

Platt **562516 156589** **11 November 2013** **TM/12/01373/FL**
Borough Green And
Long Mill

Proposal: Section 73 application to vary conditions 1 (direction of shooting); 2 (maximum number of archers and club use); of planning permission TM/12/01294/FL (Retrospective application for engineering operation to alter archery field by cutting bank to south west and deposit arisings to north west)

Location: Land Rear Of The Butts Beechinwood Lane Platt Sevenoaks Kent TN15 8QN

Applicant: Mr William Terry

1. Description:

- 1.1 This application was withdrawn from the meeting of the Area 2 Committee on 17 April 2013 following the receipt of additional information from ArcheryGB which needed further investigation and consultation. The previous main and supplementary reports are attached. Applications (A) and (B) were both approved at that meeting - these being retention of engineering works and a retrospective application to retain a toilet block comprising 2 WCs.
- 1.2 This remaining application (referred to as application (C) previously) relates to an altered archery area changed in 2011/2012 and that is the subject of this report.
- 1.3 The history of this site is complex and is described in the previous annexed report.
- 1.4 The result of the 2005 appeal meant that the field was permitted to remain in use for archery subject to a number of conditions, key ones relevant in this case being:
 - Use to be restricted to private, recreational and practice purposes.
 - Archery activities to be carried out in strict accordance with the standards and requirements of the Grand National Archery Society (GNAS - now renamed "Archery GB").
 - Direction of shooting to be as specified in the letter accompanying the application (one way only in a west north-westerly direction).
- 1.5 In March 2010, significant engineering operations of a new nature involving an enlargement of the archery field beyond anything previously considered were undertaken. A retrospective application was intended to facilitate/accommodate 2 way shooting (as promoted by the British Long Bow Society) with a Longbow in the York Round.

- 1.6 That case was complex and raised a lot of public concern. It was resolved that the element of the proposal that involved the introduction of southwards-facing shooting was not acceptable due to the impact on actual and perceived safety. The planning permission was conditioned accordingly.
- 1.7 Since that planning permission, it has been noted that southwards shooting of bows had taken place and consequently a Breach of Condition Notice was served in March 2013 under delegated authority.
- 1.8 This current application is to re-apply for south and south east shooting (i.e. 2-way); to allow a club use with no restriction on numbers and to allow bows more than 50lb draw weight. The submitted plans indicate a car park area of 40 spaces. The applicant's rationale for this application, which was to vary conditions imposed on a planning application granted early 2012, is summarised as follows:
- *Two way shooting will be accommodated by the widening of the field at its southern end.*
 - *To the south the overshoot will be not less than 20 yards for the maximum range of 100 yards and arrows will be contained by high banks in keeping with BLBS and GNAS/ArcheryGB guidelines. The recommended 20 yards side safety margin from the boundary hedge/fence as this applies to Boneashe Lane would become a mandatory condition should two way shooting be approved.*
 - *The limitation on the number of archers should be determined by the size of the field and the number of targets that can be safely erected - 4 archers could shoot at one of 8 bosses - giving a maximum of 32 in attendance.*
 - *All archers would be members of the British Longbow Society and would be a collective body recognised as a de facto club. Public indemnity insurance would pertain for each shooting member. A properly constituted club offers a more regulated form of shooting.*
 - *Two-way shooting will allow for controlled competitive shooting. This does not disturb residents and as this is not a spectator sport, it serenely blends with a rural environment. Initial hostility alleging congestion in sunken lanes has not been substantiated.*
 - *It is not practicable nor enforceable to limit the maximum draw weight to 50lbs. Longbows crafted by artisans are not stamped with a bow weight; "string follow" will quickly let down from 56lbs to 50 lbs; a bow weight greater than 50lbs is normally needed to hit targets at 100 yd distance. Bow weight does not affect actual or perceived safety.*
 - *The application is accompanied by a letter from the Regional Judge which states that the Longbow shooting entails bows of up to 70lb weight and that*

provided the BLBS Rules are adhered to, then shooting can be safely carried out at the Butts.

- *The Regional Judge has signed a layout which shows the outer extents of safety lines for side and overshoot purposes.*

- 1.9 Just before the 17 April 2013 Area 2 Committee meeting, a report was submitted by the applicant, signed by 2 judges of ArcheryGB (Hannah Brown and Mark Davis) who inspected and approved (subject to a number of specified caveats) Mr Terry's archery arena in April 2013. It is assumed that this was in response to concerns expressed in the 17 April report on application (C), namely non-compliance with the Rules of the BLBS (British Long Bow Society).
- 1.10 In support of the planning application, the applicant also submitted a copy of his April 2013 application to ArcheryGB for registration of a club called "West Kent Archery Society". This required a "VENUE SURVEY" document dated April 2013.
- 1.11 The case officer was subsequently advised by Anne Rook (the ArcheryGB Insurance officer) on 22 August 2013 that no such club was registered with Archery GB. However, it now appears that was an admin error on Ms Rook's part and that the WKAS was indeed registered with ArcheryGB in May 2013 and consequently Ms Rook has confirmed that the Club's activities would be insured by ArcheryGB subject to the restrictions therein.
- 1.12 Hannah Brown is the Chairman of the Judges for ArcheryGB and I understand that she can be invited by an individual or a club to inspect grounds, although that is not compulsory. Such grounds may include any that may not necessarily be where a club is based. She has advised that there is no requirement for a club's grounds to be inspected by a Judge, this is discretionary and it is assumed this Inspection was sought on this occasion by the applicant in seeking to respond to the Committee report published in April 2013.
- 1.13 Regarding the papers on which Hannah Brown based her Declaration dated 9 April 2013, it is noted that the diagram of the ground submitted by Mr Terry did not appear to clearly give the features (a) to (e) as requested by the relevant application form. Similarly, it was not clear as to how the "accurate dimensions" were conveyed to the Judge, the aerial photograph on the application being unscaled and 3 years old. The Harrington plan attached to the VENUE SURVEY (WT/2010/06) did not have clear dimensions. Hannah Brown has advised that she and Mark Davis satisfy themselves from their own personal inspection and tape and laser measurement of the archery site and so the absence of full and accurate information provided by Mr Terry on the form is not therefore relevant, in their opinion.
- 1.14 I have asked Hannah Brown to comment on why Mr Terry says "no" to the question "is the ground shared with any other activity as the Butts clearly does

include the main house of the Butts in which Mr Terry resides. There is also a self contained annex occupied residentially by a member of his staff.

- 1.15 Hannah Brown's response on that point is that the Judges consider the bank on the southern end of the arena to foreshorten the requisite overshoot buffer and thus the Annex, Mr Terry's own house, the WC block and the parking do not share the "ground" where the shooting takes place, in their interpretation. Hannah Brown has confirmed that she and her Judge colleague were made fully aware of a proposed 40 space car park and toilets intended to serve the archers etc, sited beyond the southern boundary formed by the bank. In their opinion, provided there is "control" of the entrance to the top of the bank, they do not have any concerns that people using the WC block or car park area will be put at risk from being in those areas.
- 1.16 Similarly, whilst part of the side safety margin lies on land used in connection with a commercial light industrial use, because the Judges caveat that fencing panels are to be installed in that corner, that foreshortens the side safety margin to exclude the neighbouring land from the "ground".
- 1.17 Hannah Brown advises that if Mr Terry wishes to have up to 32 archers in a competition, that can be with groups of 8 archers shooting at 4 targets set at 2.5m spacings between centres and thus the 2 Judges were both satisfied that safety can be met within the dimensions of the field when shooting southbound. Essentially, as the targets are 4 ft in diameter (1.22m), the minimum outer edge to outer edge of 4 targets would be 8.72m.
- 1.18 In their interpretation that means that 4 targets can be fitted within the tapered southern end of the ground. It is noteworthy that the 2.5m separation between target centres given by ArcheryGB judge differs from the 10 feet separation (3.05m) in the BLBS Rules but that adds 1.65m to the width of the line of targets (ie increasing the edge to edge to a distance of 10.34m), which can still be accommodated safely according to the Judges, subject to the caveats imposed by them.
- 1.19 Notwithstanding that ArcheryGB does not require a capability for 2 way shooting, the Judges state that southwards shooting here can be safe, in their expertise.
- 1.20 Finally, in her letter of 11 April 2012, Hannah Brown referred to the site being safe for club shooting within the BLBS Rules. She has since confirmed that this was a typing error and that she has no knowledge of the BLBS Rules and no authority to comment on an activity taking place under the banner of BLBS.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 The complex planning history and the locally controversial nature of the application.

3. The Site:

3.1 This is as described in the Annexed report.

4. Planning History:

4.1 The revised history since the April 2013 Committee is as follows:

TM/12/01294/FL Approved 3 May 2013

Retrospective application for engineering operation to alter archery field by cutting bank to south west and deposit arisings to north west

TM/12/01951/FL Approved 3 May 2013

Retention of detached w.c. block for use by staff and persons using the archery field (retrospective)

5. Consultees (additional responses since April 2013)

5.1 PC: We would reiterate all our previous concerns about this application. We see this as a further attempt to achieve the Applicant's original intention of two way club shooting. This has been refused before and upheld on appeal and we fail to see that this further evidence justifies you varying your conditions applied to TM/10/00875/FL. Conditions 1 and 6 were applied *"in the interest of the actual and perceived public safety of the area"*. This additional information does not alter that fact. Condition 2 was applied *"in the interest of highway and rural amenities"*. Again this information does not alter this. We have expressed on many occasions that the access to and from The Butts is not conducive to any increase in traffic. *We would urge you to refuse this application and maintain the conditions you deemed applicable previously.*

5.2 We fail to see the relevance of this additional information. It does not alter our previous objections and we would still urge you to stand by your reasoning for the conditions placed on the previous consent. If anything, it reinforces our concerns that the applicant always wanted competitions (*"Mr. Terry wished to have up to 32 archers in a competition"*) with parking available (*"you were made fully aware of a proposed 40 space car park and toilets"*). We have not been advised of these developments but would trust that with the amount of local interest concerning this site, we should have been. Regardless of all this additional information, fed to you in apparently piecemeal fashion, the application still requests that you allow two way shooting and an increase in the number of participants. Your original conditions were based on *"public safety of the area"* and *"the interest of highway and rural amenities."* These have not changed; hence we see no reason for your conditions to be relaxed.

5.3 Private Reps: At the time of writing this report, 3 further objections are as follows:

- I am dismayed that yet another "retrospective" application has been made on this property and feel that the applicant is undermining "the democratic process".
- The appeal Inspector decision included conditions imposed for good reason, imposed by a highly qualified and independent planner after lengthy debate by all parties. Illogical for these to be varied or granted retrospective permission. Urge Council once again to refuse the applications.
- Nothing has changed. Mr Terry has got what he said he wanted bows and arrows for 6 - 8 friends. He now wants more. The site is unsuitable for more cars. Boneashe Lane is practically impassable - in part due to the stone walls Mr Terry has built. Beechin Wood Lane has been designated a quiet lane for walkers. It is still next to listed houses and a conservation area which all wish to continue to enjoy without extra traffic driving round and round trying to find The Butts. Please don't allow this further application which makes a mockery of the whole planning process.
- We do not see that the information received changes the situation and believe that the conditions placed by TMBC should remain as they are still relevant. The public safety of the area and the interest of highway and rural amenities is vitally important.
- Our objections remain unchanged as we believe TMBC made the right decision when they set the conditions at the time of the original application.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 Policy DC5 of the MDE DPD relates to tourism and leisure. It is my view that DC5 does now apply to this application for a use which is no longer intended as a purely private recreational archery but a leisure facility of a type that it was intended should be encompassed by that policy. In addition, Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 includes safety as a material planning consideration in a general sense.
- 6.2 Policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS and policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD require the character and amenities of a locality to be safeguarded, including prevailing levels of tranquillity.
- 6.3 The archery field is adjoined by 2 residential gardens to the north, the garden of the host dwelling to the south and Boneashe Lane to the east. Residential amenities are required to be protected as per policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS.
- 6.4 There are a number of more detailed issues to assess in this application which includes inter-related elements of

- Lifting of restrictions on the use of the range to allow for a club use with potentially unrestricted numbers of participants.
- Introduction of 2-way shooting and perceived safety thereof.

- 6.5 The issues in terms of the MGB and countryside are the visual impact and the impact on openness. Relevant policies are CP1, CP3, CP14 and CP24 of the TMBCS.
- 6.6 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF requires protection of the Green Belt and recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. As is detailed in paragraph 81 of the NPPF, the MGB can provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation. The application seeks to facilitate an open recreation use suited to a rural environment – a recognised function for the Green Belt and thus in compliance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF.
- 6.7 The club use on the level indicated in the application and the indicative car parking area do not impact on the neighbouring residential amenities or the Conservation Area, in my view, in light of the intervening distances.
- 6.8 The restrictions on the use of the range for private recreational use reflected the wishes of the applicant at the time of the 2005 application and the condition was re-imposed by the appeal Inspector:

Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 4 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, the use of the site shall be restricted to use for the applicant's own private recreational and practice purposes in strict accordance with the details set out in the letter dated 27.04.05 from Robinson Escott Planning and no tournaments or events shall be held at the site.

- 6.9 The position was explained by the Inspector:

"absence of detailed numbers who might attend a tournament or event and there is a potential for problems on local roads which clearly have a limited capacity....Moreover there is at least a possibility of the transmission of noise from a gathering of large numbers of people in an area where the ambient noise is very low and where occupiers of properties in the Platt Conservation Area to the north could be affected...5 targets would limit participation to 20 archers. And provided that other attendees (spectators and tournament officials) do not add to this number significantly and there are safeguards in respect of noise, it may well be reasonable for the condition to be varied".

- 6.10 It is clear that the Inspector reached a conclusion based on the facts at the time and did not and could not purport to reach a definitive view on any future use – indeed in the absence of detail that would have been inappropriate. This aspect of the current proposal therefore needs to be assessed on its planning merits as they

currently apply. Notwithstanding the comments of the PC and many objectors, the imposition of a condition on a planning permission or on an appeal decision is not set in stone - the applicant has the prerogative to seek a variation and the LPA *must* consider such requests on their planning merits and factor in the views of the Inspector in his appeal decision as a material planning consideration, and in the context of current planning policy.

- 6.11 Members will note that the objections raised by local residents can be summarised as vehicular access being via designated quiet lanes, single track lanes said to be unsuitable for extra cars and traffic both for an official club and for club activities involving visiting archers from other clubs. Also there are concerns over litter and noise and general concern about impact on the rural amenities, MGB and nearby Conservation Area.
- 6.12 Members will note that KCC H&T does not support a refusal on highway grounds in the light of the applicant advising that the maximum number of participants would be 32 and the relatively infrequent number of events/competition. The applicant states that there are normally no officials or spectators in attendance – Target Captains are nominated from within the group of archers and a Field Captain controls overall shooting, and is usually a participating archer. Notwithstanding those submissions from the applicant, that does call into question the need for the indicative 40 space car park indicated on the former tennis court when the applicant estimates the maximum number of vehicles to be 25. On the basis that it is important in this case to avoid on-street parking due to the narrowness of the surrounding lanes, I am of the view that a 25 space car park could be acceptable in this case. It is to be sited on an area of the garden that will be screened from the public domain by trees and topography. However, it will need planning permission as an engineering operation and the principle of the size can be assessed in detail subsequently, if Members are minded to agree the recommendation
- 6.13 The applicant states that there would be 3 tournaments in the period April to September each year. Fixed rounds would last for between 3-5 hours. *Ad hoc* practice by club members would be between the hours of 10.30am to 6.00pm on Wednesdays and Thursdays and at weekends.
- 6.14 In the light of the ability to control the intensity of the non-private club use by condition, I would advise Members that there would not appear to be a highway safety reason to refuse this level of non-private use. I form this view in the knowledge that the access roads in the locality are single track and designated as “Quiet Lanes”. There is to be no use of amplified sound and in this context I do not consider a noise objection to the archery club *per se* can be substantiated. The proposal would not breach amenity protection required by Policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS nor Policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD which require prevailing levels of tranquillity to be conserved.

- 6.15 Similarly, whilst I note the objections that claim that a club use and tournaments would harm rural amenities, the MGB and nearby Conservation Area, such a low key use is consistent with NPPF and of course there are clear examples of more intensive recreational uses in the MGB than this, notwithstanding the accepted sensitivity of the locality. I therefore consider that there is compliance with paragraphs 17, 88, 90 and 137 of the NPPF.
- 6.16 Since February 2012, the approved direction of shooting is west, west-north-west and north west only. This means that the archers would stand with their backs to and shoot away from the host dwelling of the Butts and roughly obliquely towards the gardens of dwellings of Pigeons Green and The Barn. Any overshoot would be into open farmland owned by the applicant. The reason for the condition was “in the interests of public safety”.
- 6.17 Southwards shooting was not approved due to concerns over a *perception* of the lack of safety, which is a material planning consideration. It is therefore necessary to consider the 2 sets of safety rules pertaining to Archery at the site. The applicant originally stated that the BLBS Rules were adhered to. For shooting at 100yds, the BLBS Rules require an overshoot of 50 yds (45m) and a side buffer of 20 yds (18.29m).
- 6.18 The BLBS safety criteria are Rules. I am of the view that in assessing the “perception of safety” as experienced by local residents or neighbours, they should, as far as possible, need to feel confident that the BLBS Rules for safety are applied as “Rules” and not merely guidance/recommendations. The Rules specify that in terms of Field Safety, Annex A of the Rules shows recommended over-shoot and lateral safety distances. There is nothing in the Rules of the BLBS that specifies any scope for discretion such that the distances can be reduced or any other form of divergence can be introduced below the dimensions clearly shown in the Annex A.
- 6.19 In respect of the introduction of 2-way shooting with the Longbow, it is clear in the BLBS Rules that this is “allowed” but not mandatory. Therefore it appears that the introduction of 2-way shooting is only **necessary** in itself to allow formal competitive shooting at the Beechin Wood site. It appears to have arisen solely from the desire of the applicant to be part of the 2-way Longbow shooting “splinter group” as he described it in the 2010 application.
- 6.20 In response to these concerns, in May 2013 the applicant registered a club called “West Kent Archery Society” with ArcheryGB (formerly the GNAS - Grand National Archery Society) and, as a consequence, he states that he meets the Rules of the ArcheryGB. As detailed above, this has been endorsed by 2 Judges from ArcheryGB and the Insurance Officer of ArcheryGB.
- 6.21 Policy CP24 of the TMBCS refers to the safety of an area as being a policy objective. In the light of the endorsement by 2 Judges and the Insurance Officer of

ArcheryGB, Members may agree that previous safety concerns in terms of the proposed line of southwards target shooting can no longer be sustained.

- 6.22 The garden of the applicant's dwelling at Beechin Wood (and also the WC block and car park) falls outside the overshoot and margin recommended by the ArcheryGB because the bank foreshortens the distance of the buffer - that is, they state that the face of the bank will catch stray arrows.
- 6.23 In widening the archery field to move away from Boneashe Lane, the westerly safety buffer of 20 yards now falls outside land controlled by the applicant, being the curtilage of the commercial units of Beechin Wood Farm. However, the ArcheryGB Judges have approved this, subject to the erection and retention of fencing panels to this corner. Again, this engineering feature would foreshorten the side buffer satisfactorily in their judgement.
- 6.24 The applicant therefore now has endorsement that the health and safety of non-employees on his archery club site will be protected, including the car park area and the WC block.
- 6.25 In my view, notwithstanding the failure to adhere to the less pragmatic BLBS Rules, the stance of ArcheryGB supporting as safe southwards shooting at 100yds reduces the weight to be given by the council in terms of the perceived fears of the PC and local residents/occupiers that stray arrows may reach the public domain.
- 6.26 Whilst, in my April 2013 report, I advised Members that there appeared to be well-grounded fears arising from invalidation of the BLBS insurance as its Rules are breached (inasmuch as an uninsured activity compounds the perception of fear), the applicant now has a club registered and insured and judged to comply with the necessary Rules for ArcheryGB.
- 6.27 I have previously advised Members that the applicant has, in the past, openly admitted to having breached planning conditions for "pragmatism". Reputation and previous breaches of planning control are not normally material planning matters. In a case of this nature, Members may understand that previous behaviour does add weight to the local perception of a less than fully rigorous approach to safety in the minds of local residents and neighbouring land owners. However, on balance, in the light of the additional information presented since this case was last considered by Members, I have to advise that I can no longer recommend refusal as the balance now weighs in favour of the grant of a variation to the planning permission as requested following the additional information from ArcheryGB.

Conclusions

- 6.28 I appreciate that this case is complex and has raised a lot of public concern. In the light of all the information presented, I have concluded that the element of the proposal that involves the introduction of southwards-facing (ie 2-way) shooting,

which goes hand in hand with club use, can no longer be resisted in light of the clear support from experts and responsible persons in both aspects of safety and related insurance of competitive club archery in Great Britain.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Letter dated 16.03.2012, Block Plan WT/2010/11 dated 27.04.2012, Site Plan WT/2010/12 dated 27.04.2012, Drainage Layout WT/2010/13 dated 27.04.2012, Details WT/2010/14A dated 27.04.2012, Section WT/2010/15 dated 27.04.2012, Location Plan WT/2010/10 dated 27.04.2012, Letter dated 27.04.2012, Design and Access Statement dated 27.04.2012, Block Plan WT/2010/11A dated 29.06.2012, Supporting Information dated 29.06.2012, Supporting Statement dated 29.06.2012, Plan WT/2010/16C with notes dated 24.09.2012, Plan WT/2010/16C dated 26.10.2012, Letter dated 26.10.2012, Letter VENUE SURVEY GNAS dated 16.04.2013, Letter VENUE SURVEY ARCHERYGB dated 05.06.2013, Email ARCHERYGB WKAS Membership dated 23.08.2013, Email ARCHERYGB Chair of Judges dated 03.10.2013, Email ARCHERYGB Chair of Judges dated 18.10.2013, Other REVISED APPLICATION FORM dated 11.11.2013, Letter dated 13.11.2013, Photographs dated 13.11.2013, subject to the following

Conditions

1. Notwithstanding drawings WT/2010/14A and WT/2010/16C, all archery activities practised pursuant to this consent shall accord with the Rules of ArcheryGB and involve shooting on the approved field only. At all times there shall be a minimum of a 50 yd overshoot to the boundaries with the neighbouring properties of The Barn, Pigeons Green and Pigeons Green Cottage and a minimum 20 yd side safety margin to the boundary of the site with Boneashe Lane.

Reason: In the interests of the actual and perceived public safety of the area to comply with policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.

2. No southwards shooting of archery shall take place until the 20 yard side safety buffer to Boneashe Lane has been clearly demarcated on site and all land within the side buffer has been landscaped. These shall be in accordance with details and timetable to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the actual and perceived public safety of the area to comply with policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.

3. No southwards shooting of archery shall take place until fencing panels to the South-west corner have been erected in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the actual and perceived public safety of the area to comply with policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 4 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, unless otherwise agreed in writing, the use of the site shall be restricted to be used for:
- i. the applicant's own private recreational and practice purposes with a maximum of 8 participants, or
 - ii. ad hoc practice by club members between the hours of 10.30am to 6.00pm on Wednesday and Thursdays and weekends, or
 - iii. a club run from the site with a maximum of 3 tournaments in the period April to September each year.

Reason: In the interests of rural amenities and to comply with policies CP1, CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010.

5. There shall be no illumination of the site without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of rural amenities and to comply with policies CP1, CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010.

6. The approved catch safety netting shall be erected in strict accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and retained so at all times whilst archery is taking place at the site. It shall be drawn back to the supporting poles immediately on cessation of an archery session and maintained in that position until the commencement of the next session.

Reason: In the interests of rural amenities and to comply with policies CP1, CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010.

7. There shall be no use of public address systems or other use of amplified sound systems at any time.

Reason: In the interests of rural amenities to comply with policies CP1, CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010.

8. Any archery activities practised pursuant to this consent shall be carried out using a Longbow of a maximum weight of 70lbs with an average draw weight no greater than 50lb and in strict accordance with the safety standards and requirements of both the British Long Bow Society and Archery GB (formerly the Grand National Archery Society) or any body that may in the future supersede such organisations.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and in the interests of the public safety, both actual and perceived, in order to comply with policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.

Informative

You are advised that the indicative car park needs planning permission as an engineering operation and the application should be submitted as soon as possible.

Contact: Marion Geary