

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL



EXECUTIVE SERVICES

Chief Executive

Julie Beilby BSc (Hons) MBA

Gibson Building
Gibson Drive
Kings Hill, West Malling
Kent ME19 4LZ
West Malling (01732) 844522

NB - This agenda contains proposals, recommendations and options. These do not represent Council policy or decisions until they have received proper consideration through the full decision making process.

Contact: Committee Services
committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk

7 November 2016

To: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

(Copies to all Members of the Council)

Dear Sir/Madam

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board to be held in the Civic Suite, Gibson Building, Kings Hill, West Malling on Tuesday, 15th November, 2016 commencing at 7.30 pm

Yours faithfully

JULIE BEILBY

Chief Executive

A G E N D A

PART 1 - PUBLIC

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|-------|
| 1. | Apologies for absence | 5 - 6 |
| 2. | Declarations of interest | 7 - 8 |

3. Minutes 9 - 12

To confirm as a correct record the Notes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board held on 26 July 2016

Matters for Recommendation to the Cabinet

4. Local Transport Plan for Kent - Consultation 13 - 28

Matters submitted for Information

5. Airports Update 29 - 32
6. Local Plan Update 33 - 36
7. Urgent Items 37 - 38

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive

Matters for consideration in Private

8. Exclusion of Press and Public 39 - 40

The Chairman to move that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting during consideration of any items the publication of which would disclose exempt information.

PART 2 - PRIVATE

9. Urgent Items 41 - 42

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

MEMBERSHIP

Cllr D A S Davis (Chairman)
Cllr T Edmondston-Low (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr M A C Balfour
Cllr Mrs S M Barker
Cllr P F Bolt
Cllr V M C Branson
Cllr M O Davis
Cllr B T M Elks
Cllr Mrs S M Hall

Cllr Mrs F A Kemp
Cllr R D Lancaster
Cllr M Parry-Waller
Cllr S C Perry
Cllr R V Roud
Cllr A K Sullivan
Cllr M Taylor

This page is intentionally left blank

Apologies for absence

This page is intentionally left blank

Declarations of interest

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

Tuesday, 26th July, 2016

Present: Cllr D A S Davis (Chairman), Cllr T Edmondston-Low (Vice-Chairman), Cllr M A C Balfour, Cllr Mrs S M Barker, Cllr P F Bolt, Cllr V M C Branson, Cllr M O Davis, Cllr B T M Elks, Cllr Mrs S M Hall, Cllr Mrs F A Kemp, Cllr R D Lancaster, Cllr M Parry-Waller, Cllr R V Roud and Cllr M Taylor

Councillors D J Cure, N J Heslop, P J Montague, M R Rhodes, H S Rogers and T B Shaw were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S C Perry and A K Sullivan

PE 16/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct. However, in the interests of transparency Councillor M Balfour indicated that he was the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport at Kent County Council.

PE 16/15 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the notes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board held on 5 July 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET

PE 16/16 LOCAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS LIST

Decision Notice D160059MEM

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health summarised the Borough Council's obligations in respect of the validation of planning applications, together with associated submissions, and made recommendations for local requirements to provide clarity on what information should be submitted to make an application valid.

It was reported that the adoption of a Local Validation Requirement List (LVRL) would enable the Council to seek the provision of information over and above the submission of application forms, certificates of ownership and plans. A LVRL, drafted in accordance with national

guidance and comprising a matrix setting out validation requirements, was attached as Annex 1 to the report for consideration.

Whilst Members supported the introduction of local requirements, concern was expressed that the average homeowner could find the validation list complicated and be unsure which document applied to which type of application. It was proposed that an Executive Summary setting out the basic steps be prepared to simplify the process for inexperienced applicants.

It was also suggested that a general disclaimer 'reserving the right to request additional information' be included to enable Planning Officers to pursue extra material outside the validation requirements.

Particular reference was made to proposals for contaminated land assessments and whether there was any merit in having a validation of remediation step independent from the validation of application. In response, Members were advised that this stage was an 'in principle' validation and should highlight whether there were any potential serious concerns to be followed up regarding contaminated land.

RECOMMENDED: That the Local Validation Requirement List, attached as Annex 1 to the report, be adopted with effect from 14 September 2016; subject to minor amendments regarding an Executive Summary and general disclaimer statement as set out above.

PE 16/17 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PLAN

Decision Notice D160060MEM

The report gave an overview of a proposed Planning Enforcement Plan intended to provide a clear and transparent structure for dealing with planning enforcement matters. Particular reference was made to how complaints would be managed and prioritised.

The proposed approach to enforcement, including timescales for action, details of responses to suspected breaches of planning control and prioritisation of planning enforcement resources were set out in the Plan, attached as Annex 1 to the report.

After careful consideration of the Plan, concern was expressed about the consistency of the terminology used and whether there could be confusion around the meaning of expedient and 'serious harm'. Officers recognised the importance of consistency and suggested that paragraph 2.6 of the Plan be amended to reflect that the test for expediency was 'serious' harm and not just 'general' harm.

In addition, it was suggested that the Enforcement Plan be reviewed in 6 months to check and monitor progress.

Reference was made to Parish and Town Council involvement as effective community engagement was a key part of delivering a responsive and accountable planning enforcement service. Concern was expressed that, as there appeared to be no definitive action outlined with regard to parish and town councils, effective communication and involvement could be lost. In response, it was suggested that this point would be revisited and strengthened to benefit and encourage parish and town councils to engage with planning officers over planning enforcement issues. However, parishes were invited to contact the Borough Council immediately with any concerns raised by their residents.

Finally, it was suggested that the Enforcement Plan be reported to the next meeting of both the Parish Partnership Panel and the Tonbridge Forum in September.

RECOMMENDED: That the Planning Enforcement Plan, set out in Annex 1 to the report, be adopted, subject to the amendment to paragraph 2.6 as set out above.

MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION

PE 16/18 TRANSPORTATION UPDATE

Members were updated in respect of two recent transportation studies: one exploring the economic case for improving the connectivity between the M25 and M26; the other establishing baseline data for the capacity of the A20 corridor between the A228 and the Coldharbour roundabout.

The study into improving connectivity between the M25 and M26 had concluded that, whilst there was an economic case for investment in east facing slips at junction 5 of the M25 this was relatively weak.

With regard to the traffic conditions along the A20 corridor the study confirmed and clarified the capacity issues along this stretch of road and provided useful evidence for the Local Plan and to support bids for further funding to deliver further minor improvements or 'quick wins'.

Members noted the recommendations and conclusions arising from the studies and expressed disappointment that the M25 study had not given more weight to the potential significant impacts of future development and growth such as that represented by the proposed Lower Thames Crossing, future airport capacity in the south east and new Paramount theme park.

The local Member for Borough Green, in his role as a representative of the Kent Association of Local Councils (Tonbridge and Malling) thanked the Borough Council, Kent County Council and local communities for their support of and contribution to the study. Whilst disappointed by

the study's conclusion it was an important piece of evidence and provided a foundation to support infrastructure growth.

Reference was made to the A20 corridor study and whether this provided sufficient evidence against further development in that area as local Members remained concerned that further building, whether roads or houses, would exacerbate an already difficult situation. In response, the need to demonstrate 'severity' before refusing any planning application and the difficulty associated with judging the percentage of traffic movements that created this severity was explained.

Members were advised that a full copy of the study would be uploaded to the Borough Council's website, which would include details on traffic movements along the A20 corridor. However, it was recognised that a strategic long term solution was required and it was hoped that this would be an objective of the Local Plan.

Final versions of the reports would be published on the Borough Council's website as soon as they were available.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN PRIVATE

PE 16/19 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no matters considered in private.

The meeting ended at 8.45 pm

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING and TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

15 November 2016

Report of the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)

1 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN FOR KENT – CONSULTATION

To seek endorsement of officer level comments returned to KCC in respect of the recent consultation on the fourth Local Transport Plan, which closed in October and to provide an update of other relevant transportation items.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Local Transport Plan for Kent (LTP4) consultation document is the culmination of collaborative working between KCC and each of the 12 Districts and Medway Unitary Authority. It sets out strategic ambitions for the county as well as the local schemes which are vital for supporting economic growth. The deadline for responding to the consultation was midnight on Sunday 30 October 2016, officer-level comments were provided as per **[ANNEX 1]** of this report.

1.1.2 The Kent and Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) provides the evidence base for LTP4. It has identified (as far as possible) the scale of growth expected in Kent to 2031 and therefore what infrastructure investment is required to support it and help grow the Kent economy.

1.2 Outcomes for Transport

1.2.1 The overall ambition for Kent is “to deliver safe and effective transport, ensuring that all Kent’s communities and businesses benefit, the environment is enhanced and economic growth is supported.”

1.2.2 There are subsequently five outcomes and policies to achieve this ambition. They are:

- 1) Outcome 1: Economic growth and minimised congestion. **Policy:** Deliver resilient transport infrastructure and schemes that reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability to enable economic growth and appropriate development, meeting demand from a growing population.

- 2) Outcome 2: Affordable and accessible door-to-door journeys. **Policy:** Promote affordable, accessible and connected transport to enable access for all to jobs, education, health and other services.
- 3) Outcome 3: Safer travel. **Policy:** Provide a safer road, footway and cycleway network to reduce the likelihood of casualties, and encourage other transport providers to improve safety on their networks.
- 4) Outcome 4: Enhanced environment. **Policy:** Deliver schemes to reduce the environmental footprint of transport, and enhance the historic and natural environment.
- 5) Outcome 5: Better health and wellbeing. **Policy:** Promote active travel choices for all members of the community to encourage good health and wellbeing, and implement measure to improve local air quality.

1.3 Strategic transport priorities

1.3.1 There are nine strategic priorities in addition to the priorities for each specific district. These are:

- Enabling Growth in the Thames Gateway
- New Lower Thames Crossing
- Port Expansion
- A Solution to Operation Stack
- Bifurcation of Port Traffic
- Provision for Overnight Lorry Parking
- Ashford International Stations Signalling (Ashford Spurs)
- Journey Time Improvements and Thanet Parkway Railway Station
- Rail and Bus Improvements.

1.3.2 The Council supports these strategic priorities and welcomes the benefits they will bring to Tonbridge & Malling and to the wider area. However, there are concerns regarding the new Lower Thames Crossing without the inclusion of the C Variant (improvements to the A229 and M2 junction3) or other alternatives to provide a suitable link between the M2 and M20. These concerns are shared by KCC and have been expressed to Highways England as part of the consultation on the preferred route for the LTC that took place earlier this year by both TMBC and KCC. The C Variant or other alternatives linking the M2 and M20 should be included as a key priority for the Local Transport Plan, as set out in question 6a of the response.

1.3.3 In addition to these strategic priorities, there are also a number of Kent-wide priorities including road safety, highways maintenance and asset management and home to school transport, active travel (walking and cycling) and aviation, that are supported in the officer level response.

1.4 District Priorities – Tonbridge & Malling

1.4.1 The district priorities are identified as the infrastructure requirements needed to support sustainable growth. These priorities have been highlighted in the Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) and will be updated as the evidence in the GIF is updated.

1.4.2 There are a number of specific schemes identified for Tonbridge & Malling Borough and these have been identified through collaborative working between KCC and the Borough Council.

1.4.3 In the pipeline already, the construction of an eastern overbridge at junction 4 of the M20, due to be completed by the end of this year and secured through funding from the South East Local Enterprise Partnership Local Growth Fund and developer contributions.

1.4.4 The Local Growth Fund has also funded the Tonbridge Town Centre regeneration works, including improvements to Tonbridge High Street and around the railway station.

1.4.5 The GIF has highlighted four schemes that can be brought forward during the life of LTP4.

- The potential for Urban Traffic Control (traffic signal coordination) in Tonbridge to help alleviate congestion and improve air quality.
- M20 junction 3 – 5 ‘smart’ (managed) motorway system.
- M25/M26 east facing slips to alleviate movement restrictions; and
- A20 corridor improvements between A228 and M20 junction 5.

1.4.6 It is accepted that there are limited financial resources to provide the infrastructure needed to support the growth in the Borough to 2031, and that for some of the measures identified, enabling developing will be required to support it.

1.4.7 Two further future schemes are identified;

- Tackling congestion in Tonbridge town centre; and
- A study into traffic flows on A229 Bluebell Hill.

1.4.8 An additional two District priorities for Tonbridge and Malling Borough should be included and are set out in the response to question 7a. These are in respect of

improvements to the A228 corridor supporting in part the submission by Snodland Town Council, but also reflects some of the early responses received in relation to the emerging Local Plan, which proposes additional development in the vicinity of the A228 north of Kings Hill.

- 1.4.9 The second additional priority is for reference to be made to the potential for improvements to the A26. In particular improvements to the connections between the A26 and A20 corridors via Hermitage Lane and also through Watringbury and East Malling.

1.5 Responding to the consultation document

- 1.5.1 A consultation questionnaire for responding to LTP4 was provided and contained ten technical questions. The officer-level response was submitted by the deadline of 30 October, a copy of which is contained in annex A of this report.
- 1.5.2 The officer-level comments are largely supportive of the document and its contents, taking the opportunity to highlight those measures and road improvement schemes that are of particular importance to Tonbridge & Malling, such as improvements to Bluebell Hill and lobbying for the C Variant as part of the Lower Thames Crossing. The Council also supports the M25/M26 east facing slips to alleviate restrictions or other reasonable alternatives that may come forward to achieve the same goals.
- 1.5.3 There is scope to include other proposals in future iterations of the LTP and to update the GIF that is reviewed annually.
- 1.5.4 The inclusion of a scheme in LTP4 does not, unfortunately, guarantee it will be delivered. The funding is limited and competition, high. At the very least, the LTP4 provides some of the necessary detail to apply for bidding along with the data contained in the GIF. The Council will continue to explore other opportunities with KCC to secure funding for appropriate improvements and schemes.

1.6 Legal Implications

- 1.6.1 There are unlikely to be any legal implications as Kent County Council are ultimately responsible for the content of LTP4.

1.7 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.7.1 Working with KCC and providing input to LTP4 represents good practice and value for money

1.8 Risk Assessment

- 1.8.1 There are no risks associated with this report.

1.9 Recommendations

- 1.9.1 It is recommended Members **ENDORSE** the comments in the questionnaire in **[ANNEX 1]** that are supportive of LTP4 and the identified priorities for Tonbridge & Malling.

The Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Ian Bailey
Planning Policy Manager

Steve Humphrey

Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

View Response

Answers to **Local Transport Plan 4**

INCOMPLETE RESPONSE

Response ID #499138. Submitted on 28 Oct 2016 11:44 by Jill Margaret Peet

1. Are you completing this questionnaire on behalf of:

Please select the option from the list below that most closely represents how you will be responding to this consultation.

- Yourself as an individual
- Yourself as a member of KCC staff
- A District / Town / Parish Council
- A Charity, Voluntary or Community Sector Organisation (VCS)
- A Business
- Other

*If you answered 'Other', please specify

«No response»

1a. Please tell us the name of the organisation (a council, VCS organisation or business) you are responding on behalf of

You must provide an answer to this question.

Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council

2. Please tell us your postcode

We use this to help us to analyse our data. It will not be used to identify who you are.

ME19 4LZ

The draft Local Transport Plan (http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti/-/669666/22078629.1/PDF/-/Local_Transport_Plan_Consultation_main_ONLINE.pdf) sets out the following Ambition for Kent:

To deliver safe and effective transport, ensuring that all Kent's communities and businesses benefit, the environment is enhanced and economic growth is supported.

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the overall Ambition set for the Local Transport Plan?

Please select one box.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

3a. Please add any comments on the overall Ambition set for the Local Transport Plan below:

The overall ambition is comprehensive in covering the desired outcomes of the five policies on page 10 of the document.

4. This Ambition will be realised through five overarching Outcomes and Supporting Policies. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the Outcomes and Policies?

Please select one box per outcome.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Outcome 1. Economic growth and minimised congestion. Policy: Deliver resilient transport infrastructure and schemes to reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability, to enable economic growth and appropriate development.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outcome 2. Affordable and accessible door to door journeys. Policy: Promote affordable, accessible and connected transport to enable access for all to jobs, education, health and other services	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outcome 3. Safer travel. Policy: Provide a safer road, footway and cycleway network to reduce the likelihood of casualties, and encourage other transport providers to improve safety on their networks.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outcome 4. Enhanced environment. Policy: Deliver schemes to reduce the environmental footprint of transport, and enhance the historic and natural environment.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Outcome 5. Better health and wellbeing. Policy: Promote active travel choices for all members of the community to encourage good health and wellbeing, and implement measures to improve local air quality.



4a. Please add any comments on the five overarching Outcomes and Supporting Policies below.

The five overarching Outcomes and Supporting Policies encompass many of the Borough Council's own objectives relating to safety, health and wellbeing and sustainability and are supported.

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Strategic Priorities for the Local Transport Plan? (Pages 11 to 21 in the LTP (http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti/f/726210/21980133.1/PDF/-/Strategic_Priorities_extract_from_Local_Transport_Plan_Consultation_ONLINE.pdf))

Please select one box.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

5a. Please add any comments on the Strategic Priorities for the Local Transport Plan below:

Please indicate which **Strategic Priorities** you are commenting on.

In progressing the strategic priorities for the LTP, every opportunity should be taken to lobby for the inclusion of the C Variant, or other alternatives to provide a satisfactory link between the M2 and M20as part of the Lower Thames Crossing. Without it, the potential impact on the A229, A228 and A227 could be substantial, resulting in greater pressure on KCC resources for highways improvements and maintenance, not to mention the detrimental impacts it would have on local residents and businesses.

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Kent Wide Priorities for the Local Transport Plan? (Pages 22 to 23 in the LTP (http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti/f/726210/21929733.1/PDF/-/Kentwide_Priorities_Extract_from_Local_Transport_Plan_Consultation_Draft.pdf))

Please select one box.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

6a. Please add any comments on the Kent Wide Priorities for the Local Transport Plan below:

Please indicate which **Kent-Wide Priorities** you are commenting on.

«No response»

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the District Priorities for the Local Transport Plan? (Pages 24 to 50 in the LTP (http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti/f/726210/21929605.1/PDF/-/District_Priorities_Extract_from_Local_Transport_Plan_Consultation_Draft.pdf))

Please select one box.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

7a. Please add any comments on the District Priorities for the Local Transport Plan below:

Please indicate which **district** you are commenting on.

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH

Pleased to see the schemes listed for Tonbridge & Malling and support the LSTS Tunbridge Wells town centre to Tonbridge railway station cycle route improvements.

An additional District priority for Tonbridge and Malling in respect of the A228 corridor should also be considered in the light of the emerging development strategy in the new Local Plan. In particular those areas in Snodland and the areas south of Kings Hill that may be affected.

In the context of the emerging development strategy, reference should also be made to the potential for improvements to the A26. In particular improvements to the connections between the A26 and A20 corridors via Hermitage Lane and also through Wateringbury and East Malling.

8. We have completed an initial Equality Impact Assessment

(http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti/-/669666/21967333.1/PDF/-/Eqia_Draft__LTP_V4_Amey_final_for_consultation_with_TM__Copy.pdf) (EqIA) for the draft Local Transport Plan 4.

An EqIA is a tool to assess the impact any service change, policy or strategy would have on age, disability, gender, gender identity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, pregnancy or maternity, marriage and civil partnership and carer's responsibilities.

We welcome your views, please add any comments below:

«No response»

9. We have completed a draft Strategic Environmental Assessment

(http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti/-/669666/21966885.1/PDF/-/LTP4_SEA_ER_Consultation_draft_FINAL.pdf)(SEA).

SEA is a process to ensure that significant environmental affects arising from policies, plans and programmes are identified, assessed, mitigated, communicated to decision makers and monitored.

We welcome your views, please add any comments below:

«No response»

10. Please add any final comments you have on the draft Local Transport Plan below.

Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council welcome the opportunity to continue working with KCC on updating the GIF to inform the LTP as and when required.

About You

We want to make sure that everyone is treated fairly and equally, and that no one gets left out. That's why we are asking you these questions.

We won't share the information you give us with anyone else. We'll use it only to help us make decisions, and improve our services.

If you would rather not answer any of these questions, you don't have to but please click through to the end of the questionnaire to submit your response.

11. Are you...?

Please select one box.

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to say

12. Which of these age groups applies to you?

Please select one box.

- 0-15
- 16-24
- 25-34
- 35-49
- 50-59
- 60-64
- 65-74
- 75-84
- 85 + over
- I prefer not to say

The Equality Act 2010 describes a person as disabled if they have a longstanding physical or mental condition that has lasted, or is likely to last, at least 12 months; and this condition has a substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. People with some conditions (cancer, multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS, for example) are considered to be disabled from the point that they are diagnosed.

13. Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010?

Please select one box.

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to say

13a. Please tell us which type of impairment applies to you.

You may have more than one type of impairment, so please select all the impairments that apply to you. If none of these applies to you, please select 'Other', and give brief details of the impairment you have.

- Physical impairment
- Sensory impairment (hearing, sight or both)
- Long standing illness or health condition, such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, heart disease, diabetes or epilepsy
- Mental health condition
- Learning disability
- I prefer not to say
- Other*

*If you answered 'Other', please specify:

«No response»

14. To which of these ethnic groups do you feel you belong? (Source: 2011 census)

Select one option.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> White English | <input type="radio"/> White Scottish |
| <input type="radio"/> White Welsh | <input type="radio"/> White Northern Irish |
| <input type="radio"/> White: Irish | <input type="radio"/> White: Gypsy/Roma |
| <input type="radio"/> White: Irish Traveller | <input type="radio"/> White: Other* |
| <input type="radio"/> Mixed: White and Black Caribbean | <input type="radio"/> Mixed: White and Black African |
| <input type="radio"/> Mixed: White and Asian | <input type="radio"/> Mixed: Other* |
| <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Indian | <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Pakistani |
| <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi | <input type="radio"/> Asian or Asian British: Other* |
| <input type="radio"/> Black or Black British: Caribbean | <input type="radio"/> Black or Black British: African |
| <input type="radio"/> Black or Black British: Other* | <input type="radio"/> Arab |
| <input type="radio"/> Chinese | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to say |

*If your ethnic group is not specified in the list, please describe it here:

«No response»

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please click the 'finish' button below, and follow the instructions on the next page to submit your response.

Privacy

Kent County Council collects and processes personal information in order to provide a range of public services. Kent County Council respects the privacy of individuals and endeavours to ensure personal information is collected fairly, lawfully, and in compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING and TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

15 November 2016

Report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

Part 1- Public

Matters for Information

1 AIRPORTS UPDATE

Summary

This report provides a brief update on the Governments recent decision to support a third runway at Heathrow and looks at the process that will now follow.

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Over the years the Borough Council has taken a keen interest in the unfolding picture surrounding decisions about future airport capacity in the south east. The latest decision by Government to support a third full length runway at Heathrow marks an important step towards addressing predicted airport capacity.
- 1.1.2 Members will recall that in the Autumn of 2012 an Airports Commission, was established, led by Sir Howard Davies, with the task of recommending options to provide for increased capacity to maintain the UK's position as a key aviation hub and provide the basis for future economic investment.
- 1.1.3 Having undertaken considerable analysis and consultation it was clear that the Commission favoured Heathrow as the preferred solution for new runway capacity. This has now been reflected in the Government's decision to support a new runway to the northeast of the current airport complex.
- 1.1.4 Government have set out why the North east runway at Heathrow has been favoured over expansion at Gatwick or alternative capacity increases at Heathrow, both of which were shortlisted options of the Commission. In short the favoured option is seen to offer the greatest economic benefit, in terms of direct employment but also the contribution to the regional and national economy. It was also selected because Heathrow is best placed to deliver new long haul flights, the expansion of existing routes and new routes to emerging markets. It was also seen as the best solution in terms of connectivity and accessibility by road and rail. However, with expansion the Government intend to impose significant environment controls, such as new restrictions on night flying and considerable compensation in respect of noise levels over a wide area.

1.2 The Councils position on airports capacity

1.2.1 The Borough Council's primary concern, along with neighbouring authorities and KCC, has been to position itself against expansion at Gatwick which could have significant noise implications for residents in the southern part of the Borough. However, after some analysis we also took the positive position of actively supporting investment at Heathrow as the next overall solution. Those overall views were fed into the Commissions work during it's consultation.

1.3 The process moving forward

1.3.1 Now that a decision in principle has been made, the Government will bring forward a National Policy Statement (NPS) for consultation. An NPS will set out the planning policy against which detailed applications will be judged. That will include further parliamentary scrutiny, by a select committee, and a vote in the House of Commons before it becomes national policy. That process is seen as taking about a year.

1.3.2 Following the adoption of the NPS, a Development Consent Order (DCO) application can be made by the promoter of the scheme for Heathrow and theoretically by other parties who wish to advance schemes. The submission of a full DCO is in itself a massive task, involving a full Environmental assessment which in this case will be very wide ranging and detailed. The DCO will also need to deal with a significant number of related construction and mitigation, not least to do with works to the M 25 and associated road and rail works. It is a colossal project that also will include stages of detailed consultation and is estimate by Government to take 3-4 years.

1.3.3 Assuming consent is granted and the construction programme runs to the current project plan of the promoters it is estimated that the new runway could be operational after 2025.

1.4 Observations

1.4.1 Although here now seems to be a clear way forward for the Northeast runway option at Heathrow, some commentators are saying that the NPS may not entirely close the door on other airports, such as Gatwick, to promote a DCO and it will be important for us to keep a close eye on the content of the NPS when it is published for consultation next year.

1.4.2 It also seems likely that at various stages there might be attempts to legally challenge decision making by way of judicial Review. Some parties have made their intention clear on that score and the opportunity for such a challenge does present itself at various stages of the process.

1.4.3 From a strategic planning viewpoint the NPS on the level of housing and employment growth is bound to have significant on the approach towards plans for London itself (and of course those areas to the west of the London). This is an

interesting time insofar as the Mayor is currently on a programme to prepare a new Plan for London, which currently pays little regard to expansion at Heathrow. Bearing in mind also the apparent reluctance to fully review the greenbelt in London to meet the current predicted development needs, the Airport implications will no doubt increase the tension with authorities outside of London.

1.5 Legal Implications

1.5.1 None arising from this report

1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.6.1 None arising from this report

1.7 Risk Assessment

1.7.1 The risks associated with the whole airports decision making process is on the impact on residents and businesses in the Borough.

Background papers:

contact: Steve Humphrey

Airports: The Governments View, October 2016

Steve Humphrey

Director, Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING and TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

15 November 2016

Report of the Director of Planning Housing and Environmental Health

Matters for Information

1 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

This report updates Members on the current Local Plan public consultation exercise, which began on the 30th September 2016. The consultation is due to close on 25th November.

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 The first major public consultation on the emerging Local Plan as required by Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations began for an eight week period on Friday the 30th September and is due to close at 5pm on Friday the 25th November.
- 1.1.2 In advance of the launch a press release and briefings were arranged for local media, which have resulted in widespread press coverage of the consultation and how to find out more information and respond. Full use has been made of our website and social media and hard copies of the main consultation document ('The Way Forward') and supporting information have been provided to Parish and Town Councils. Further copies have been placed on deposit at all libraries in the Borough and the two main Council Offices at Kings Hill and Tonbridge Castle.
- 1.1.3 In addition a series of four Local Plan events for Local Councils and Community Groups were arranged to take place during the first few weeks of the exercise, to explain in some more detail the purpose of the consultations and how to respond effectively and constructively. The aim of these events is to enable attendees to take messages back to their colleagues and communities.

1.2 Consultation Update

- 1.2.1 At the time of writing this report all four of the Local Plan events had taken place and also all of the six scheduled public exhibitions. As noted above, the events were aimed at briefing local Council and community group representatives about the purpose of the consultation and how to respond. 18 of the 27 Tonbridge and Malling Parish and Town Councils attended. The feedback from the events has generally been positive and those attending have found them helpful.

- 1.2.2 The public exhibitions have been very well attended thus far and have proved to be popular with residents wishing to find out more about the Local Plan and the proposals in The Way Forward document. These were intended primarily to provide a means of engagement for those who do not have access or prefer not to use the internet or prefer a more human interface with the process. We have responded positively to requests for a further evening exhibition due to take place at the Council Offices, Kings Hill on the evening of 10th November.
- 1.2.3 The exhibitions at Kings Hill Community Centre, Larkfield Leisure Centre, the Angel Centre, Hadlow Village Hall, Aylesford Village Hall and Borough Green Village Hall were attended by between 50 and 100 people over the 3 hour sessions. The exhibition at Kings Hill formed part of a separate Local and Neighbourhood Plan event organised and hosted by the Parish Council.
- 1.2.4 In the main those attending the exhibitions have welcomed the opportunity to discuss the Local Plan process, the proposed 'Way Forward' and share their concerns. Officers have been able to provide clarification, reassurances and encouragement to follow this up with a formal response through the various channels available. Despite our best efforts, a relatively small proportion of those attending did not appreciate the need for preparing a new Local Plan to meet future needs or understand the implications of the alternative scenario of not maintaining an up to date development plan and supply of housing. However, overall it is fair to say that the majority of people have been keen to understand the background to the local plan and the local implications and no doubt that will lead to many representations being received following the consultation period.
- 1.2.5 The main topics arising through discussions at the exhibitions include concerns about the proximity of proposed development to their own home, impact on local infrastructure, particularly the local highway network, but also schools and health facilities, ensuring adequate parking to accompany new development and issues relating to Green Belt.
- 1.2.6 As of 3rd November (approximately half way through the 8 week consultation) 149 responses had been received including 84 Survey Monkey returns (this is the on-line questionnaire found on our website responding to the 15 suggested questions in the 'Way Forward') and 65 emails and letters. Normally, there is an increase in the level of response to consultation exercises such as this towards the end of exercise. There will be an opportunity to provide a verbal update on these figures on the night of the Board meeting.
- 1.2.7 Officers have become aware during the consultation of a number of co-ordinated responses being encouraged on a small number of specific issues. These include proposals to extend the Green Belt designation further east than suggested in the Way Forward and objections to the proposed development strategy in respect of the developable areas located at Lower Haysden in Tonbridge, north of Borough Green and in the vicinity of Hermitage Lane, Aylesford.

1.3 Next Steps

- 1.3.1 The consultation is due to close on 25th November after which all responses will be carefully considered and will form part of a report back to this Board.

1.4 Legal Implications

- 1.4.1 Local Planning Authorities are required to prepare and keep up to date a development plan for their area. Failure to do so may leave the Council's planning decisions at risk of appeal and could also lead to intervention from Government.

1.5 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.5.1 There will be direct financial and value for money considerations associated with the public consultation exercise described in this report. These costs will be met from existing budgets. In addition and as noted above, failure to prepare a Local Plan within reasonable timescales may have financial implications if this results in appeals being lost.

1.6 Risk Assessment

- 1.6.1 An out of date Local Plan puts at risk the ability of the Local Planning Authority to control development and plan positively for local communities.

1.7 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.7.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

contact: Ian Bailey
Planning Policy Manager/
Louise Reid
Head of Planning

Steve Humphrey
Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

The Chairman to move that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting during consideration of any items the publication of which would disclose exempt information.

**ANY REPORTS APPEARING AFTER THIS PAGE CONTAIN EXEMPT
INFORMATION**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank