We note with dismay a revised application for these works, to which we have previously strongly objected. Our objections, as residents in Westerham on the corner of the A25 and Goodley Stock Road, remain. The objections outlined below also cover our neighbours at Nos 2 & 3 who have asked to be included in this written objection. We remain strongly opposed to this application for the following reasons:

1. Pollution: If this application is approved the huge increase in the volume of traffic on the A25 and all surrounding roads will cause unacceptable levels of pollution to residents, local businesses and school children.
2. Traffic: In the five years we have been resident in Westerham, we have already seen a noticeable increase in traffic on roads that take a heavy battering from ordinary traffic, let alone larger vehicles, and which were not designed to do so. An even bigger increase in traffic volume will naturally and quite obviously lead to a big deterioration in the state of the A25 and surrounding roads, for which the local authority will have to find the funds to fix. As there are already numerous potholes and roads that remain in poor condition that are not being fixed (we assume because the councils do not have the money to do so), this situation will not improve and these roads will be left to get worse and worse.
3. Sweep Paths: We can find no fully detailed surveys highlighting vehicle sweep paths within the planning application. Has there not been a suitable AUTORACK sweep survey conducted of the roads that will be used to access the Moorehead development, in particular the A25 through Westerham from Goodley Stock Road down to the A233 junction towards Sevenoaks, showing sweep paths for the various HGV types, lorries, small vans and cars passing through the village in both directions (at the same time), with all the correct road widths indicated and highlighting the numerous pinch points? With many years experience within the civil engineering industry, I would suggest it will show that it simply does not work, and that the section of road (as noted above) cannot cope with vehicles of this sort and frequency. I would have been very interested in this survey being included in the planning process to help determine the outcome.
4. Traffic bottlenecks/pinch points: Those of us who regularly use these roads are aware of the pinch points which are already an issue. It is stating the obvious that an increase in traffic, let alone the enormous increase in traffic that will result if this application is approved, will make it unacceptable worse. Traffic already has a problem flowing in certain areas – this can only get worse, not better. Any argument to the contrary is quite obviously false and I simply do not understand how the people trying to get this application through think it will be otherwise/how they can sell this so that it appears no-one will suffer. We all know this is incorrect. It would be good to have someone explain to us how many more times the applicants will try to amend their application so that it is tweaked in some way to get through. The application is what it is: a proposal that will allow more traffic, more noise, more pollution and more misery for local residents and businesses. For these people, there are only negatives here, no positives.
5. Noise: This point speaks for itself. No-one connected with the making of this application could possibly contend that the noise levels will remain the same. That simply isn’t possible. This is a relatively quiet but bustling, commuter, community based old market town, whose charm, way of life and the enjoyment it provides not just to local residents but to all who visit Westerham is gradually and sadly being eroded.
We must work together to do all we can to stop this.
6. General: We can only imagine how those residents must feel whose properties are much closer to the site than our own. Are there any formal objections lodged by Sunny County Council Highways and/or Kent Highways? If not, why not? If so, we would like to see the contents of those objections. With increased traffic, massive issues at pinch points (and the actions that motorists/pedestrians will be forced to spur of the moment to keep themselves safe from harm) and massive amounts of extra pollution, this application clearly poses a danger. This development is very clearly NOT in the public interest because it is going to local residents and businesses, they will advise they do not want this application to be approved. And it is the voices of precisely these people who should carry the most weight because these are the people that will suffer the most. How will this building enhance the surrounding area? It will not, nor is there any place for this kind of development in a location that is both an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and part of the Green Belt. What about the negative impact on property prices? For those owners closer to the site who simply would not be able to cope with the increase in all things bad, will they be compensated if they are either unable to sell their properties or forced to sell them at below-market rate? I suspect not. This is grossly unfair at best and at worse could financially cripple some households. In all good conscience, who will take responsibility for that? The fact that there might be a “revised parking layout” and “revised landscaping plan” does absolutely nothing to change the fundamentals of this application: an unwanted, harmful and potentially dangerous increase in traffic, pollution and noise.

With all the above points in mind, we respectfully request that this planning application be declined.