard to the proposal for a new drop-off and parking area for the school, this received support from the majority of respondents (21 in favour, 6 against); it is clear from our discussions that the absence of such a facility is a genuine problem for the village at present.

Similarly, a proposal for traffic calming in this location was favoured by the majority of respondents (23 in favour, 5 against); the detailed comments also suggest traffic calming may be appropriate in other locations within the village.

With regard to the proposal for a playing field for the primary school, and public open space, this was again supported by a majority, with 18 in favour, and 11 against; the additional comments expressed a variety of views, on the type of facility required, where people supported such provision.

The final question, seeking additional comments, was taken as an opportunity by residents to address a variety of issues, including in some cases opposition to the principle of development in this location.

I am sure you will find these comments of interest, as many relate to wider issues in the village.

Finally, we would welcome the opportunity to have a discussion with yourself and your colleagues, concerning the emerging proposals, ideally within the next few weeks, I will contact you to see if we can arrange a mutually convenient date.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely

**David Jarman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

For and on behalf of  
Hobbs Parker Property Consultants LLP

e: david.jarman@hobbsparker.co.uk

Encs.

Cc. Mr and Mrs T Gotke  
Mr J Bore, Lloyd Bore Landscape Architects

---

Completed	-	29
Incomplete	-	20
Taken from exhibition	-	51
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>100</b>

**Q1) TYPE OF HOUSES APPROPRIATE**

1/2 bed apartments	-	6
2 bed homes	-	10
3 bed homes	-	19
4 bed homes	-	9
5 bed homes	-	2
Elderly accommodation	-	15

**Other comments**

- No houses \* 6

**Q2) PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Yes	-	24
No	-	4

**Other comments**

- No more houses
- How can you guarantee houses go to local people
- Not housing association, housing for public sector/NHS staff. MOAT style housing

**Q3) LOCAL EMPLOYMENT**

Light industrial workshops	-	7
Small office suites	-	12
Other	-	5

**Other comments**

- Bakery \* 4
- Butcher\*4
- Greengrocers\* 3
- Tea shop \*3
- Farm shop \* 3
- More shops \*2
- Chip Shop
- No employment\*5
- Forestry
- Animal Husbandry
- Conservation Work
- None unless safe access is provided to school site for pedestrians via bridge

- Too many empty units already

#### **Q4) PROVISION OF A NEW DROP OFF AND PARKING AREA**

Yes - 21  
No - 6

##### **Other comments**

- Not drop off, just parking
- Will need a crossing or bridge
- Does not like the two options;
- Only on field opposite, no houses or industrial units
- Support the need for it but not the houses
- Would prefer it to be on the school side of Ashford Road above stumble tree farm;
- Parking not drop-off area;
- Parking in roadway should then be restricted with double yellow lines;
- Parents should escort their children to school, drop off would cause more chaos;
- Safe access is essential for the school;
- A foot bridge needs to be provided;
- Too much congestion in this area;
- As long as the parents use it;

#### **Q5) TRAFFIC CALMING**

Yes - 23  
No - 5

##### **Other comments**

- From Hamstreet cross road towards Warehorne up to by-pass bridge;
- Warehorne road has become a single lane road in effect due to parking and the development at park farm had made things worse, the local roads cannot support extra housing \*3
- Need Road Humps all the way through Ashford Road
- Yes to traffic calming but not linked to development\*3;
- Cross roads outside pub should have roundabout
- Junction to Warehorne opposite the pub, people go too fast through the village
- Cock Lane and Marsh Road
- Roundabout of 2070 to Tenterden
- On main street near shops
- Cotton hill\*2
- Land to the west of the school should be used
- 20Mph and car park
- Speed trap on top and bottom of Ashford Road
- All approaches to the village
- Entire main road, needs 20mph electronic signs as minimum
- Top of hill
- Junction with by-pass
- 20mph through out the village
- Main priority for parking for school
- 2070 from junction with marsh road to end of speed limit ½ way to canal.
- Ashford Road, Marsh Road, Ruckinge Road

## Q6)PLAYING FIELD AND OPEN SPACE

Yes - 18  
No - 11

### Other comments

- For use of school only\*2;
- Field used for recreation only no additional housing ie. Cricket pitch, the proposed dwellings will complain about the noise;
- Scheme doesn't help safety
- Not supported by school
- Not the right type of playing field
- The village does not need additional facilities \*3
- Cricket Pitch
- Do not clutter open space with facilities
- Wild Meadow lands
- No houses just open space
- Adult play exercise area as other towns have done
- Play area for small children and off road cycle area for older children
- Lancaster close has a play space, any space should be used for parking
- Skate board ramp
- More Family areas

## Q7) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Opposed to development because it affects our current views from No.7 St Mary's Close;
- If permitted the residents of the Close should be consulted;
- Would like natural boundaries such as woods and water feature between close and development \* 2;
- Changing the current road layout important;
- Recognise the need for the proposal
- I live in St Mary's Close and if I had to make a choice it would be the option with the playing field adjacent to our garden;
- The proposed development will increase problems during peak school hours particularly at the start of the day when parents are trying to drop off children and others are going to work;
- Parking area not sufficient to solve problem;
- No demand for houses in the village, 20+ are presently for sale;
- Lancaster close and some infilling should be able to meet requirements;
- The current infrastructure cannot sustain the extra houses;
- Didn't feel the event was adequately advertised \* 2;
- Scheme do not have support of school or parish council, the parish council has identified more sustainable sites for development
- Leave our Village alone
- Do not build
- No industrial units near school
- Drainage
- Traffic caused by development will lead to hold-ups
- Extending village outwards
- School drop off is not supported because it is for parents outside village
- The school can develop its own playing field
- Providing offices in this location would cause a traffic nightmare at peak times

- Area to the west of the school be where the school extends not across the road
- Children will be crossing a busy highway, not good planning
- Development will ruin the rural setting of our home Stumbletree Cottage
- Hamstreet does not need to grow more
- Would prefer traditional houses with low carbon footprint to contemporary houses
- The village does not have a need for additional private houses or office space;
- Affordable housing is fine
- Traffic is bad at school
- The main priority is school parking, development is acceptable as long as parking is correct
- Access to playing field a problem for school
- Houses must have family areas and gardens