

# 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: Democratic Services  
[committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk](mailto:committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk)

8 March 2021

To: MEMBERS OF THE CABINET  
(Copies to all Members of the Council)

Dear Sir/Madam

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the Cabinet to be held online via Microsoft Teams on Tuesday, 16th March, 2021 commencing at 7.30 pm. Information on how to observe the meeting will be published on the Council's website.

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 |

*Members in any doubt about such declarations are advised to contact Legal or Democratic Services in advance of the meeting*

3. Minutes 9 - 18

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 February 2021

4. Matters Referred from Advisory Boards 19 - 36

*The notes of meetings of Advisory Boards are attached, any recommendations identified by an arrow being for determination by the Cabinet. Notices relating to any decisions already taken by Cabinet Members under the arrangements for delegated decision making have previously been circulated.*

5. Matters Referred from Advisory Panels and Other Groups 37 - 52

*The minutes of meetings of Advisory Panels and Other Groups are attached, any recommendations being identified by an arrow.*

### **Matters for Recommendation to the Council**

6. Leybourne Lakes Country Park - New Lakeside Facility 53 - 56

*This report provides an update on funding for the Leybourne Lakes Country Park new lakeside facility and recommends to Council a budget increase funded entirely from specific developer contributions.*

7. Virtual Meetings and Homeworking 57 - 90

*A report relating to virtual meetings and homeworking was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 11 March 2021.*

*Due to the timescale and print deadlines for Cabinet, recommendations arising from the Committee will be circulated to Members in advance of the meeting.*

### **Executive Key Decisions**

8. Tonbridge Allotments Association - Proposed Charges 91 - 96

*Item CH 21/3 referred from Communities and Housing Advisory Board of 16 February 2021.*

9. Changes to On-Street Parking Fees and Charges 97 - 160

*A report relating to changes to on-street parking fees and charges was considered by the Joint Transportation Board on 8 March 2021.*

*Due to the timescale and print deadlines for Cabinet, recommendations arising from the Board will be circulated to Members in advance of the meeting.*

## **Executive Non-Key Decisions**

10. Coronavirus Update 161 - 168

*This report provides an update as to how the Council and our communities continue to respond and adapt to living with coronavirus.*

11. New Homes Bonus Scheme 169 - 184

*On 10 February 2021, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published the paper 'The Future of the New Homes Bonus: consultation'. Responses are requested by 7 April 2021, and this report sets out an indicative response to the consultation.*

12. East Peckham Parish Council - Request for a Compulsory Purchase Order 185 - 188

*To consider a request to make a Compulsory Purchase Order in respect of allotment land at Church Lane, East Peckham.*

13. Urgent Items 189 - 190

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**

14. Exclusion of Press and Public 191 - 192

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**

### **Executive Non-Key Decisions**

15. Debts for Write-Off 193 - 196

16. Urgent Items 197 - 198

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

Councillor N J Heslop, (Leader) and (Economic Regeneration)  
Councillor R P Betts, (Street Scene and Environment Services)  
Councillor M A Coffin, (Finance, Innovation and Property)  
Councillor D Lettington, (Strategic Planning and Infrastructure)  
Councillor P J Montague, (Housing)  
Councillor M R Rhodes, (Community Services)

Members of the Council who are not members of the executive may attend meetings of the Cabinet. With the agreement of the Leader, any such Member may address the Cabinet on any item on the agenda but may not vote.

Apologies for absence

This page is intentionally left blank

Declarations of interest

This page is intentionally left blank



## TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### CABINET

Thursday, 11th February, 2021

**Present:** Cllr N J Heslop (Chairman), Cllr R P Betts, Cllr M A Coffin, Cllr D Lettington, Cllr P J Montague and Cllr M R Rhodes.

Councillors M C Base, Mrs S Bell, A E Clark, M A J Hood, D W King, Mrs A S Oakley, W E Palmer, R V Roud, J L Sergison and N G Stapleton were also present pursuant to Access to Information Rule No 23.

### PART 1 - PUBLIC

#### **CB 21/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

#### **CB 21/16 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 26 January 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **CB 21/17 MATTERS REFERRED FROM ADVISORY BOARDS**

The Notes of the meetings of the following Advisory Boards were reviewed by Cabinet on 26 January, any recommendations contained therein being incorporated within the decisions of the Cabinet reproduced at the annex to these Minutes.

- Communities and Housing Advisory Board of 10 November 2020
- Planning and Transportation Advisory Board of 11 November 2020
- Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board of 8 December 2020
- Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board of 6 January 2020

As a result of the deadlines for preparing the agenda, the Notes of any meetings of Advisory Boards held between 26 January and 11 February 2021 would be reviewed by Cabinet at the meeting to be held on 16 March 2021.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be received and noted.

**CB 21/18 MATTERS REFERRED FROM ADVISORY PANELS AND OTHER GROUPS**

As a result of the deadlines for preparing the agenda, the Notes of any meetings of Advisory Panels and other groups held between 26 January and 11 February 2021 would be reviewed by Cabinet at the meeting to be held on 16 March 2021.

**MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL****CB 21/19 SETTING THE BUDGET 2021/22**

Further to the reports to the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee earlier in the cycle, the joint report of the Chief Executive, Director of Finance and Transformation, the Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation and Property updated the Cabinet on issues relating to the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and gave details of the necessary procedure to be followed in order to set the budget for 2021/22.

In addition, the budget setting process for this year had to incorporate the difficult task of estimating the scale of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the Borough Council's finances both in the short and medium term.

Members noted that, as at the time of publishing the report the final settlement had not been confirmed, all figures contained in the report were based on the provisional local government finance settlement received in December 2020. The Director of Finance and Transformation advised that it was now confirmed that the final local government finance settlement was the same as the figures previously announced. The Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) was for one year only (2021/22) and the Fair Funding Review had been deferred for a further year.

It was also noted that the settlement figures included funding in 2021/22 for 'negative RSG'; New Homes Bonus legacy payments and funding allocation and a one off Lower Tier Services grant allocation.

Attention was drawn to recommendations from Advisory Boards and the decision of the Licensing and Appeals Committee regarding the levels of fees and charges to be implemented from 1 April 2021 (as set out at Annex 2 to the report).

The report then described the remaining procedure to be followed in setting the budget for 2021/22 and calculating the council tax. For the purposes of updating the MTFS a council tax increase of £5 in 2021/22 had been assumed and for each year thereafter.

The Cabinet deliberated on the most appropriate guidance to offer the Council as the way forward for updating the MTFS for the next ten year

period and setting the council tax for 2021/22. Members were advised of details of special expenses for the same period.

An updated copy of the Savings and Transformation Strategy was presented, including revised outline targets and timescales to be revisited and aligned with the latest projected 'funding gap'. Members were also reminded that the funding gap set out in the report assumed that all the recommendations made by Advisory Boards and Committees, as summarised in paragraph 1.9.22 of the report, were delivered. If for whatever reason these were found not to be deliverable, the funding gap and therefore the savings and transformation target would increase.

The Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation and Property referred to the 'essential spend only' policy adopted by the Borough Council during the coronavirus pandemic and proposed that this good practice continued into 2021/22 until well into the recovery phase post Covid 19. This continuation would not have specific targets attached; but would be expected to deliver measurable savings in the period. This proposal was supported by the Cabinet.

Finally, the Director of Finance and Transformation explained the basis on which the statement as to the Robustness of the Estimates and Adequacy of the Reserves had been made, including an understanding that the required savings and transformation contributions based on latest projections of £975,000 would be deliverable.

In closing the Cabinet recorded appreciation to the Director of Finance and Transformation and Financial Services for the significant contribution in preparing the budget during a challenging period and for the ongoing support provided to residents, communities and businesses.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the Revenue Estimates, as presented to the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee earlier in the cycle, together with the subsequent adjustments detailed at paragraph 1.4.2 be endorsed and adopted by the Council;
- (2) the fees and charges as recommended by the appropriate Advisory Boards, set out at Annex 2, be endorsed (Decision Notices D210020CAB to D210026CAB);
- (3) the Capital Plan be updated, as set out in paragraph 1.6.15, and adopted by the Council;
- (4) the Capital Strategy, as presented to the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board and the Overview and Scrutiny

- Committee earlier in the cycle, be endorsed and adopted by the Council;
- (5) the prudential indicators listed in paragraphs 1.7.7 and 1.7.12 be endorsed and adopted by the Council;
  - (6) subject to the comment at paragraph 1.7.11 of the report, for the financial year 2021/22 the Borough Council's 'annual minimum revenue provision' as set out at paragraph 1.7.15, be noted as 'nil';
  - (7) the updated MTFs, set out at Annex 11a, be noted and endorsed;
  - (8) the guidance to the Council as to the best way forward in updating the MTFs for the next ten year period and setting the Council Tax for 2021/22 be noted and endorsed;
  - (9) the updated Savings and Transformation Strategy, attached at Annex 11b, including the proposed scale and timing of each of the required savings and transformation contributions, as set out at paragraph 1.10.7 be noted and endorsed;
  - (10) the list of Covid-19 funding allocations , as set out at Annex 11c, that had been granted during 2020/21 to support both the Borough Council's own services, and awarded to businesses, organisations and individuals be noted;
  - (11) the good practice of 'essential spend only' should continue into 2021/22 until well into the recovery phase post Covid 19. This continuation to not have specific targets attached but would be expected to deliver measurable savings in the period;
  - (12) the special expenses calculated in accordance with the Special Expenses Scheme and set out at Annex 14b, be endorsed; and
  - (13) the Statement provided by the Director of Finance and Transformation as to the Robustness of the Estimates and the Adequacy of the Reserves, as set at Annex 17a, be noted and endorsed.

**\*Referred to Council**


**CB 21/20 SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX 2021/22**

The joint report of the Chief Executive, Director of Finance and Transformation, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation and Property set out the requirements under the Local Government Finance Act 1972 for a billing authority to set an amount of council tax for each category of dwelling in its area. Members were

advised of the position concerning the determination of their respective precepts for 2021/22 by the major precepting authorities.

Attention was drawn to the reduced council tax base available as a result of the coronavirus pandemic due to the lower number of houses built in 2020 and increased claims for council tax support.

Consideration was given to a draft resolution identifying the process to be undertaken in arriving at the levels of council tax applicable to each part of the Borough to which any charges under the special expenses scheme would be added. The resolution and further information regarding the precepts of the other authorities would be reported to the full Council on 23 February 2021.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the resolution be noted and the Council be recommended to approve a 2.3% or £5.00 per annum increase in the Borough Council's element of the council tax for 2021/22, representing a notional "average" charge at Band D of £219.50. 

**\*Referred to Council**

#### **CB 21/21 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME 2021/22**

Consideration was given to the [Draft Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2021/22](#) which had been revised to bring it in line with statutory prescribed requirements, housing benefit and other national benefit rates and increased to income bands where uplifts to the Minimum Wage, a component of the income band level calculation, had been taken into account.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the draft Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2021/22 be commended to the Council for adoption for adoption. 

**\*Referred to Council**

#### **CB 21/22 RISK MANAGEMENT**

The report of the Management Team invited Members to review the Risk Management Strategy and accompanying Risk Management Guidance which set out the Borough Council's risk management objectives and detailed the roles and responsibilities of officers, Members and partners in the identification, evaluation and cost-effective control risks. The report also provided an update on the risk management process and the Strategic Risk Register. Members noted that the entry in relation to the local county elections and the Local Plan had been escalated to 'high risk'.

**RECOMMENDED:** That 

- (1) the Risk Management Strategy and accompanying Risk Management Guidance be endorsed and adopted by the Council; and
- (2) the updates to the Strategic Risk Register since the last reiteration be noted, with particular emphasis on the escalation to RED (high risk) of the risks set out in paragraph 1.4.6. and duplicated below:
  - Financial position/budget deficit
  - Brexit/EU Transition Impact and Economic uncertainty (severely impacted by the coronavirus pandemic)
  - Corporate Strategy and Savings and Transformation Strategy
  - Waste Services
  - Elections
  - Local Plan

**\*Referred to Council****CB 21/23 TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY FOR 2021/22**

The report of the Director of Finance and Transformation provided details of investments undertaken and return achieved in the first nine months of the current financial year and an introduction to the 2021/22 Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategy. Members were invited to recommend adoption of the Strategy by the Council.

It was noted that the Audit Committee at its meeting of 18 January 2021 had reviewed and endorsed the matters covered by the report.

**RECOMMENDED:** That 

- (1) the treasury management position as at 31 December 2020 and the reduced level of income incorporated into the 2020/21 revised estimates be noted;
- (2) the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategy for 2021/22, set out at Annex 5, be adopted; and
- (3) the practice note, set out at Annex 6, to be applied to the assessment and management of a non-treasury investment be endorsed.

**\*Referred to Council**

**CB 21/24 REVENUE ESTIMATES 2021/22**

All budgetary matters were considered in detail in the substantive item on setting the Budget 2021/22 (Minute Number CB 21/19). However, the recommendations from the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board of 6 January 2021 in relation to the formulation of initial draft proposals in respect of the Budget, including Revenue Estimates (Minute Number FIP 21/3) was given due consideration as part of the substantive discussion.

**CB 21/25 CAPITAL PLAN**

All budgetary matters were considered in detail in the substantive item on setting the Budget 2021/22 (Minute Number CB 21/19). However, the recommendations from the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board of 6 January 2021 in relation to the formulation of initial draft proposals in respect of the Budget, including the Capital Plan (Minute Number FIP 21/4) was given due consideration as part of the substantive discussion.

**DECISIONS TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION - EXECUTIVE KEY DECISION****CB 21/26 REVIEW OF CHARGES AND FEES 2021/22 - HOUSES IN  
MULTIPLE OCCUPATION AND CARAVAN SITE LICENCES**

Decision Notice D210020CAB

Consideration was given to the recommendations from the meeting of the Communities and Housing Advisory Board of 10 November 2020 (as set out at Minute Number CH 20/26).

**RESOLVED:** That:

- (1) the following charges be approved with effect from 1 April 2021:
  - £545 for processing a new mandatory HMO licence application;
  - £500 for the processing of a renewal application for a mandatory HMO licence;
  - £395 for processing a new caravan site licence application where the use of the site is for permanent residential use; and
  - £190 for the transfer of a caravan site licence for a permanent residential site use.

**CB 21/27 REVIEW OF CEMETERY CHARGES 2021/22**

Decision Notice D210021CAB

Consideration was given to the recommendations from the meeting of the Communities and Housing Advisory Board of 10 November 2020 (as set out at Minute Number CH 20/27).

**RESOLVED:** That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertake a broad strategic review of the charges applied at Tonbridge Cemetery.

**CB 21/28 REVIEW OF PLANNING APPLICATION CHARGING REGIME**

Decision Notice D210022CAB

Consideration of recommendations from the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board of 11 November 2020 (as set out at Minute Number PE 20/24).

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the updated Pre-application Charging Schedule 2021/22 (attached at Annex 1 to the report) be adopted; and
- (2) the fee of £1,200 plus VAT for large scale, strategic development be approved.

**CB 21/29 REVIEW OF PLANNING PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT AND CHARGING SCHEDULE**

Decision Notice D210023CAB

Consideration of recommendations from the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board of 11 November 2020 (as set out Minute Number PE 20/25).

**RESOLVED:** That the updated Planning Performance Agreement Charging Schedule 2021/22 (attached at Annex 1 to the report) be adopted.

**CB 21/30 REVIEW OF BUILDING CONTROL FEES 2021/22**

Decision Notice D210024CAB

Consideration of recommendation from the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board of 11 November 2020 (as set out at Minute Number PE 20/26).



**RESOLVED:** That a 1% increase to the Building Control Charges from 1 April 2021, as per the list of fees attached at Annex 1 to the report, approved.

**CB 21/31 REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2021/22 - STREET SCENE AND ENVIRONMENTAL**

Decision Notice D210025CAB

Consideration of recommendations from the meeting of the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board of 8 December 2020 (as set out at Minute Number SSE 202/4).

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the proposed scale of charges for garden waste subscriptions, fixed penalty notices for littering, household bulky refuse and fridge/freezer collections, 'missed' refuse collections, stray dog redemption fees, pest control, food certificates, contaminated land monitoring and private waste supplies, as detailed in the report, be approved; and
- (2) the proposed scale of charges to be implemented from 1 April 2021.

**CB 21/32 REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2021/22, INCLUDING LEGAL SERVICES, LAND CHARGES, STREET NAME AND NUMBERING; SUMMONS COSTS**

Decision Notice D210026CAB

Consideration of recommendations from the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board of 6 January 2021 (as set out at Minute Number FIP 21/6).

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) in respect of the recovery of legal fees payable by third parties, the Council's charges remain the same for 2021/22 and continue to reflect existing practices as highlighted in paragraph 1.2 of the report;
- (2) the proposed scale of fees for local land charges searches and enquiries set out at Annex 1 to the report be adopted with effect from 1 April 2021;
- (3) the current photocopying charges of £0.10 (inclusive of VAT) for each page of the same document or additional copies of the same page plus postage as appropriate be retained;

- (4) the fee Schedule for Street Naming and Numbering, set out in section 1.5 of the report, be adopted with effect from 1 April 2021;
- (5) the amount of council tax and business rates court costs recharged remain the same for the 2021/22 financial year, as set out at paragraph 1.6.4 of the report); and
- (6) the fees and charges 2021/22 related to Tonbridge Castle tours, as set out at paragraph 1.7.2), fees for schools, as set out at paragraphs 1.7.6 and 1.7.1, and the fee models for ceremonies, as set out at paragraphs 1.7.8 to 1.7.12 of the report, be approved.

### **MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION**

#### **CB 21/33 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER EMERGENCY PROVISIONS**

Details of Decisions taken in accordance with Emergency Provision were presented for information.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be received and noted.

#### **CB 21/34 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 8.39 pm

# Agenda Item 4

The notes of meetings of Advisory Boards are attached, any recommendations identified by an arrow being for determination by the Cabinet. Notices relating to any decisions already taken by Cabinet Members under the arrangements for delegated decision making have previously been circulated.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **STREET SCENE AND ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Tuesday, 9th February, 2021**

**Present:** Cllr M O Davis (Chairman), Cllr Mrs S Bell (Vice-Chairman), Cllr G C Bridge, Cllr D J Cooper, Cllr M A J Hood, Cllr F A Hoskins, Cllr A P J Keeley, Cllr D Keers, Cllr R V Roud, Cllr J L Sergison, Cllr T B Shaw and Cllr Miss G E Thomas

Councillors Mrs P A Bates, R P Betts, J L Botten, M D Boughton, V M C Branson, A E Clark, M A Coffin, N J Heslop, P M Hickmott, S A Hudson, J R S Lark, D Lettington, B J Luker, Mrs A S Oakley, W E Palmer, M R Rhodes and Mrs M Tatton were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor D A S Davis

#### **PART 1 - PUBLIC**

##### **SSE 21/1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct. However, in the interests of transparency, Councillor F Hoskins advised that Priory Wood, Tonbridge, bordered on to her property.

##### **SSE 21/2 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the notes of the meeting of the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board held on 8 December 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

##### **SSE 21/3 PRESENTATION BY LASER ENERGY**

The Advisory Board received a presentation from H Cartledge and S Marks of Laser Energy which outlined work undertaken to date to establish the carbon footprint of the Borough Council and its operations and to identify options for achieving the Council's aspiration to be carbon neutral by 2030. The Chairman thanked the representatives for their detailed presentation which would inform the consideration of the Council's Climate Change Strategy.

---

**MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET**

**SSE 21/4 CLIMATE CHANGE FORUM**

Decision Notice D210017MEM

The report of the Chief Executive outlined the format for a proposed “Climate Change Forum” to establish wider engagement on climate change issues.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the format of the proposed Climate Change Forum, as outlined at section 1.2 of the report, be endorsed.

**SSE 21/5 PRIORY WOOD, TONBRIDGE - LANDFILL GAS INVESTIGATION - UPDATE**

Decision Notice D210018MEM

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on the monitoring of landfill gas levels at the Priory Wood site in Tonbridge and outlined a number of possible refinements to the Quantitative Risk Assessment undertaken since 2019. Particular attention was drawn to the consultants’ recommendation to undertake an Infrastructure Report in respect of the gas extraction system which provided an important safeguard to residential properties (Annex 4 refers). It was noted that, currently, the gases generated within the landfill posed a moderate to low risk to site users and those properties within the immediate vicinity of the public open space.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) a Gas Extraction System Condition Survey, as set out at Annex 4 to the report, be undertaken; and
- (2) the Environmental Protection team undertake monthly monitoring of gas levels to keep the situation under review and any changes be reported to a future meeting of the Advisory Board.

**SSE 21/6 WILDFLOWER STRIP ON AMENITY OPEN SPACE**

Decision Notice D210019MEM

Consideration was given to the potential introduction of wildflower strips on areas of amenity open space to support increased biodiversity. The report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services outlined liaison undertaken with the Medway Valley Countryside Partnership and the Council’s grounds maintenance contractor regarding

a potential trial location in Tonbridge. It was noted that the outcome of the trial and an assessment of additional borough-wide opportunities would be reported to a future meeting of the Advisory Board.

**RECOMMENDED:**

- (1) the proposed trial of a roadside nature reserve on amenity open space at Darenth Avenue, Tonbridge be progressed; and
- (2) liaison be undertaken with the Medway Valley Countryside Partnership and the Council's ground maintenance contractor on the potential for proposals across the wider borough and a report submitted to a future meeting of the Advisory Board.

**MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION**

**SSE 21/7 STREET SCENE AND WASTE SERVICES –  
RESPONSE TO COVID 19**

The report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services provided an update on progress with the themes and activities identified in the Street Scene and Waste section of the approved First Year Addendum to the Corporate Strategy. This included updates on service performance, the reintroduction of the weekend bulky waste collection service, the roll out of the new service arrangements to flats and communal properties, the reduction in the number of bring bank/recycling sites, and the transfer of public conveniences to Parish/Town Councils.

**SSE 21/8 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



**TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**COMMUNITIES AND HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD**

**Tuesday, 16th February, 2021**

**Present:** Cllr J L Botten (Chairman), Cllr Mrs J A Anderson, Cllr Mrs S Bell, Cllr R W Dalton, Cllr N Foyle, Cllr F A Hoskins, Cllr S A Hudson, Cllr Mrs R F Lettington, Cllr L J O'Toole, Cllr W E Palmer, Cllr Mrs M Tatton, Cllr Miss G E Thomas and Cllr D Thornewell

Councillors M C Base, Mrs P A Bates, R P Betts, V M C Branson, G C Bridge, A E Clark, M A Coffin, N J Heslop, M A J Hood, D Lettington, B J Luker, P J Montague, Mrs A S Oakley, M R Rhodes and H S Rogers were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S M Hammond and K King

**PART 1 - PUBLIC**

**CH 21/1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

**CH 21/2 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the notes of the meeting of the Communities and Housing Advisory Board held on 10 November 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET**

**CH 21/3 TONBRIDGE ALLOTMENTS ASSOCIATION - PROPOSED CHARGES**

The report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services provided details of the arrangements made with the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association (TAGA) to manage and maintain allotments in Tonbridge on the Council's behalf and set out proposed charges and concessions to be implemented from 1 October 2022.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the proposed charges brought forward by the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association, as detailed in the report, be agreed. ◀

**\*Referred to Cabinet**

**CH 21/4 ANNUAL GRANTS TO KEY VOLUNTARY SECTOR BODIES**

(Decision Notice D210027MEM)

The report of the Chief Executive sought endorsement of the grants to be made to key voluntary and community sector organisations which provide support services to residents within the Borough.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) based on the good progress and vital support provided to residents from Involve, Imago and the Maidstone and West Kent Mediation Scheme, the grant funding be continued for year 2 of the 4 year agreement with each organisation; and
- (2) based on the good progress and vital support provided to residents from Age UK Sevenoaks and Tonbridge and Citizens Advice North and West Kent (CANWK), grant funding to each organisation be maintained at current levels for the financial year 2021/22.

**CH 21/5 LEYBOURNE LAKES COUNTRY PARK - FUTURE MANAGEMENT AND FACILITY DEVELOPMENT**

(Decision Notice D210028MEM)

Further to the report considered at the meeting of the Advisory Board held on 10 November 2020 (minute number CH 20/32 refers), this report updated and brought forward a revised timescale on both the proposed transfer of the site management of Leybourne Lakes Country Park (LLCP) to the Tonbridge and Malling Leisure Trust (TMLT) and the Capital Plan Scheme for the provision of additional lakeside facilities. Members were reminded that the proposed transfer had been identified in the Council's First Year Addendum to the Corporate Strategy.

**RECOMMENDED:** That subject to the Monitoring Officer being satisfied about the lawfulness of the actions in relation to the potential transfer, both the potential management transfer and the facility development be progressed as outlined in the report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services.

**MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION****CH 21/6 PARKS AND LEISURE - RESPONSE TO COVID-19**

The report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services provided updates on progress with the themes/activities identified within the Parks and Leisure section of the approved First Year Addendum to the Council's Corporate Strategy. This included updates

on the Council's Indoor and Outdoor Leisure Facilities, progress with Capital Plan Projects and the 2020/21 Events Calendar.

**CH 21/7 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - UPDATE**

The report of the Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive provided an update on some of the recent work of the Community Safety Partnership.

**CH 21/8 SOCIAL HOUSING DECARBONISATION FUND DEMONSTRATOR**

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on the success of the Council's Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund Demonstrator competition consortia bid undertaken with Fenland District Council to secure funding to upgrade Clarion owned homes in Tonbridge and Wisbech.

**CH 21/9 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 8.18 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## **TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **ECONOMIC REGENERATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**Wednesday, 17th February, 2021**

**Present:** Cllr B J Luker (Chairman), Cllr F G Tombolis (Vice-Chairman), Cllr G C Bridge, Cllr R I B Cannon, Cllr Mrs T Dean, Cllr N Foyle, Cllr M A J Hood, Cllr F A Hoskins, Cllr D W King, Cllr J R S Lark, Cllr L J O'Toole, Cllr W E Palmer, Cllr J L Sergison, Cllr K B Tanner and Cllr C J Williams

Councillors Mrs J A Anderson, Mrs P A Bates, Mrs S Bell, R P Betts, V M C Branson, M A Coffin, N J Heslop, D Lettington, P J Montague, Mrs A S Oakley, M R Rhodes and H S Rogers were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

#### **ERG 21/1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

#### **ERG 21/2 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the notes of the meeting of the Economic Regeneration Advisory Board held on 3 November 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **ERG 21/3 THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF COVID-19 CRISIS**

Members received a comprehensive update on the impact of the Covid-19 crisis on the local economy. Attention was drawn to the support available to local businesses; the impact on the 'High Street' economy and to planning for its recovery.

Particular reference was made to the number of business support grants being managed by the Borough Council and Members were pleased to note the effective and timely distribution of this funding. In addition, reference was made to the West Kent Kickstart Programme, which supported young people, and the continued interest in the Shop Front Initiative, which the Borough Council intended to operate until later in the year.

In conclusion, the Borough Council had a robust economic strategy in place to support local businesses, recognised the risks around new variant strands of the coronavirus and continued to work with key partners on resilience, support and economic recovery.

**MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET****ERG 21/4 ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS GRANT**

Decision Notice D210029MEM

The report set out progress to date with regards the use of Additional Restrictions Grant (ARG) to support local businesses and outlined proposals for the future application of the remaining funding in order to support resilience and recovery during the period up to March 2022.

Additional Restrictions Grant funding had been provided by Government predominantly to distribute financial assistance to local businesses that met the required eligibility criteria, as well as to provide 'wider business support'. Guidance indicated that at least 80% was to be spent on direct grant assistance to eligible businesses within the Borough and any remainder to be spent on direct business support. The approach proposed for the short term (April – June 2021) and medium term (July 2021 – March 2022) established some key principles for this fund to ensure that the funding was spent in a timely manner on support that was helpful to local businesses and also met the key objectives of the Borough Council.

Members were reminded that a number of other grant schemes were also available to support local businesses during the current climate. To date the Borough Council had distributed in the region of £25million, with further funding to be allocated to eligible businesses as soon as possible and whilst money was available.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the report be noted; and
- (2) the outline approach to the allocation of Additional Restrictions Grant for the short term (April – June) and the medium term (July – March) during 2021/22, as detailed in paragraph 1.4.2 of the report, be endorsed.

**ERG 21/5 SHOP LOCAL CAMPAIGN**

Decision Notice D210030MEM

The report set out the achievements of the Christmas Shop Local Campaign and sought approval to consider future campaigns to support local independent retailers during 2021.

In order to demonstrate the Borough Council's support for economic recovery in the Borough it was proposed that the 'Shop Local' messaging continued into 2021 and that a further survey of independent

retailers be undertaken to confirm the level of support for a 'Spring 2021' (post lockdown) campaign.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the contents of the report and the achievements of the Christmas Shop Local Campaign be noted; and
- (2) the support for further Shop Local Campaign activity during 2021, as detailed at paragraphs 1.23 and 1.31 of the report and summarised above, be endorsed

### **MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION**

#### **ERG 21/6 WEST KENT PARTNERSHIP**

The report presented details of the key matters discussed at the meeting of the West Kent Partnership held on 22 January 2021.

### **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN PRIVATE**

#### **ERG 21/7 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



**TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**Tuesday, 2nd March, 2021**

**Present:** Cllr R W Dalton (Chairman), Cllr J L Botten (Vice-Chairman), Cllr T Bishop, Cllr V M C Branson, Cllr D J Cooper, Cllr D A S Davis, Cllr M O Davis, Cllr S A Hudson, Cllr D Keers, Cllr D W King, Cllr H S Rogers, Cllr N G Stapleton, Cllr M Taylor and Cllr D Thornewell

Councillors Mrs J A Anderson, Mrs P A Bates, Mrs S Bell, R P Betts, G C Bridge, A E Clark, M A Coffin, Mrs T Dean, M A J Hood, N J Heslop, D Lettington, P J Montague, Mrs A S Oakley, M R Rhodes, R V Roud and J L Sergison were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M D Boughton

**PE 21/1      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor M Davis declared an Other Significant Interest in the agenda item relating to the Local Plan on the grounds of his status as a partner of Warner's Solicitors. In accordance with the dispensation granted under section 33 of the Localism Act 2011 at Minute GP 19/13 (General Purposes Committee of 19 June 2019) he remained in the meeting but took no part in the discussion of the item or the voting thereon.

**PE 21/2      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the notes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board held on 11 November 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET**

**PE 21/3      LOCAL PLAN UPDATE**

(Decision Notice D210031MEM)

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on the Local Plan process since July 2020, set out the next steps and requested that the response sent to the Local Plan Inspectors on 29 January 2021 be endorsed.

In addition, the latest position with regard to the Borough Council's 5 Year Housing Land Supply, the outcome of the latest Housing Delivery Test results and the implications for decision making were set out.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the contents of the report be noted; and
- (2) the response to the Local Plan Inspectors sent on 29 January 2021, previously circulated to all Members and available on the Borough Council's website, be endorsed.

**PE 21/4 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2021**

(Decision Notice D210032MEM)

In response to the current local plan position and delays to the adoption of the Plan, the report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health outlined a proposed strategy for development management related matters for the forthcoming year. Members were advised that the implementation of an effective strategy which responded positively to the current position would ensure that the Borough Council continued to provide an efficient and high-quality service and robustly defend its position in the event of appeals being lodged.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the proposed Development Management strategy for 2021, as detailed in the report and summarised below, be agreed

- (1) Officers will not seek to refuse applications for planning permission on grounds of prematurity until such time that the local plan is at a sufficiently advanced stage to accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and will advise the Area Planning Committees of the risks of doing so should any proposals be made to that effect;
- (2) Development of an electronic system to regularly monitor the five-year housing land supply position to inform decision making and in defending housing related planning appeals;
- (3) External consultants will be instructed to advise the Council on technical matters that require specific expert input to inform decision making and in defending relevant appeals where considered necessary to do so;
- (4) Officers will explore all opportunities to adopt individual technical studies used as part of the local plan evidence base for development management purposes and seek to commission further studies for adoption on an individual or cumulative basis as required;

- (5) External training will be provided to all officers across the service on giving evidence at hearings and public inquiries to ensure they have the necessary skills to advance and defend the Council's case in appeal scenarios in conjunction with any external specialist consultants that may be necessary to employ; and
- (6) Officers will assemble a legal team of suitable experience to thereafter be engaged where necessary as part of ongoing public inquiry work.

**PE 21/5 REVISIONS TO THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND INTRODUCTION OF A NATIONAL MODEL DESIGN CODE**

(Decision Notice D210033MEM)

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on the consultation related to the revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework and proposed National Model Design Code and proposed the key elements of a response for Member consideration.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the content of the report be noted;
- (2) the formal consultation response be formulated in line with the key elements outlined in the report; and
- (3) the final response be delegated to the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure.

**PE 21/6 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no matters considered in private.

The meeting ended at 8.19 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

The minutes of meetings of Advisory Panels and Other Groups are attached, any recommendations being identified by an arrow.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **PARISH PARTNERSHIP PANEL**

**Thursday, 4th February, 2021**

**Present:** Cllr N J Heslop (Chairman), Cllr M A Coffin (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Mrs J A Anderson, Cllr R P Betts, Cllr R W Dalton, Cllr F A Hoskins, Cllr S A Hudson, Cllr D Lettington, Cllr B J Luker, Cllr M R Rhodes and Cllr M Taylor.

Together with representatives of Addington, Aylesford, Birling, Borough Green, Burham, Ditton, East Malling and Larkfield, East Peckham, Hadlow, Hildenborough, Ightham, Kings Hill, Mereworth, Offham, Platt, Ryarsh, Shipbourne, Wateringbury, West Peckham, Wouldham, Wrotham Parish Councils and County Councillors Mrs T Dean, Mr M Balfour, Mrs S Hohler and Mr H Rayner.

Councillors A P J Keeley, A Kennedy, P J Montague, Mrs A S Oakley, W E Palmer, H S Rogers, R V Roud, J L Sergison, T B Shaw, N G Stapleton and D Thornewell were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Plaxtol Parish Council and Snodland Town Council.

### **PART 1 - PUBLIC**

#### **PPP 21/1 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PPP 21/2 UPDATE ON ACTION IDENTIFIED IN THE LAST MINUTES**

##### **PPP 20/17 – Invitation to Southern Water**

The Chairman advised that an invitation had been extended to representatives of Southern Water to attend a future meeting of the Parish Partnership Panel. Every effort would be made to secure their attendance at the meeting to be held on 10 June 2021.

Borough Green Parish Council thanked County Councillor Rayner and Tom Tugendhat MP for their assistance in communicating with Southern Water, which had seen a resolution to their immediate concerns. However, the Parish Council welcomed the opportunity for further updates from Southern Water representatives at the Parish Partnership Panel.

**PPP 20/22 (c) – Climate Change Strategy**

The Cabinet Member for Street Scene and Environment Services (Councillor Betts) advised that the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board, to be held on 9 February, would consider proposals for the establishment of a Climate Change Forum. The Kent Association of Local Councils – Tonbridge and Malling branch (KALC TM) expressed interest in participating in this Forum to ensure effective communication with all parish councils.

Representatives from Laser Energy would also attend the meeting to provide details of the Borough Council's carbon footprint.

**PPP 20/27 Update on Waste Services**

The Cabinet Member for Street Scene and Environment Services (Councillor Robin Betts) advised that the ongoing pandemic continued to represent a significant challenge for Waste Services, due in part to the volume of waste being collected, pressure of staff absence and ensuring staff were able to work safely. However, the contractor had been able to maintain a full completion of rounds on a regular basis and the service over the Christmas period had operated without major incident. It was indicated that once the lockdown measures had been relaxed and staffing pressures reduced a more balanced service could be provided with a better focus on street cleansing.

The Chairman remained committed to providing a more detailed update on the waste service, together with information on fly tipping, at a future meeting of the Parish Partnership Panel.

**PPP 21/3 KENT POLICE SERVICES UPDATE**

On behalf of Kent Police, Inspector Elizabeth Jones provided a verbal update on the achievements made in performance and the neighbourhood policing agenda. The headline messages related to action being taken to address increased thefts from sheds, garages and outbuildings; successful operations against illegal puppy farms and the focus on domestic and child abuse. The latter had increased significantly during the lockdown and Kent Police were actively involved in undertaking 'hidden harm' visits.

In addition, there had been increased reports of anti-social behaviour and drug dealing. Parish Councils were invited to advise the CSU/Kent Police of problem areas so that police visibility could be increased. The Youth Engagement Officer was committed to engaging and educating young people and Kent Police would consider the use of enforcement orders when necessary.



Finally, Inspector Jones had been involved in a recent online community event which had proved very successful. It was hoped that more events of this type would be arranged in the future.

A number of local issues and concerns were raised by Parish Councils and these were discussed in depth. These related to damage to property and harm to wildlife, the conflict between walkers, cyclists and horse riders sharing the same space, excessive speeding along the A227 and Seven Mile Lane and the prevention of motorcyclists gathering on the A25.

Any actions or areas where Kent Police could assist were noted by Inspector Jones. There would also be liaison with the Safer Roads Partnership on speeding issues. Inspector Jones indicated that Kent Police remained committed to resolving speeding issues locally and would continue to work with parishes on identifying priority enforcement areas. However, it was noted that Kent Police had limited powers to address speeding issues long term and changing habits and road layouts had the potential to provide a more sustainable and effective solution.

#### **PPP 21/4 BOROUGH COUNCILS RESPONSE TO THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC**

The report of the Chief Executive and the Management Team, presented to Cabinet on 26 January 2021, had provided an overview on a number of aspects as the Borough Council and its communities continued to adapt to living with coronavirus.

Particular reference was made to the nationwide vaccination programme and the Chairman, in his role as Leader of the Borough Council, was pleased to confirm that a mass vaccination centre would operate from the Angel Centre, Tonbridge in the next few weeks. It was hoped that the facility would be open the week commencing Monday 8 February 2021, subject to the Kent and Medway Health Trust setting up the centre.

The Borough Council would monitor the operation regularly to ensure that appropriate measures were in place to ensure the safety of everyone. However, the Leader was pleased that a mass vaccination centre had been secured within the Borough as this would benefit all local residents.

Reference was made to the number of Covid-19 cases within Tonbridge and Malling and a downward trend was reported. Whilst the current position looked optimistic the Chairman emphasised the need to remain cautious and adhere to Government guidance.

A further round of grant funding to support businesses had been launched this week and 150 applications had been received so far. The

Borough Council continued to distribute monies as quickly as possible. Details of the grant funding available to businesses was summarised at paragraph 1.6 of the Cabinet report.

#### **PPP 21/5 UPDATE ON THE LOCAL PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure (Councillor David Lettington) provided an update on the progress of the Local Plan and indicated that, in the opinion of the Planning Inspector, the 'duty to co-operate' had not been met.

In consultation with external legal support, the Borough Council had robustly challenged these views. A detailed written [response](#) had been submitted to both the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State. There had also been a request that the Secretary of State intervene and direct the Planning Inspector to continue with the Local Plan hearings.

The local Members of Parliament supported the position of the Borough Council and had also written to the Secretary of State. In addition, the Leader of the Borough Council had asked to meet with the Minister to discuss the position further. This was still subject to confirmation.

A number of concerns and points were raised, discussed and noted and included frustration that the Local Plan hearings had been postponed, the implications arising from unmet housing need and a reduced land supply and the extremely difficult position the Borough Council now faced with no Local Plan setting the parameters for development.

A revised timetable relating to the measures to be addressed would be considered by the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board in due course.

#### **PPP 21/6 KENT COUNTY COUNCIL SERVICES UPDATE**

The County Member for Malling North (Councillor Sarah Hohler) reported that good progress continued to be made on asymptomatic testing with over 160,000 individuals tested within Kent. There had been one case of the South African variant in postcode area ME15 and the subsequent door to door testing was going well. Kent remained on target to deliver 10,000 tests by the end of the week.

Reference was made to the Department of Transport initiative to open 4 new test centres for HGV drivers nationally. It was expected that there would be a test centre on the M25. As a result of ongoing testing of freight drivers, a number of individuals were in the 'driver isolation unit' in Wrotham Heath.

Kent County Council would be considering and setting their budget for 2021/22 next week. It was reported that the council tax base would be much reduced due to the coronavirus pandemic. However, there had

been a good response to the recent public consultation on the County budget, with 65% expressing concern that social care needs were not being met. There was also high support for local authorities sharing premises and resources and for online meetings.

Details of a number of County initiatives and consultations were also set out for information. Attention was drawn to the Vision Zero Consultation related to speeding and the ambition to reduce fatalities. Consideration was being given to piloting a speed corridor in support of this initiative.

All Kent County Council consultations could be viewed online at:

<http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti>

The Chairman, in his role as Leader of the Borough Council, advised that Tonbridge and Malling were lobbying Government for West Kent to be included in a Kent wide scheme for lorry enforcement, especially as there were implications for the M2, M20 and M26 of increased lorry parking. The Chairman and County Members reiterated that the impact on local communities was at the forefront of the HGV enforcement campaign.

In closing the meeting, the Chairman advised that the Kent Association of Local Councils – Tonbridge and Malling Area had regular communication with the Borough Council. All parish councils were encouraged to raise issues via this route as soon as possible so that any concerns could be addressed in a timely manner and did not have to wait for a meeting of the Parish Partnership Panel.

The meeting ended at 9.16 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## **TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **TONBRIDGE FORUM**

**Monday, 1st March, 2021**

**Present:** Cllr N J Heslop (Chairman), Cllr J R S Lark (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Mrs J A Anderson, Cllr Mrs P A Bates, Cllr M D Boughton, Cllr V M C Branson, Cllr G C Bridge, Cllr A E Clark, Cllr D W King, Cllr K King, Cllr M R Rhodes and Cllr Miss G E Thomas.

Together with County Councillors Mr R Long and Mr M Payne and representatives of:

- The Bridge Trust,
- Tonbridge Area Churches Together,
- Tonbridge District Scout Council,
- Tonbridge Historical Society,
- Tonbridge Rotary Club,
- Tonbridge Sports Association,
- Tonbridge Town Team, and
- University of the Third Age

Councillors R P Betts, N Foyle, M A J Hood, F A Hoskins, D Lettington, Mrs A S Oakley and J L Sergison were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor F G Tombolis, Kent Police (Tonbridge), Society of Friends, Tonbridge and Malling Seniors, Tonbridge Civic Society and Tonbridge Theatre and Arts Club.

#### **TF 21/1 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **TF 21/2 UPDATE ON ANY ACTION IDENTIFIED IN THE LAST MINUTES**

There were no actions identified.

#### **TF 21/3 KENT POLICE UPDATE**

As a result of operational pressures and significant activity in the Town Centre related to a suspicious package on the afternoon of the meeting, Kent Police were not in attendance. Any specific community or town issues that Members wished to raise with Kent Police were to be emailed to [allison.parris@tmbc.gov.uk](mailto:allison.parris@tmbc.gov.uk) for onward circulation to Inspector Elizabeth Jones for addressing.

Issues noted at the meeting included parking on Vale Rise and broken glass on the cycle lane at the top of Quarry Hill impacting on cyclists.

#### **TF 21/4      BOROUGH COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC**

The report of the Chief Executive and the Management Team, presented to Cabinet on 26 January 2021, provided an overview on several aspects as the Borough Council and its communities continued to adapt to living with coronavirus.

Particular reference was made to the nationwide vaccination programme and the Chairman, in his role as Leader of the Borough Council, was pleased that, through the efforts of Members and Officers, a mass vaccination centre had been secured for West Kent. The facility at the Angel Centre, Tonbridge was well organised by the NHS and the operation would be regularly reviewed, assessed and monitored by the Borough Council.

The Chairman also welcomed a new symptomatic test and trace centre at the Upper Castle Field car park which would be managed by the NHS and monitored by the Borough Council.

Whilst the number of Covid-19 cases within Tonbridge and Malling continued to decrease and the national position looked optimistic, the Chairman emphasised the need to remain cautious and to adhere to Government guidance.

The Borough Council continued to distribute grant funding to businesses as quickly as possible and there had been a high level of interest. Currently, approximately £28m of financial support had been distributed. Members recorded appreciation for the timely and effective administration of the grant schemes.

Particular reference was made to the Additional Restrictions Grant which was available to help businesses still trading but impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. Details of grant funding available were summarised at paragraph 1.6 of the Cabinet report.

It was reiterated that the Borough Council would work with communities, residents and businesses as the lockdown measures were relaxed. In addition, it was reported that increased visitor numbers to the Country Parks and around public open spaces continued to present significant challenges around social distancing, mass gatherings, anti-social behaviour and littering.

In response to a question related to a lack of an asymptomatic test centre in the Tonbridge area, the Chairman advised that there were facilities available at the Hop Farm and in Tunbridge Wells and that further test facilities were a subject for the NHS.

**TF 21/5 TONBRIDGE AND MALLING SERVICES UPDATE**

Members of the Cabinet provided updates on a number of issues relevant to their portfolios:

(1) Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan:

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure (Councillor David Lettington) thanked the Tonbridge Bicycle Users Group for their comments regarding the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan. It was indicated that the Chairman of the Joint Transportation Board had provided a full response to the Group and that the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board would consider the Plan during the summer.

(2) Local Plan:

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure provided an update on the progress of the Local Plan and indicated that, in the opinion of the Planning Inspector, the 'duty to co-operate' had not been met.

In consultation with external legal support, the Borough Council had robustly challenged these views. A detailed written response had been submitted to both the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State. There had also been a request that the Secretary of State intervene on behalf of the Borough Council and direct the Planning Inspector to continue with the Local Plan hearings.

It was also noted that the local Members of Parliament supported the position of the Borough Council and had also written to the Secretary of State.

A detailed update would be provided to the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board to be held on Tuesday 2 March 2021.

(3) Waste Services:

In response to questions from the Forum, the Cabinet Member for Street Scene and Environment Services (Councillor Robin Betts) reiterated that the ongoing pandemic and lockdown restrictions had impacted significantly on the waste services contractor. Currently, the service was focusing on collection of refuse and recycling from households which remained a top priority. However, it was recognised that street cleansing and emptying of litter bins remained a significant issue for residents. It was hoped that the relaxation of lockdown measures would enable these issues to be addressed as staff could be reallocated to new priorities.

**TF 21/6 TONBRIDGE BICYCLE USERS GROUP - NOMINATION OF MEMBERSHIP**

The Chairman welcomed the request for the Tonbridge Bicycle Users Group to become a formal member of the Tonbridge Forum. However, in response to a detailed discussion around establishing criteria and a set of ground rules for membership it was suggested that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertake a review of Tonbridge Forum attendance, membership criteria and rules.

The importance of retaining openness and inclusiveness was recognised and Members reiterated the need for everyone to feel welcome and encouraged to participate.

**TF 21/7 KENT COUNTY COUNCIL SERVICES UPDATE**

The County Councillors for Tonbridge (Michael Payne and Richard Long) provided an update on County initiatives and consultations.

Particular reference was made to the 20mph speed restriction currently being piloted around the town centre and which was still open for consultation. It was recognised that community support was essential in enabling speed restrictions to succeed and the outcomes from the consultation could influence any changes to the scheme.

Councillor Payne was pleased to report that the number of positive coronavirus cases was lower in Tonbridge and Malling than the Kent average and good progress continued to be made on the mass vaccination programme. In addition, support was available to enable schools to implement testing when they reopened from 8 March. Councillor Long expressed appreciation to teachers and all support staff for continuing to provide education, either at school or online, throughout the pandemic.

The first phase of a Road Resurfacing Programme was progressing well and would continue until the end of March. Work had been carried out on the A26 Vale Rise Roundabout and Tonbridge High Street; whilst repairs to Bordyke would commence shortly. All of these works had regard to environmental impact controls as the contractor used biodegradable fuel across all plants and electric vehicles where possible.

**TF 21/8 TONBRIDGE THEATRE AND ART GROUP (OAST THEATRE) - DETAILS OF ONLINE EXHIBITION**

In the absence of the Tonbridge Theatre and Art Group representative due to ill health there were no details provided regarding the online exhibition. However, the current Winter Exhibition could be viewed via the Oast Theatre [website](#).



The meeting ended at 8.45 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes from the Joint Transportation Board of 8 March are to follow.

This page is intentionally left blank

## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### CABINET

16 March 2021

#### Report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services

#### Part 1- Public

#### Matters for Recommendation to Council

### 1 LEYBOURNE LAKES COUNTRY PARK – NEW LAKESIDE FACILITY

#### 1.1 Executive Summary

- 1.1.1 This report updates Cabinet on funding for the Leybourne Lakes Country Park New Lakeside Facility and recommends to Council a budget increase funded entirely from specific developer contributions.

#### 1.2 Introduction

- 1.2.1 At the last meeting of the Communities & Housing Advisory Board (CHAB) Members recommended a revised timescale for the transfer of the management of the site to the Leisure Trust, and the construction of a new lakeside facility at LLCP, with the decision taken by the Cabinet Member. With regard to the new lakeside facility the Council received the consultants Cost Confidence report shortly after the meeting of CHAB. The Council's budget for the project is £741,000 and the Cost Confidence report showed an estimated total cost of £815,000. The project is therefore £74,000 over budget. The next stage of the project is to move to Cost Certainty stage but this cannot progress unless the original budget can be realistically achieved. To achieve the timescale for the project the outcome of Cost Certainty will need to be considered by CHAB at its May meeting, alongside the financial proposal from the Trust resulting from the transfer.

#### 1.3 Cost Savings

- 1.3.1 In order to move forward to the Cost Certainty stage opportunities for cost savings have been considered. A detailed review of the Build cost plan has been undertaken in liaison with the consultants, which resulted in savings of £41,000. This has reduced the build cost to £774,000, resulting in the project being £33,000 over budget. Savings primarily related to a reduction in the roof overhang, revised finishes to the internal walls, reduction in hard standing to the perimeter and a rationalisation of external doors and windows. The fundamental design of the building has remained unchanged and there has been no change to the size of the building.

## **1.4 Developer Contributions**

- 1.4.1 Cabinet will be aware that the current budget is funded in full by a developer contribution held by the Council since the Park was first developed. In liaison with Planning Services a review of other developer contributions has been undertaken. A contribution of £20,700 specifically for enhancement works at LLCP has just been received, which results in the project now being only £12,300 over budget. Four additional developments with contributions allocated to the Park are also in the pipeline, amounting to a further £40,000.

## **1.5 Legal Implications**

- 1.5.1 None

## **1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.6.1 With such a small budget shortfall of £12,300 and further potential developer contributions identified, there is confidence that the project can be fully externally funded at a revised budget cost of £774,000, and therefore the project should proceed to Cost Certainty stage. This will enable the agreed timescale to be met. In order to increase the provision in List A of the Capital Plan a recommendation from this Cabinet to Council is required.

## **1.7 Risk Assessment**

- 1.7.1 The risk of the final cost of the project being overbudget is reduced by the process of progressing the Cost Confidence and Cost Certainty approach to the procurement process. The increase in the Capital budget will reduce the risk of the project not achieving the proposed timescale.

## **1.8 Equality Impact Assessment**

- 1.8.1 The decision 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.

## **1.9 Policy Considerations**

- 1.9.1 Community Procurement Healthy Lifestyles

## **1.10 Recommendations**

- 1.10.1 Following assessment of Stage1 [Cost Confidence], in order to ensure the delivery of the project it is recommended to Full Council that the budget for the project be increased to £774,000, with the excess being funded from specific developer contributions.

Background papers:

contact: Darren Lanes

Nil

Robert Styles  
Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 7

**Recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of 11 March are to follow.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**11 March 2021**

**Report of the Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet**

**1 VIRTUAL MEETINGS & HOMEWORKING**

**This report provides an update to the previous scoping report on virtual meetings and homeworking**

**1.1 Background**

1.1.1 The scoping report considered by this Committee on 3 December 2020 set out the basis for a review of virtual meetings and homeworking. A number of options for inclusion in the review were set out as follows:

- the effectiveness of the adopted protocol for the use of video-conferencing facilities;
- whether post pandemic, the Borough Council wished to continue with virtual Council meetings;
- the feasibility of rationalising the Borough Council's office accommodation at the Gibson Building, with a view to increasing the amount of homeworking to support the Climate Change Strategy and reduce overheads.

1.1.2 Members recognised that the adoption of virtual meetings had been a necessity during the coronavirus pandemic and had meant that the Borough Council business and decision making continued. A number of Members felt that the virtual meeting experience had been positive as the arrangements were efficient, transparent and aided structured debate. Other Members expressed a preference for a return to face to face meetings. It was suggested that the review should give consideration to hybrid as well fully virtual and fully physical meetings. In addition, Members supported the continuation of livestreaming meetings so that residents were able to observe proceedings.

1.1.3 With regard to homeworking, Members expressed support for reviewing the feasibility of rationalising office accommodation and the Borough Council's assets. However, Members were mindful of the work/life balance and the potential impact on staff of different working arrangements. The Director of Central Services

indicated that the welfare of staff remained a priority for the Borough Council and the review would consider all options carefully.

1.1.4 Members resolved to include all of the options set out above, subject to the inclusion of exploring options for

- hybrid meetings
- fully virtual meetings
- fully physical meetings; and
- the continuation of livestreaming meetings even if the current regulations were not extended;

1.1.5 This report updates members on the current position in relation to both virtual meetings and homeworking and asks Members to consider initial proposals for amendments to the existing protocol.

## **1.2 Virtual Meetings**

### **Legislative position**

1.2.1 As set out in the previous report to this Committee, Virtual meetings are permitted by the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. These regulations are of temporary effect, as they apply only to meetings required to be held, or held before 7 May 2021. It is possible that Parliament may seek to extend the regulations prior to that date, however the Government has indicated that any extension would require primary legislation and that no such parliamentary vehicle exists to achieve that prior to 7 May.

1.2.2 We are aware that Lawyers in Local Government (LLG) and the Association of Democratic Services Officers (ADSO) are looking to assist the government by exploring legislative options for the extension of appropriate powers. However, at the time of preparing this report the position remains that the current powers to hold virtual meetings are due to expire on 7 May 2021.

1.2.3 In the meantime, and given the current national restrictions, the present ability of the Council to hold anything other than fully virtual meetings will largely be dictated by the national situation in relation to coronavirus.

1.2.4 Officers are continuing to investigate the practical and financial aspects of the options identified at 1.1.5 above and a report on these will be presented to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## Review of Protocol

- 1.2.5 On 07 May 2020 the Leader exercised his powers under paragraph 1.4 of the Executive Procedure Rules to amend the extent of delegation to the Monitoring Officer so as to allow temporary changes to be made to the Constitution to facilitate virtual meetings.
- 1.2.6 The amendment to the Constitution as made by the Monitoring Officer i.e. the inclusion of a protocol for the use of video-conferencing facilities is set out at **Annex 1**. The proposed amendment was agreed by the Leader and Deputy Leader, and notified to all Members on 14 May 2020, and subsequently reported to Council on 14 July 2020.
- 1.2.7 The effectiveness of the Protocol at Annex 1 has been considered by Officers as part of this review.
- 1.2.8 Officers have also consulted with the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of planning committees to ascertain whether there are processes which could be improved for public speaking, (whether within the video-conferencing protocol or rules for public speaking at virtual planning meetings).
- 1.2.9 A number of legal commentators have expressed views on data protection and GDPR compliance and virtual meetings, and the extent to which attention needs to be drawn to the data rights of individuals (Councillors, Officers and the public) at such meetings. In response to this, in addition to the specific privacy notice which the Council already has in place for virtual meetings, it is proposed within the revised protocol that the Chair of the meeting should specifically draw the attention of those present at the meeting to the fact that faces and voices will be “livestreamed” and kept on the Council’s YouTube channel for a period up to 6 months. A link to the Privacy Notice is also included in the revised Protocol at **Annex 2**.
- 1.2.10 Where motions are amended during debate, it has been noted that the final revised motion can be difficult to keep track of in a virtual setting. The revised draft protocol suggests, in order to address this, that members would be able to request that the revised motion be typed by the Democratic Services Officer (DSO) (or other appropriate officer) into the “chat” on MS teams ahead of any vote on an amended motion.
- 1.2.11 The use of a “roll call” of members was adopted from a relatively early stage in the use of virtual meetings, and has been of benefit to committees, chairs and the DSOs as a tool for ensuring attendance and vote counting are accurately recorded. It is therefore proposed that this becomes a formal part of the protocol. Rule 3.10 of the revised Protocol suggests that the formal roll call could be accepted by the Borough Council as the equivalent of signing the attendance sheet. This reduces the need for hard copy lists and reduces the risks of Members not signing the attendance sheet during the meeting and streamlines the whole process.

- 1.2.12 With the switch to internet-based meetings, some connection difficulties were inevitable, particularly if members, officers and the participating public are based in more rural areas where broadband speeds may be an issue. From the outset of the protocol, safeguards have been put in place to ensure that participating members are aware of all material issues put within a debate. In certain circumstances it may be the case that connection problems are so severe that a voting member misses a key issue in the debate. In those circumstances, the voting member affected should not take part in a vote as this risks the member not having taken into consideration that issue (which may have affected their vote on a matter).
- 1.2.13 In practical terms, where this has happened, the member concerned has often advised the Chair and DSO that the connection issue has occurred and will seek advice from the DSO (and/ or legal adviser where present) as to whether they are still entitled to vote. This is good practice which should continue but is not necessarily something which can be captured within a rule. The protocol proposes to continue to allow the Chair to temporarily postpone a meeting if they become aware of connection difficulties but Committee may wish to consider whether this should be clarified to only apply to a situation where there are a number of members unable to participate due to a connection problem, for example where a meeting became inquorate or otherwise unworkable. The protocol proposes retaining the general discretion to the Chair to take a short adjournment for individual member's connection difficulties if necessary to maintain proper conduct of a meeting. If the Member in question is unable to alert the Chair or Democratic Services Officer to a technical problem, they are asked to contact their ward colleague who will make the issue known via the chat function.
- 1.2.14 Rules for voting have been made clearer in the revised Protocol as set out at 3.24 to 3.29. Rule 3.26 emphasises that a vote conducted by way of a formal roll call shall not be treated as a recorded vote, as set out in CPR 8.5 of the Constitution, and will not be recorded in the Minutes unless requested by a Member as per CPR 8.4 and CPR 8.6 of the Constitution.

#### Rules for Public Speaking at Virtual Planning Committees

- 1.2.15 There are also a number of considerations for committee in relation specifically to planning committee meetings, under the public speaking rules for virtual meetings.
- 1.2.16 The rules originally made provision for the submission of written statements to be read out by the DSO in lieu of a member of the public "attending" virtually. There is no parallel provision in the rules for physical meetings. In practice (on occasion) this has led to the submission of large numbers of very similar statements for the DSO to read out and the Chair and Vice-Chair have had to decide how the material points are best put to members. The revised protocol suggests removing the ability for written statements to be read out *save where* the member of the public has difficulty connecting to the meeting on the day. Committee may alternatively wish to consider whether, if written statements are to be retained, to put on a formal

basis that the Chair has discretion as to how many statements will be read, and that other statements will be provided in writing as an electronic “pack” to members of the committee.

- 1.2.17 Once a member of the public has made an address to planning committee, the present rules allow for “points of clarification” to be asked of the speaker. This is not an opportunity of detailed questioning or “examination” of a speaker’s representation, but for issues of fact to be clarified if not understood. What is permitted as a point of clarification is for the Chair’s discretion and officers have issued some guidance on this. However, there is a general sense amongst the Chairs and Vice-Chairs that this rule can be applied unevenly across the 3 area committees and even depending upon the particular speaker. What may or may not be a “point of clarification” is very much circumstance-specific and risks arise to decision making if certain speakers are seen to be given an “advantage” (in terms of more time to address the committee on their points through questioning) over others. The revised rules therefore suggest removing the ability for points of clarification to be raised with public speakers.
- 1.2.18 Related to this is the ability (or otherwise) of planning committees to receive technical advice on matters which fall to statutory consultees to provide guidance on (in particular, highways matters).
- 1.2.19 In the first instance, the primary advice on such matters is received in writing as part of the application process and will be summarised (or sometimes reproduced) in officer reports. Insofar as possible members should of course engage with these matters at an early stage if there are matters of detail which they consider need to be covered or revisited.
- 1.2.20 In relation specifically to highway matters, KCC Highways officers often are present to assist the planning officers in giving advice on matters affecting the highway network- for which KCC are of course responsible. In these circumstances KCC Highways officers are often asked questions on their technical assessments, through the Chair.
- 1.2.21 Members may wish to consider whether the highways (and other technical) consultants of applicants or others making a representation should be afforded the same opportunity. It should be borne in mind that whilst KCC highways are responsible for the highway network- and should be taken to understand what they consider appropriate or not on their network- those representing applicants or other interested bodies will be seeking to make a case which best supports their client’s position (whether for or against an application). With this in mind, officers strongly consider that the current arrangements should not be changed: there is a legal requirement to give significant weight to the views of statutory consultees, a position which does not exist with regard to other technical representations. Having these open to questioning risks “muddying the waters” as to the relative weight which should be afforded to certain representations and leads to risks to decision making.

1.2.22 Were Members minded to consider changes to these provisions, it is suggested they should consider whether there is a requirement for rules which:

- provide for a separate section of the discussion to be allocated to technical consultees;
- limit the time for questions of technical consultees;
- enable consideration of the qualifications of consultees and a decision to be reached as to whether they would “qualify” for the “technical discussion” and;
- make provision for whether such a discussion would be permitted in the absence of the statutory consultee responsible for the issue (for example, highways, heritage, air quality) to avoid committee being given a single-sided view of such matters.

1.2.23 There may be a requirement to amend the Constitution in the longer term if it is considered that some of the provisions outlined in the temporary arrangements should be carried over to the formal Rules set out in Part 4.

### **1.3 Homeworking**

1.3.1 The vast majority of Council staff have worked from their homes since the middle of March 2020. Staff have currently been advised to work from home until at least 30 June 2021, with a further review to be undertaken in mid-May. In the meantime, Management Team continues to progress its review of longer term working arrangements with a view to embedding increased homeworking into working patterns. The review is presently focussing on the categorisation of staff roles with a view to identifying which roles require an office base for some/ all of the working week, which roles are predominantly field based and which roles can be performed effectively from home. This work will be important in calculating the core office space requirements for the Council. As part of the review we have also recently conducted a staff survey to ask staff for their views on remote working. The results of that survey were reported to the Joint Employee Consultative Committee on 25 February 2021.

1.3.2 Some services/ staff have continued, or resumed working from locations other than their home address to varying degrees where there has been a business need to do so or if it has been impractical for individual members of staff to work from home. For example, some services are unable to work from home due to the nature of the specific work they undertake e.g. Civil Enforcement Officers. Presently the numbers of staff at the Gibson Building vary from day to day (between 20 and 30), Staff are also present at Tonbridge Castle, and engaged in work activities at other locations e.g. Environmental Health Officers will be making visits to premises.

1.3.3 If the Borough Council is to progress viable alternatives to the current working arrangements at the Gibson Building, it remains the case that the consent of Kent



County Council will be required in order to release or modify the relevant restrictions on our title. Officers have therefore been in further discussions with Kent County Council to consider options for a mutually acceptable way forward.

- 1.3.4 We have specifically explored with KCC whether it would be feasible for both authorities to rationalise their office accommodation at Kings Hill e.g. through co-location. In this regard a joint expression of interest was submitted to One Public Estate in October 2020 for revenue funding (up to £50,000) to progress feasibility & options appraisal work. The bid was subsequently included in the OPE Phase 8 bid for funding. We are expecting that the Secretary of State will announce the outcome of the Phase 8 bid process in March 2021. A verbal update will be provided at the meeting.

## **1.4 Legal Implications**

### Virtual meetings

- 1.4.1 Section 100A(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 requires that meetings of the Council shall be open to the public unless the meeting has resolved to go into private session to deal with confidential or exempt information (as defined in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).
- 1.4.2 However, during the coronavirus pandemic, the Government has temporarily removed the legal requirement for local authorities to hold public meetings in person. 'Open to the public' is given a wider meaning to allow purely remote access, and includes access through remote means including (but not limited to) video conferencing, live webcast, and live interactive streaming and where a meeting is accessible to the public through such remote means the meeting is open to the public whether or not members of the public are able to attend the meeting in person.
- 1.4.3 The most common means of allowing remote access is to webcast the meeting, but a meeting can be held by purely audio means and so public attendance can also be purely audio. Note however that the public would only attend by remote access if they are able to observe in real-time. Having the meeting recorded and broadcast later is not sufficient.
- 1.4.4 The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 are of temporary effect, as they apply only to meetings required to be held, or held before 7 May 2021.

### Homeworking

- 1.4.5 As an employer, the Council is responsible for employees' welfare, health and safety 'so far as is reasonably practicable' (s2, Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974). It must also conduct a suitable and sufficient risk assessment of all the work activities carried out by employees, including homeworkers, to identify hazards

and assess the degree of risk (Reg 3, Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999).

- 1.4.6 In addition to the statutory duties, the Council has a common law duty to take reasonable care for the safety of its employees e.g. a duty to see that reasonable care is taken to provide staff with a safe place of work, safe tools and equipment, and a safe system of working. It is also an implied term of employment contracts that employers will take reasonable care for the health and safety of employees and provide a reasonably suitable working environment for the performance of the employee's contractual duties.

## **1.5 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.5.1 None arising out of this report.

## **1.6 Risk Assessment**

- 1.6.1 As set out in report.

## **1.7 Equality Impact Assessment**

- 1.7.1 To ensure that the Borough Council have due regard to equality duties an Equality Impact Assessment will need to be undertaken if it is opted to make any changes to the contractual working arrangements for staff.

## **1.8 Policy Considerations**

- 1.8.1 In the addendum to the Corporate Plan for 2020/21, Cabinet agreed the following as part of the 'Running the Council' theme within the Review, Reorientation and Recovery strategy:-

- We would undertake a review of the effectiveness of homeworking/flexible working and the potential to embed it within the culture of the Council in the longer term;
- Where appropriate, Managers to build flexible working into the work patterns for their teams in order to build resilience into the organisation and embed new ways of working;
- To review office accommodation requirements in light of changes to homeworking/ flexible working and in order to reduce overheads and meet the targets set within the adopted Climate Change Strategy

- 1.8.2 In respect of the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point above, Members are also asked to note that Cabinet resolved (30 June 2020) as follows:-

'Management Team be asked to conduct a review of all the Borough Council's assets, including use of the Gibson Building, to cover all areas as well as the need, function and capability of the Council Chamber and Committee Room for Council,

Cabinet, Advisory Board and Committee meetings, in line with the Digital and Climate Change Strategies.’

1.8.3 The Draft Climate Change Action Plan for 2020 includes the following targets under the theme of ‘TMBC Estate’ –

- Undertake an assessment of business mileage for all staff and develop a policy to support tele-conferencing and skype meetings to reduce business travel;
- Amend the homeworking policy to encourage greater take up of homeworking/ flexible working where possible, to reduce home to work travel

## 1.9 Recommendations

1.9.1 Members are asked to **RECOMMEND** to Cabinet that:

- (1) the amended Protocol at Annex 1 is approved ;
- (2) the amended temporary arrangements for public speaking are approve

Background papers:

None

contact: Adrian Stanfield/  
Allison Parris/ Kevin Toogood

Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive  
Adrian Stanfield

This page is intentionally left blank

**TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**CONSTITUTION**

Item	Page (s)
------	----------

Part 5: Codes - Supplement

1.	<p>Protocol for Use of Video-conferencing Facilities</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">- Annex 1 – Rules for Public Speaking at Area Planning Committee</p>	3 - 10
----	--	--------

The Protocol supports the implementation of virtual meetings as permitted by the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. These temporary arrangements are in place until 7 May 2021.

**APPROVED: May 2020**

**The Director of Central Services and Monitoring Officer is responsible for ensuring that the Constitution is kept up to date.**



**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PROTOCOL FOR THE USE OF VIDEO-CONFERENCING  
FACILITIES**

**The following protocol shall be adopted in relation to the conduct of all meetings of the Council, Cabinet and all Committees and Boards. Participation via video conferencing will be permitted in accordance with the following provisions.**

**Application of Rules**

These rules shall only apply until:

- (a) 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021;
- (b) In the event that the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 are amended to extend the period during which Council standing orders are suspended, such period as stated within those Regulations as amended; or
- (c) such earlier date as may be determined by the Leader

**Prior to the Meeting**

- 1) In order to facilitate access to the virtual meeting, the following arrangements will apply:-
  - a. Members will be able to access all virtual meetings via a link in the meeting appointment.
  - b. It will be assumed that Members will be in attendance at all meetings of Cabinet/ Committees/ Boards of which they are a member. Any Member who is unable to attend a meeting should give their apologies in the usual way.
  - c. Any Member who is not a member of Cabinet, a Committee or Board but who wishes to attend and/ or speak at any such meeting is requested to let the Democratic Services Team know by no later than 5pm on the working day prior to the meeting taking place. Relevant officers will also be invited to the meeting, to provide advice (including any legal advice which may be needed) and to ensure the meeting follows proper procedures.
- 2) Any other person who is in attendance at the meeting for the purposes of exercising a right to speak e.g. a member of the public speaking at an Area Planning Committee, must register with the Democratic Services Team as early as possible but, in any event, no later than **5.00pm on the closest working day prior to the day of the meeting**. For example, any person wishing to speak at a meeting scheduled to take place on a Wednesday must give notice no later than 5pm on the Tuesday before the meeting. Notice should be given by email to [committee.services@tmbsc.gov.uk](mailto:committee.services@tmbsc.gov.uk). Anyone seeking to register to speak after this time will be refused
- 3) The Democratic Services Officer will notify the relevant Chairman, and will take steps to ensure that the link can be established, that support for this link and for the Member using it can be provided, and that all associated facilities, e.g. telephone, email, are available.

- 4) In the case of a number of requests being received for the establishment of multiple remote links for the same meeting, such requests will be considered in chronological order of receipt until the maximum number that the equipment can support has been reached, subject to priority being given to voting members of the relevant Committee/ Board.
- 5) Any person participating by video-conference link must test their link before the commencement of the meeting and should (insofar as practicable) join the meeting at least 20 minutes before the scheduled start time to ensure any connectivity issues can be addressed.
- 6) The video-conferencing equipment must be arranged in such a way that the Chairman can hear and, where practicable, see the remote Member(s) in attendance, as well as any members of the public in attendance exercising a right to speak.

### **At the meeting**

- 7) Members and Officers should recognise that the virtual meeting is a public meeting and they will be visible and audible by the general public. All Members and officers should conduct themselves, and dress, accordingly. Mobile telephones should be switched off or on silent and not used during the meeting unless they are being used to access the meeting, or committee papers. Wherever possible, backgrounds should be free of distraction and care should be taken to ensure there are no sensitive or personal papers visible. A neutral or blurred virtual background should be used wherever possible.
- 8) A virtual “meeting chat” will be established (via the conversation function) between:
  - a. Members of the Cabinet, Board, Committee or other meeting (as appropriate) and the Chairman so that participating Members may indicate a wish to speak;
  - b. Key presenting officers, any council legal representative, and Democratic Services Officer present to ensure that officers are able to discuss questions raised by members so that an appropriate answer can be provided, and procedures are adhered to;
  - c. An appointed officer (either Democratic Services Officer or an appropriate presenting officer) and the meeting Chairman (or Mayor for Council). This is to ensure the Chairman/ Mayor is aware of any procedural issues requiring their attention or which may require the meeting to be adjourned or postponed or officer advice is needed to be sought.
- 9) No other “meeting chats” are to be used when the meeting is taking place, and those set out above are only to be used for the stated purpose. Members should proceed as if the content can be viewed by participants and the wider public. It should not be used to discuss the substantive issue – this should be done verbally.
- 10) The Chairman will confirm at the outset and at any reconvening of the meeting that he/she can hear and, where practicable, see all participating Members and any members of the public in attendance exercising a right to speak. Any Member participating by remote link must confirm their attendance at the outset and at any reconvening of the meeting. He/she must also confirm that they can hear and, where



practicable, see the other participating Members and any members of the public in attendance exercising a right to speak. Members should ensure that their microphones are turned off unless they are speaking.

- 11) Any Member participating by remote link who declares an interest (either a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or Other Significant Interest) in any item of business and is required to leave the meeting or determines to do so, shall leave the meeting for the duration of the item in question. Officers will make arrangements to be able to contact members to ensure they can be “invited back” to the meeting once the item in question has been concluded.
- 12) Should any aspect of the video-conference link fail, the Chairman may call a short adjournment of up to fifteen minutes to determine whether the link can quickly be re-established. If not re-established within this time, the Chairman may temporarily suspend discussion of the item under consideration at the time of link failure and continue with the remaining agenda items. Efforts should continue to re-establish the link. The Chairman will return to the suspended item on re-establishment, or on confirmation that this cannot be done, or before the end of the meeting, whichever is the earliest. For clarity, the item under consideration at the point of any re-establishment of a link will be concluded before returning to the suspended item.
- 13) If the Committee, Panel, Board or Council have to discuss confidential or exempt items under “Part 2” the Chairman will make clear that the officers and Members will be moving into a confidential discussion. This will take place in a separate virtual meeting room to which there will be no access by the general public or press. Once the confidential item has been discussed, the Chairman/ Mayor will announce in the public meeting room that the Members are returning to the public discussion.
- 14) In the event of link failure, the remote Member(s) will be deemed to have left the meeting at the point of failure of the equipment and if the link cannot be re-established before the end of the meeting then the presumption will be that the meeting should continue to deal with the item. If the link is successfully re-established then the remote Member(s) will deem to have returned at the point of re-establishment. However, any Member who is absent for all or any part of the item in question will not be able to participate in the vote.

### **Voting**

- 15) Voting will be by way of a roll call. The Chairman shall ask Members to record whether they are for, against, or abstaining by way of roll call. Councillors will need to vote for or against the motion using the phrases ‘For’ or ‘Against’ or if wishing to abstain do so by stating that they wish to ‘Abstain’. No response shall be taken as an abstention. For the avoidance of doubt a vote conducted by way of roll call shall not be treated as a recorded vote for the purposes of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of the Constitution.
- 16) Where a roll call is not able to take place, voting will be through a poll overseen by the Democratic Services Officer through the conversation function, with the Democratic Services Officer announcing whether the motion/amendment was agreed or not agreed once this has concluded. No response shall be taken as an abstention

### **Area Planning Committees/Licensing & Appeals Panel**

- 17) As the Council must be able to demonstrate that decisions of a regulatory nature are taken on the basis of the same information being available to all Members involved in the decision, any additional papers tabled at a meeting of an Area Planning Committee or a Licensing & Appeals Panel must be emailed to the remote venue and time allowed, by a short adjournment if necessary, for these to be delivered to and read by the remote Members.
- 18) Supplementary reports must, therefore, be circulated in final form no later than 24 hours before the start time of the relevant meeting. Any additional updates required after that time will be in the form of an oral address by the relevant officers at the meeting.
- 19) Similarly, to help ensure that a remote Member can clearly follow any officer presentation, separate copies of the presentation should be shown simultaneously at all remote venues, in addition to using the video-conferencing link.
  - a. Please note that Paragraphs 17 and 18 will also apply to any other person who is required to take part in a Hearing.
- 20) All written representations to Area Planning Committees must be made no later than 48 hours prior to the start time of the relevant meeting.
- 21) The Chairman will conduct the meeting in accordance with the Interim Rules for public speaking at planning committee as set out at Appendix (x), Part 4 of the Constitution.

### **Confidential/Exempt Items**

- 22) If a remote Member wishes to participate in discussion of a confidential/exempt item, he/she must verify that the venue from which they are participating is secure, that no member of the public has access and that no recording of the proceedings is being made.

### **Amendment of Protocol**

- 23) The Monitoring Officer is authorised to make any amendments to this Protocol and/or the Interim Rules for public speaking at planning committee in consultation with Chief Executive and Leader.

**TEMPORARY RULES FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING IN RESPECT OF  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS DURING THE CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Application of Rules</b>
1.1	<p>These rules shall only apply until:</p> <p>(a) 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021;</p> <p>(b) In the event that the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 are amended to extend the period during which Council standing orders are suspended, such period as stated within those Regulations as amended; or</p> <p>(c) such earlier date as may be determined by the Leader</p> <p>These rules apply to the consideration of planning and allied applications that may be determined by the Borough Council where the application is to be determined by an Area Planning Committee (or by Council in accordance with Council and Committee Procedure Rule 15.23 or 15.24), but do not apply to applications where the Council is a consultee and not the determining authority.</p>
1.2	The right to speak does NOT apply to reports relating solely to enforcement matters or any other business of the Area Planning Committees than that in 1.1 above.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Procedure before Committee</b>
2.1	Where these rules apply, the Applicant's Acknowledgement Letter will indicate that, in the event that the matter is to be determined by a Committee, members of the public will be given an opportunity to speak at the Committee.
2.2	Once the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health has determined that an application will be determined by a Committee, the applicant will be sent written notification stating the date, time and manner of accessing the Committee's meeting.
2.3	The Neighbours' Consultation Letter will state that, in the event that the matter is to be determined by a Committee, members of the public or a representative of the relevant Parish Council will be given an opportunity to speak if they have made a written representation.

2.4	Anyone who has made a written representation on an application, and the applicant/their agents, must notify the Council in advance that they wish to take advantage of the opportunity to speak at Committee. Anyone who wishes to do so must register with the Democratic Services Officer contact as early as possible but, in any event, no later than <b>5.00pm on the closest working day prior to the day of the meeting</b> . For example, any person wishing to speak at a meeting scheduled to take place on a Wednesday must give notice no later than 5pm on the Tuesday before the meeting. Notice should be given by email to <a href="mailto:committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk">committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk</a> . Anyone seeking to register to speak after this time will be refused.
2.5	A person wishing to address committee but who does not wish to appear “live” at the virtual meeting may either provide a video or audio recording of their statement (limited to 3 minutes) or provide the address in writing to be read out by the Chairman (or an Officer nominated by the Chairman) (up to 3 minutes per statement), no later than <b>5.00pm on the closest working day prior to the day of the meeting</b> . In any event, anyone wishing to address the committee whether in person or otherwise is encouraged to provide a written copy of their statement.
2.6	<p>Where a recorded (or written) statement is being provided, the representor is encouraged to state their postal address at the beginning of their statement for the committee’s reference.</p> <p>Potential speakers are encouraged to indicate (for the purposes of the Data Protection Act 2018 and/or any other relevant data protection legislation) if they agree to their contact details being shared with other representors to enable them to get in contact with each other and to encourage them to select a single spokesperson.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Procedure at Committee</b>
3.1	In the introduction to the meeting the Chairman will explain the composition of the virtual “top table”. The Chairman will also explain the need for speakers to only deal with planning matters and the need to guard against making defamatory statements.
3.2	The Chairman will indicate the order in which the Agenda is to be dealt with, this will ordinarily be as the Agenda, but is at the absolute discretion of the Chairman (on advice of officers where needed).
3.3	The Chairman will explain the speaking time limitations. Each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes for each application. Where there is more than one application for a site, for example an application for planning permission and listed building consent, the time allowed will be limited to 3 minutes for each application i.e. 6 minutes in total.

3.4	Where the Chairman has suggested at the Chairman's briefing that an initial officer presentation is required, that presentation will be the first step in consideration of the Committee item, and will occur before the speakers are invited to speak.
3.5	<p>The speakers shall be taken in the following order:</p> <p>The representative of the relevant Parish (where they have registered in advance to speak);</p> <p>Individual speakers will then be invited to come forward by the Chairman, by name;</p> <p>Where a written statement has been provided in lieu of attending, the Chairman shall read out the statement (up to 3 minutes per application, per statement) after all "live" speakers have addressed the committee;</p> <p>Any pre-recorded statements shall then be played;</p> <p>Finally, the applicant and/or their agent will then have an opportunity to address the committee where they have registered to do so in advance.</p> <p>Where any written statement or pre-recorded statement exceeds 3 minutes, only the first 3 minutes shall be read or played.</p>
3.6	Committee Members will not be able to question speakers directly but may seek clarification of matters of fact raised by the speaker through the Chairman.
3.7	At the conclusion of their presentation, the speaker's microphone will be muted by the meeting organiser.
3.8	At the conclusion of the public speaking, the Chairman will invite Members to debate the application. The members will indicate their wish to address the meeting through the virtual meeting platform and the Chairman will invite each member to speak in turn. All other microphones will be muted by the meeting organiser.
3.9	After Members have debated the item, Officers will answer questions, summarise the debate or clarify points, including any matters arising from the points raised by speakers, and to give any necessary professional advice before Members reach their decision.
3.10	If the case is deferred for a site inspection or for a further report speakers will be permitted to speak again at a subsequent meeting.



**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**PROTOCOL FOR THE USE OF VIDEO-  
CONFERENCEING FACILITIES**

The following protocol shall be adopted in relation to the conduct of all meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees, Boards and Panels/Forums. Participation via video conferencing will be permitted in accordance with the following provisions.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Application of Rules</b>
These rules shall only apply until:	
(a)	7 May 2021;
(b)	In the event that the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 are amended to extend the period during which Council standing orders are suspended, such period as stated within those Regulations as amended; or
(c)	Such earlier date as may be determined by the Leader.

<b>2.</b>	<b>Prior to the Meeting</b>
2.1	In order to facilitate access to the virtual meeting, the following arrangements will apply:-
(a)	Members will be able to access all virtual meetings via a link in a meeting appointment.
(b)	Appointments will be sent to All Councillors via a three monthly programme. Every effort will be made to resend the appointment on the day of the meeting.
(c)	It will be assumed that Councillors will be in attendance at all meetings of Cabinet/ Committees/ Boards of which they are a member. Any Member who is unable to attend a meeting should give their apologies in the usual way.

	(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. All Councillors can attend any meeting of the Executive (Cabinet), Committee, Advisory Board, Panel or Forum of which they are not a Member. They may address the meeting on any item on the agenda when/if invited by the Chairman to do so.</li> <li>ii. For the benefit of any public who may be observing proceedings online Councillors should indicate when they are not Members of the Committee/Advisory Board etc.</li> <li>iii. As non-Members they cannot vote on any item.</li> </ul>
2.2	<p>Any other person who is in attendance at the meeting for the purposes of exercising a right to speak e.g. a member of the public speaking at an Area Planning Committee, must register with the Democratic Services Team as early as possible but, in any event, <b>no later than 5.00pm on the closest working day prior to the day of the meeting</b>. For example, any person wishing to speak at a meeting scheduled to take place on a Wednesday must give notice no later than 5pm on the Tuesday before the meeting. Notice should be given by email to <a href="mailto:committee.services@tmhc.gov.uk">committee.services@tmhc.gov.uk</a></p> <p><b>Anyone seeking to register to speak after this time will be refused.</b></p>	
2.3	<p>Democratic Services will liaise with the relevant Chairman and Vice-Chairman and take steps to ensure that access to the meeting by Councillors, Officers and members of the public can be facilitated. If required IT support will be requested.</p>	
2.4	<p>In the case of a number of requests being received for the establishment of multiple remote links for the same meeting such requests will be considered in chronological order of receipt. This applies to Area Planning Committees, where members of the public may be exercising their right to speak, and meetings where there are external representatives such as Parish Partnership Panel, Tonbridge Forum, Joint Transportation Board, Joint Standards Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	
2.5	<p>All meetings of the Borough Council will start at 19.30 hours unless otherwise stated on the Summons/Agenda. On occasion, and following consultation with the relevant Chairman, it may be necessary for proceedings to start earlier if there is a significant amount of business to be completed.</p> <p>Any changes to a meeting start time will be set out clearly on the meeting Summons/Agenda, the website and all appointment links.</p>	



2.6	Any external participant must test their link in advance of the meeting and should (where practicable) join at least 15-20 minutes before the scheduled start, as set out on the Summons/Agenda, to ensure that any connectivity issues can be addressed.
2.7	<p>Councillors are encouraged to join the meeting at least 10 minutes before the scheduled start, as set out on the Summons/Agenda, to ensure that any connectivity issues can be addressed.</p> <p>Democratic Services may not be able to respond to or monitor emails requesting assistance at the start of a meeting, due to undertaking other priorities to facilitate the online meeting. These should be directed to the IT Helpline in the first instance. Once the meeting has commenced, Democratic Services will be available to offer assistance.</p>
2.8	The video-conferencing equipment must be arranged in such a way that the Chairman can hear and, where practicable, see the online Members in attendance, as well as any members of the public in attendance exercising their right to speak.
2.9	<p>All meetings held via video-conferencing will be livestreamed to YouTube so that members of the public can observe proceedings. These recordings are retained and will be available to view on the Borough Councils YouTube channel for a period of 6 months.</p> <p>Any member of the public registering to speak at an Area Planning Committee or wishing to ask a question at Council should be aware that their voice and/or face will be recorded and livestreamed to the Borough Council's YouTube channel.</p> <p>The Borough Councils <a href="#">Privacy Notice</a> for Virtual Meetings is available on our website.</p>

<b>3.</b>	<b>At the Meeting</b>
3.1	<p>Members and Officers should be aware that the virtual meeting is a public meeting and they will be visible and audible by the general public, either attending the meeting or observing the proceedings via livestream.</p> <p>All cameras should be turned off and microphones muted five minutes before the start of the meeting to avoid appearing on the livestream before the formal proceedings have commenced.</p>
3.2	<p>All Members (including external representatives) and Officers should conduct themselves accordingly, dress appropriately and conduct themselves as they would for a face to face meeting.</p> <p>Mobile phones should be switched off, or on silent, and not used during the</p>

	meeting unless they are being used to access the meeting or read committee papers.
3.3	Wherever possible, backgrounds should be free of distraction and care should be taken to ensure there are no sensitive or personal papers visible.  A neutral or blurred background should be used wherever possible.
3.4	A virtual ‘meeting chat’ will be established within the meeting between:
	(a) Members of the Cabinet, Board, Committee or other meeting (as appropriate) and the Chairman;
	(b) Key presenting officers, any council legal representative, and Democratic Services Officer present;
	(c) An appointed officer (either Democratic Services Officer or an appropriate presenting officer) and the meeting Chairman (or Mayor for Council);
	This enables participating Members to indicate a wish to speak; ensures that Council and Committee Procedure Rules are adhered to; ensures that the Chairman or Mayor is aware of any procedural issues or points of order requiring their attention which may require the meeting to be adjourned or postponed or officer advice is needed to be sought.
3.5	The ‘meeting chat’ should only be used for the purposes set out in (3.4) and not for any other reason. Any questions should be directed to the Chairman and raised as part of the meeting debate.  Members should proceed as if the content of the ‘meeting chat’ can be viewed by all participants and the wider public. It should not be used to discuss the substantive issue as this should be done verbally.
3.6	However, Members are entitled to request that an amendment to a motion be typed out in full in the ‘chat’ function and read out by the Democratic Services Officer. This ensures that there is no confusion about voting and for the benefit of anyone observing proceedings.
3.7	The Chairman will confirm at the start of the meeting that they can hear, and where practicable see, all participating Members and any members of the public in attendance exercising their right to speak.
3.8	When asked to do so by the Democratic Services Officer all Committee Members participating by a remote link must confirm their attendance and that they can hear and, where practicable see, the other participating members and any members of the public in attendance exercising their right to speak.  This will be undertaken at the start of the meeting by a formal roll call of

	Committee Members.
3.9	The formal roll call will be undertaken by the Democratic Services Officer to confirm attendance and for the benefit of anyone observing proceedings to confirm the number of Members eligible to vote.
3.10	This roll call shall be accepted by the Borough Council as the equivalent of signing the attendance sheet.
3.11	Where possible, non-Committee Members will be asked to double check cameras and microphones before the start of the meeting. The attendance of non-Committee Members will be noted by Democratic Services and entered into the Minutes. There will be no formal roll call of other Members in attendance unless requested by the Chairman as this may slow down proceedings.
3.12	All participating Members should ensure that their microphones and cameras are turned off unless they are speaking. This reduces the impact on the broadband network supporting the virtual meeting.
3.13	Should the Chairman or Democratic Services Officer become aware that any aspect of the video-conference link has failed for a significant number of Committee Members (to ensure that the meeting remains quorate) or the Cabinet Member required to make a Cabinet Member Decision, the Chairman (or in the case of the Chairman losing connection, the Democratic Services Officer) may call a short adjournment of up to 15 minutes to determine whether the link can be re-established and the meeting restarted.
3.14	Upon re-establishment of the meeting the Chairman will return to the item under discussion when the connection failure occurred.
3.15	If the link cannot be re-established, the meeting will be adjourned and all items of business with outstanding decisions will either be carried over to the next programmed meeting of the Council/Cabinet/Committee/Advisory Board or a newly scheduled meeting.
3.16	<p>If individual Members of the Committee lose internet connection, the meeting will continue as long as a quorum remains. Every effort will be made to re-establish the connection, although sometimes this may not be possible if there is an issue with the internet supplier that is out of the Borough Council's control.</p> <p>It is up to the discretion of the Chairman whether a short adjournment is required for individual Members of the Committee losing internet connection. If so, then (3.13) above will apply.</p> <p>Any Member who is absent for all or any part of the item in question will not be able to participate in the vote.</p>

<b>Declarations of Interest:</b>	
3.17	<p>Any Member participating by remote link who declares an interest (either a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or Other Significant Interest) in any item of business is required to leave the meeting and shall not participate in any discussion or vote on the item in question. The Democratic Services Officer will confirm that the Member in question has withdrawn from the meeting.</p> <p>The Member will be 'invited' back into the meeting by the Democratic Services Officer once the item in question has been concluded.</p>
<b>Rules of Debate:</b>	
3.18	<p>The virtual meeting will operate under the rules of debate as set out in Part 4 of the Constitution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CPR 6 (Rules of Debate for Council Meetings)</li> <li>- CPR 15 (Rules of Debate for Committees and Sub-Committees)</li> </ul>
<b>Confidential and Exempt Items:</b>	
3.19	<p>If the virtual meeting has to discuss confidential or exempt items under Part 2 Private the Chairman will make it clear that Members and Officers will be moving into a confidential discussion.</p> <p>Any members of the public present at the meeting will be asked to leave. If they do not leave they will be removed by the Democratic Services Officer. The Chairman will call a short adjournment to ensure that anyone who is not eligible to participate in a confidential discussion has left. The livestreaming will also be stopped.</p> <p>The meeting will be restarted in Private upon confirmation that everyone who is not eligible to participate has left and confirmation that the livestreaming has stopped.</p>
3.20	<p>In the case of an Area Planning Committee, before leaving the meeting, members of the public will be provided with a new link to a continuation of the livestreaming once the meeting has returned into public discussion.</p>
3.21	<p>Before the commencement of the confidential discussion, Members will be asked to confirm that they are alone to verify that no unauthorised person is able to see, hear or otherwise participate in the meeting.</p> <p>Members must also ensure that the venue from which they are participating is secure and that no recording of the proceedings is being made.</p>
3.22	<p>When the confidential discussion has finished the Chairman will call a short adjournment so that the livestreaming of the meeting can be re-established on a new link. The meeting will recommence once it has been confirmed that the livestreaming is recording.</p>

3.23	The majority of exempt (Part 2) items will be known in advance of the meeting and the appropriate online arrangements already made to ensure that the meeting can consider these in private. When the need to move into private only becomes apparent during the meeting, the item concerned should be adjourned to a later day.
<b>Voting:</b>	
3.24	Voting will be undertaken by either a formal roll call, or if there is no dissent during the debate, or the view of Members is clear, by general affirmation.
3.25	If voting is undertaken by way of formal roll call, the Chairman shall instruct Members of the Committee to record whether they are for, against or abstaining when asked by the Democratic Services Officer.  No response shall be taken as an abstention.
3.26	For the avoidance of doubt a vote conducted by way of roll call shall not be treated as a recorded vote for the purposes of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 (Rules) of the Constitution (CRP 8.5).
3.27	No votes shall be recorded in the Minutes unless requested by a Member under CPR 8.4 or CPR 8.6 set out in Part 4 (Rules) of the Constitution).
3.28	If there is general agreement of the recommendations (as set out in the report attached to the agenda) and where no objections have been made during the discussion, the Chairman can ask the Committee if this is agreed via general affirmation. The resolution will be recorded accordingly.
3.29	How the vote is conducted is up to the discretion of the Chairman, subject to procedural advice received from Legal and Democratic Services.
<b>Miscellaneous:</b>	
3.31	The Chairman may give direction to vary these Protocols to allow for the effective and democratic management of the meeting, subject to advice from Officers present.

<b>4.</b>	<b>Area Planning Committees</b>
4.1	As the Borough Council must be able to demonstrate that decisions of a regulatory nature are taken on the basis of the same information being available to all Members involved in the decision, any additional papers tabled at a meeting of an Area Planning Committee must be emailed to the remote venue and time allowed, by a short adjournment if necessary, for these to be delivered to and read by remote Members.

4.2	<p>Supplementary reports must, therefore, be circulated in final form no later than 24 hours before the start time of the relevant meeting. These should also be published to the website for the benefit of anyone wishing to observe proceedings.</p> <p>Any additional updates required after that time will be in the form of an oral address by the relevant Officers at the meeting.</p>
4.3	<p>Planning Officer presentations should be shown in the MS Teams meeting so that these can be clearly followed by Members, any external participants and anyone viewing proceedings via the livestream.</p>
4.4	<p>All written representations in respect of a planning application to be considered by the Area Planning Committee must be made to <a href="mailto:planning.applications@tmbc.gov.uk">planning.applications@tmbc.gov.uk</a> no later than 48 hours prior to the start time of the relevant meeting.</p> <p>This is not the same as Members of the Public wanting to register to speak at the Area Planning Committee, the deadline of which is 1700 hours on the day before the meeting and should be made to <a href="mailto:committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk">committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk</a></p>
4.5	<p>The Chairman will conduct the meeting in accordance with the Interim Rules for Public Speaking at Area Planning Committees, as set out at Annex 1 to this Protocol.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Licensing and Appeals Panel:</b>
5.1	<p>Rules (4.1) to (4.3) apply</p>
5.2	<p>Note that Rules (4.1) and (4.3) will also apply to any other person <u>who is required to take part in a Licensing Hearing.</u></p>
5.3	<p>All written representations related to a Licensing and Appeals Hearing must be made in sufficient time before the start time of the relevant meeting. These should be made to <a href="mailto:licensing.services@tmbc.gov.uk">licensing.services@tmbc.gov.uk</a></p>
5.4	<p>Late material will only be accepted on agreement of all parties and will be emailed as necessary to all participants and/or presented in the meeting. Any queries relating to a Licensing and Appeals Panel should be made to <a href="mailto:licensing.services@tmbc.gov.uk">licensing.services@tmbc.gov.uk</a></p>

<b>6.</b>	<b>Amendment of Protocol:</b>
6.1	<p>The Monitoring Officer is authorised to make any amendments to this Protocol and/or the Interim Rules for Public Speaking at Planning Committee in consultation with the Chief Executive and Leader.</p>

**TEMPORARY RULES FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING IN RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS DURING THE CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Application of Rules</b>
1.1	<p>These rules shall only apply until:</p> <p>(a) 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021;</p> <p>(b) In the event that the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 are amended to extend the period during which Council standing orders are suspended, such period as stated within those Regulations as amended; or</p> <p>(c) such earlier date as may be determined by the Leader</p> <p>These rules apply to the consideration of planning and allied applications that may be determined by the Borough Council where the application is to be determined by an Area Planning Committee (or by Council in accordance with Council and Committee Procedure Rule 15.23 or 15.24), but do not apply to applications where the Council is a consultee and not the determining authority.</p>
1.2	The right to speak does NOT apply to reports relating solely to enforcement matters or any other business of the Area Planning Committees than that in 1.1 above.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Procedure before Committee</b>
2.1	Where these rules apply, the Applicant's Acknowledgement Letter will indicate that, in the event that the matter is to be determined by a Committee, members of the public will be given an opportunity to speak at the Committee.
2.2	Once the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health has determined that an application will be determined by a Committee, the applicant will be sent written notification stating the date, time and manner of accessing the Committee's meeting.
2.3	The Neighbours' Consultation Letter will state that, in the event that the matter is to be determined by a Committee, members of the public or a representative of the relevant Parish Council will be given an opportunity to speak if they have made a written representation.

## Annex 2.1 – Revised Annex 1 Rules for Public Speaking

2.4	<p>Anyone who has made a written representation on an application, and the applicant/their agents, must notify the Council in advance that they wish to take advantage of the opportunity to speak at Committee. Anyone who wishes to do so must register with the Democratic Services Officer contact as early as possible but, in any event, no later than <b>5.00pm on the closest working day prior to the day of the meeting</b>. For example, any person wishing to speak at a meeting scheduled to take place on a Wednesday must give notice no later than 5pm on the Tuesday before the meeting. Notice should be given by email to <a href="mailto:committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk">committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk</a>. Anyone seeking to register to speak after this time will be refused.</p>
2.5	<p>A person wishing to address committee but who does not wish to appear “live” at the virtual meeting may either provide a video or audio recording of their statement (limited to 3 minutes) ), no later than <b>5.00pm on the closest working day prior to the day of the meeting</b>.</p> <p>The statement, whether presented live or pre-recorded must not be accompanied by any additional material (such as photographs or power point presentations). “Screen sharing” by speakers will not be permitted. Any statement which contravenes this rule will not be accepted.</p> <p>Anyone wishing to address the committee whether in person or otherwise is encouraged to provide a written copy of their statement, which may be read out in the event of a technical issue preventing the person connecting to the meeting or the pre-recorded statement being played. Whether or not written statements will be read out is at the discretion of the Chairman of the committee.</p>
2.6	<p>Where a recorded statement is being provided, the representor is encouraged to state their postal address at the beginning of their statement for the committee’s reference.</p> <p>Potential speakers are encouraged to indicate (for the purposes of the Data Protection Act 2018 and/or any other relevant data protection legislation) if they agree to their contact details being shared with other representors to enable them to get in contact with each other and to encourage them to select a single spokesperson.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Procedure at Committee</b>
3.1	<p>In the introduction to the meeting the Chairman will explain the composition of the virtual “top table”. The Chairman will also explain the need for speakers to only deal with planning matters and the need to guard against making defamatory statements. The Chairman will remind speakers that their face and voice may appear on the live stream, and the archived recording of the meeting</p>



## Annex 2.1 – Revised Annex 1 Rules for Public Speaking

3.2	The Chairman will indicate the order in which the Agenda is to be dealt with, this will ordinarily be as the Agenda, but is at the absolute discretion of the Chairman (on advice of officers where needed).
3.3	The Chairman will explain the speaking time limitations. Each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes for each application. Where there is more than one application for a site, for example an application for planning permission and listed building consent, the time allowed will be limited to 3 minutes for each application i.e. 6 minutes in total.
3.4	Where the Chairman has suggested at the Chairman's briefing that an initial officer presentation is required, that presentation will be the first step in consideration of the Committee item, and will occur before the speakers are invited to speak.
3.5	<p>The speakers shall be taken in the following order:</p> <p>The representative of the relevant Parish (where they have registered in advance to speak);</p> <p>Individual speakers will then be invited to come forward by the Chairman, by name;</p> <p>Any pre-recorded statements shall then be played (or written statement read out where technical issues have prevented the statement from being played);</p> <p>Finally, the applicant and/or their agent will then have an opportunity to address the committee where they have registered to do so in advance.</p> <p>Where any written statement or pre-recorded statement exceeds 3 minutes, only the first 3 minutes shall be read or played.</p>
3.6	Committee Members will not be able to question speakers on any matter
3.7	At the conclusion of their presentation, the speaker will be asked to turn off their video feed and mute their microphone.
3.8	At the conclusion of the public speaking, the Chairman will invite members of the public to leave the "Teams" meeting and watch the debate on the live stream to save bandwidth. Members will then debate the application. The members will indicate their wish to address the meeting through the virtual meeting platform and the Chairman will invite each member to speak in turn. All other microphones will be muted and video feeds switched off.


### Annex 2.1 – Revised Annex 1 Rules for Public Speaking

3.9	After Members have debated the item, Officers will answer questions, summarise the debate or clarify points, including any matters arising from the points raised by speakers, and to give any necessary professional advice before Members reach their decision.
3.10	If the case is deferred for a site inspection or for a further report speakers will be permitted to speak again at a subsequent meeting.

## **TONBRIDGE ALLOTMENTS ASSOCIATION – PROPOSED CHARGES**

### **Item CH 21/3 referred from Communities and Housing Advisory Board of 16 February 2021**

The report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services provided details of the arrangements made with the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association (TAGA) to manage and maintain allotments in Tonbridge on the Council's behalf and set out proposed charges and concessions to be implemented from 1 October 2022.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the proposed charges brought forward by the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association, as detailed in the report, be agreed. 

**\*Referred to Cabinet**

This page is intentionally left blank

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**COMMUNITIES and HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD**

**16 February 2021**

**Report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Key Decision**

**1 TONBRIDGE ALLOTMENTS ASSOCIATION - PROPOSED CHARGES**

**1.1 Summary**

1.1.1 This report brings forward a proposed review of charges and concessions for allotments in Tonbridge by the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association for Member approval.

**1.2 Background**

1.2.1 In general, allotments across the borough are provided and managed by the relevant Town and Parish Councils. Allotments in Tonbridge are, in part, provided by the Borough Council.

1.2.2 The Borough Council own 7 allotment sites in Tonbridge providing community use for approximately 270 tenants. Allotment provision is seen as an excellent opportunity to promote both mental and physical well-being at an accessible cost. In a survey undertaken by the National Allotments Society its members also commented on the social and community benefits that allotments provide. To ensure a community focussed and cost-effective service for its sites in Tonbridge, the allotments are managed and maintained on the Council's behalf by the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association. The Association is a well organised, not for profit community group, and has a very positive relationship with the Council.

1.2.3 Currently the Council pays the Association an annual sum of £5,100 to manage and maintain allotments in Tonbridge on the Council's behalf. This encompasses all functions related to allotment management including the administration of payments, managing day to day operations (including any dispute resolution) and day to day upkeep and repairs to the sites. The Council does, however, consider applications for additional financial support from the Association for larger capital improvement projects that in previous years have included improvements to disabled facilities and the provision of storage facilities/sheds. The current arrangements are considered to be a very efficient and cost-effective approach to the management of these Council facilities.

1.2.4 A new ten year Formal Agreement with the Association was made in September 2019. The Agreement has a clause stating that 'When setting rent levels for the future, TAGA shall bear in mind the need for the Sites to be self-funding in all respects'. It is a desire for both parties to try and achieve self-funding as soon as possible and for TAGA to accumulate their own capital reserve.

### 1.3 Proposed Charges

1.3.1 The Council has been advised that the Association has considered current charges and is proposing revised charges to be implemented from the 1 October 2022 (the Association has to approve these at their own annual general meeting in Oct 2021 for the following year). The proposed charges are to raise annual rents per rod by one pound every year from 2022/23 to 2024/25. Currently the charge is £6 per rod.

1.3.2 A typical full allotment plot is measured at 10 rods, with half plots (5 rods) also available. The table below shows the proposed charges for a full 10 rod plot based on the proposals. The current cost for ten rods is £60.

	Proposed Annual Charge
2021/22	£60
2022/23	£70
2023/24	£80
2024/25	£90

1.3.3 Whilst the proposed increases may appear high in terms of a percentage, they do represent a relatively small financial cost increase across a full year. By 2024/25 when the annual cost reaches £90 this still only equates to £1.73 per week.

1.3.4 In addition to the above, (as previously agreed by Members), a separate annual charge of £15 is made for those opting to rent a shed.

1.3.5 For Members information a comparison of the current Tonbridge charges in relation to charges by other local authority providers is shown below. The current Tonbridge charges fall in the middle of a varying range of charges applied by others.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Charge per annum for 10 rods including water - 2020/21</b>
Maidstone	£60
Ashford	£70
Sevenoaks	£41.50
Tonbridge	£60
Tunbridge Wells	£100

#### **1.4 Proposed removal of age concession**

- 1.4.1 The Association has also proposed the removal of the 50% discount that is currently given to over 65 year olds. This concession for allotments is considered dated and several other authorities have already removed this (Sevenoaks, Maidstone, Tunbridge Wells, Medway and Thanet).
- 1.4.2 Currently there are 100 tenants out of 290 receiving this discount.

#### **1.5 Legal Implications**

- 1.5.1 The Formal Agreement between Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association requires any change in charges to be approved by the Borough Council prior to implementation.

#### **1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.6.1 The Borough Council currently provides the Association with an annual sum of £5,100 to manage allotments in Tonbridge on its behalf. Additional financial support for the Association for larger capital improvement projects at the sites is considered on a case by case basis. This is considered to offer excellent value for money and these proposals will pave the way for the Association to be cost neutral in the future.

#### **1.7 Risk Assessment**

- 1.7.1 The Association has an obligation to ensure that provision on site is suitable and safe for users. All users are required to adhere to a formal tenancy agreement.

#### **1.8 Equality Impact Assessment**

- 1.8.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. It is the intention of the Association to cease the concession offered to over 65's giving all age groups the same equal charges.

## **1.9 Policy Considerations**

### 1.9.1 Community, Healthy Lifestyles

## **1.10 Recommendations**

- 1) It is **RECOMMENDED TO CABINET** that the proposed charges brought forward by the Tonbridge Allotments and Gardens Association as detailed in the report be agreed.

Background papers:

contact: Mike Harris

Nil

Robert Styles

Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services



# Agenda Item 9

**Recommendations from the Joint Transportation Board of 8 March are to follow.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**812 March 2018**

**Report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters For Decision Recommendation to Borough Cabinet – Key Decision**

**1 CHANGES TO ON-STREET PARKING FEES AND CHARGES**

**Summary**

**This report updates Members on the outcome of the recent formal consultation on changes to the Traffic Regulation Order with regard to on-street parking fees and charges and makes recommendations to the Borough Council's Cabinet.**

**1.1 Introduction**

- 1.1.1 At the November 2019 meeting of the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board Members considered and approved a number of proposals to alter parking fees and charges.
- 1.1.2 To enable the charges to be introduced a new on-street Traffic Regulation Order amendment is required.
- 1.1.3 The Covid-19 Pandemic has led to a year's delay in the progression of this tariff change which is normally undertaken on a two yearly cycle.
- 1.1.4 The proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.
- 1.1.5 The statutory processes for making a Traffic Regulation Order requires that the Borough Council undertakes a formal consultation on the proposed changes. The consultation was carried out between 27<sup>th</sup> November and 21<sup>st</sup> December 2020.

**1.2 Changes to fees and charges – Formal Consultation**

- 1.2.1 As part of the consultation process, the following actions were progressed, inviting comments or objection;
  - Notices were placed in each on-street Pay & Display area by each pay and display machine
  - Adverts were placed in the local media
  - Letters were send to each Member of the Borough Council

- Letters were sent to all statutory consultees (Police, Fire, Bus operators etc.)

1.2.2 Consultation information was also placed on the Borough Council's website .

### 1.3 Consultation responses

1.3.1 Consultations on changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders that govern parking tariffs normally generate a relatively low level of response. However, on this occasion we have received 238 separate online responses.

1.3.2 Of those 238 responses, 6 were duplicates, where responders have commented twice. Their comments have been combined in to one response, so we have received 232 discrete responses.

1.3.3 The proposals covered two elements;

- increases to the on-street Pay & Display parking charges (T1.1, T2 & T3 in Annex 1) collected through ticket machines and the phone payment system, and
- variations to the on-street parking permit charges (T7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 & 7.6 in Annex 1).

1.3.4 There were no comments received relating to the variation of the on-street Pay & Display charges. All the comments received related to the variation of permit charges.

1.3.5 Of those permit charge responses;

- 77 supported the proposal
- 135 objected to the proposal

However, the responses bear further analysis. A significant number of the "objection" responses were actually requests for additional Council services or for new parking permit schemes.

Analysis of who responded

Of those 162 responses from residents that are currently in a permit parking scheme

- 61 in favour of the proposal (38%)
- 101 not in favour (62%)

Of those 56 responses that are not currently in a permit parking scheme

19 in favour (34%)

37 not in favour (66%)

#### **1.4 Next Steps – Implementation**

1.4.1 Should the Board agree to set aside the objections, the proposed changes would be implemented at the start of April 2021.

#### **1.5 Next review**

1.5.1 The Council normally reviews its charges every two years, but there has been an additional year's delay due to the Covid-19 pandemic. We will look to return to the normal programme and review charges again in 2022.

#### **1.6 Legal Implications**

1.6.1 The proposals have followed and exceeded the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996

#### **1.7 Equality Impact Assessment**

1.7.1 See 'Screening for equality impacts' table at end of report

#### **1.8 Recommendations**

1.8.1 It is RECOMMENDED to Borough Cabinet that-

1.8.2 In relation to the on-street Pay & Display charges, it be noted that there were no objections and agree to make the Traffic Regulation Order to facilitate the change to charges in line with the decision made by the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board in November 2019.

1.8.3 In relation to the on-street permit charges, it be noted that there were a significant number of responses, but to set aside the objections and make the Traffic Regulation Order to facilitate the change to charges, in line with the decision made by the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board in November 2019.

Background papers:

Annex 1 – TRO Advertisement

Annex 2 – Points raised during consultation

Annex 3 – Redacted consultation responses

contact: Andy Bracey  
Parking Manager

Robert Styles

Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services

<b>Screening for equality impacts:</b>		
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Explanation of impacts</b>
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	The proposals echo primary legislation on the public highway and are intended to improve access.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	Yes	The proposals include changes to disabled parking facilities, which should improve parking issues for those with mobility-related issues.
c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		

*In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above.*

**THE KENT COUNTY COUNCIL  
(VARIOUS ROADS, TONBRIDGE AND MALLING) (WAITING  
RESTRICTIONS AND ON-STREET PARKING PLACES)  
(AMENDMENT 32) ORDER 2021**



Notice is hereby given that Kent County Council intends to make the above Order, under Section 1, 2, 35, 36, 45, 46, 47, 49, 53, 124 of and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, the effect of which will be the alteration of parking tariffs and charges.

The tariff items and charges to be changed are as follows (no other alterations are proposed);

In the Borough of Tonbridge & Malling

**On-Street Pay & Display and 'Pay by Phone'**

Tariff	Type	Time period	Current Charge	New charge
T1.1	On-street pay & display	Up to 30 minutes	70p	70p
		Up to 1 hour	£1.30	£1.40
		Up to 2 hours	£2.30	£2.50
		Up to 3 hours	£3.10	£3.40

**On-street parking permits**

Tariff	Type	Current Charge	New charge
T2	Resident's on-street permit	1 <sup>st</sup> permit per household £40 per year	1 <sup>st</sup> permit per household £45 per year
		2 <sup>nd</sup> permit per household £40 per year	2 <sup>nd</sup> permit per household £45 per year
		3 <sup>rd</sup> permit per household £40 per year	3 <sup>rd</sup> permit per household £90 per year
		4 <sup>th</sup> (and more) permit per household £40 per year	4 <sup>th</sup> (and more) permit per household £135 per year
T3	Business on-street permit	£160 per year	£175 per year

**Dispensations**

Tariff	Type	Current Charge	Proposed charge
T7.1	Discretionary dispensation permit <b>AZT</b> for essential carers	£50	£25
T7.3	Discretionary dispensation permit <b>PM</b> for property maintenance vehicles (valid in any Tonbridge residents permit bay)	£160	£175
T7.4	Discretionary dispensation permit <b>PMY</b> for property maintenance vehicles (valid in any Tonbridge residents permit bay and on yellow lines where loading and unloading is not prohibited in Tonbridge High Street)	£160	£175
T7.5	Discretionary dispensation permit <b>THB</b> for vehicles carrying out regular cash banking activities (valid on yellow lines adjacent to banking facilities where loading and unloading is not prohibited in Tonbridge High Street for a maximum of 20 minutes)	£160	£175
T7.6	Discretionary dispensation permit for commercial purposes (such as building works)	£10 per day, £30 per week	£10 per day, £40 per week

A copy of the draft Order and the Statement of Reasons for proposing to make the Order may be inspected on an "appointment only" basis due to Covid-19 restrictions (call 01732 844522 for more details) during normal working hours at the offices of Tonbridge and Malling Council Offices,

Kings Hill, West Malling, or at Tonbridge Castle and also at the Kent County Council Offices, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent.

The proposed Order may also be viewed on [www.tmbc.gov.uk/onstreetcharges](http://www.tmbc.gov.uk/onstreetcharges)

Anyone wishing to support these proposals, or object to them, should write stating reasons, and quoting the name of the Order by **21<sup>st</sup> December 2020** to;

The Parking Office, Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council, Gibson Building, Gibson Drive, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent ME19 4LZ

or by email, quoting the name of the Order to;

**[parking.office@tmbc.gov.uk](mailto:parking.office@tmbc.gov.uk)**

Dated 27<sup>th</sup> November 2020

Simon Jones  
Director of Highways, Transportation and  
Waste  
Kent County Council,  
County Hall,  
Maidstone, Kent ME14 1XQ

For enquires relating to these proposals please contact Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council on 01732 844522.



## Annex 2 On-Street Parking Tariff Change – Formal Consultation Responses – Points raised

Points raised	Tally	Response
Support the principle of escalating charges	37	Escalating charges may help households who use a larger proportion of the roadspace than others to recognise the impact they have on their neighbourhood.
Residents of Medway Wharf Road, Walters Farm Road and Botany new developments would like to join the neighbouring permit parking scheme	35	It is not possible for the new developments to join exiting permit parking schemes - the properties are not resident (or near) the permit parking roads. Other options to address this issue including the potential of a season ticket for residents are being explored.
It is an extra expense that people cannot afford in the current financial climate	20	The price increase was considered appropriate by the Council taking into account comparisons with other local authorities and to cover the costs of the Parking Service and the higher maintenance and patrolling requirements of permit parking areas. The proposed increase was scheduled for last year, but has been set back by 12 months due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
Increased charges should apply to the second car onwards, not the third.	18	Comments noted, but felt proposal maintains a balanced approach to parking permit provision.
Escalating prices penalise those households with more people living in them and more cars	16	Escalating charges may help households who use a larger proportion of the roadspace than others to recognise the impact they have on their neighbourhood.
Parking pressures have increased but parking opportunities have reduced	13	Car ownership is increasing across the country, but parking opportunities in residential areas cannot keep pace - this means that parking is becoming more of a premium.
The price of permits has already increased by £10 with the removal of free visitor permits	12	Free visitor parking permits are offered with new applications, but three years ago it was decided to remove the offer of free permits with renewals.
Residents area restrictions should be extended or 24/7 due to parking pressures	12	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Objection because Ashby's Point and surrounding developments are not allowed permits	12	It is not possible for the new developments to join exiting permit parking schemes - the properties are not resident (or near) the permit parking roads. Other options to address this issue including the potential of a season ticket for residents are being explored.
Residents ought to be allowed reduced rate car park season tickets	10	This is currently being explored.

Points raised	Tally	Response
Increased patrols needed	9	We aim to cover as much area as possible with the resources available, and the online permit system enables better enforcement.
Business permits in residential areas should be restricted or cost more	8	The number of business permits in residential areas is low, but we have to recognize that there are some businesses that are established in commercial properties that are sited in residential streets - many have been at their premises for some time and provide a benefit to the community - and that they may rely on vehicles for the effective operation of their businesses.
Prices for second and third cars should be higher	8	Comments noted.
Comparing parking charges against others leads to a constant upward spiral - TMBC should be considered independently	7	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
The price increase is too much / I object to having to pay more / I see no reason to increase the permit prices - it is not warranted	7	The price increase was considered appropriate by the Council to cover the costs of the Parking Service and the higher maintenance and patrolling requirements of permit parking areas. The proposed increase was scheduled for last year, but has been set back by 12 months due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Resident permit prices have not increased in the last 5 years.
It is unfair that commercial vehicles pay the same as cars, even though they take more space	7	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Support for reduction in price for carers	6	It is recognized that carers provide a valuable support to residents.
TMBC should not raise prices to match other areas.	5	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
It is unfair to charge for on-street parking at all	5	There are additional costs to the Council for running permit parking schemes - more lining, more signs, a higher level of patrolling and back-office systems that all need to be funded.
Prices should not rise whilst there are already difficulties in finding a space	4	Parking pressures in residential areas are an indication that some form of parking control is needed.
This just another way of the Council raising money	4	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.

Points raised	Tally	Response
Commercial vehicles should not be allowed to park in on-street residents parking bays	4	There needs to be recognition of the way people live and work - if someone brings a work van home at the end to a work day it may be replacing the need for another vehicle for travel to work. However, we recognise that this may not be the case in all situations. Unfortunately it is difficult to "filter-out" some types of commercial vehicle as they are legally the equivalent of cars.
There are too many cars and vans parking on-street	4	There needs to be recognition of the way people live and work - if someone brings a work van home at the end to a work day it may be replacing the need for another vehicle for travel to work. However, we recognise that this may not be the case in all situations. Unfortunately it is difficult to "filter-out" some types of commercial vehicle as they are legally the equivalent of cars.
Permits should be limited to 2 per household	4	We are not looking to impose limits on how many permits a household can have, but to make the households themselves recognize the impact they are having on their neighbourhood, and to consider alternative arrangements.
Permit parking restriction times should be all day	3	Initially the consultations that preceded the main permit parking schemes proposed longer time restrictions, but the consultation responses led to shorter restrictions to reduce residents and visitor needs for permits. However, there are a number of requests to extend permit parking restrictions to cover longer periods and where this has been done the schemes seem to operate more effectively.
The charge for the first car should remain unchanged	3	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
When there is no guarantee of a space it seems unreasonable to increase permit prices	3	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
The restrictions in Griggs Way are new, and to raise the price so soon is unfair.	3	The price of resident parking permits is set across the Borough. The price change was originally to be proposed before the restrictions in Griggs Way were introduced, but the price change was delayed by 12 months due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
There should be restrictions on the number of permits given out	2	Parking permits have never been intended to ration parking, so there is no upper limit on the number of permits a resident can buy, nor are there limits on the number of cars a resident can own - but the escalating permit price may introduce pressure on those with multiple cars to recognize the impact they have on their neighbourhood and prevent further proliferation.

Points raised	Tally	Response
Charging for parking permits penalises those without driveways	2	This is already a factor of property prices as properties with off-street parking facilities tend to be priced higher than similar properties without parking.
Car park season ticket prices should be lowered for residents	2	This is currently being explored.
KCC have wasted money on alterations to Quarry Hill Road and bike routes	2	This would be an issue to raise with KCC as the Highway Authority rather than the Borough Council as this would be their remit.
KCC have refused to improve road safety	2	This would be an issue to raise with KCC as the Highway Authority rather than the Borough Council as this would be their remit.
Discounts for low emission vehicles / Higher rates for higher emissions	2	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Meadow Lawn roads should be residents parking only	2	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Permit parking areas should cover more of the town	2	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Parking bays should be divided in to individual bays	2	Whilst it may seem practical, subdividing bays in to spaces actually reduces parking capacity, as spaces have to be provided to cater for larger cars rather than the average size.
The proposed charges seem proportionate and fair	2	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
Don't allow more properties to be built in areas without adequate parking	2	The Council's Planning Team look at all planning applications and follow the national planning requirements.
General unstated objection	2	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
The last price hike was unannounced, as was the withdrawal of free visitor permits	1	All previous changes have been through the same public consultation processes. The last permit price rise was five years ago and the withdrawal of free visitor permits with renewals was three years ago.
There should be checks on businesses that are running from residential properties	1	Business permit applications include checks on their location. However, where there are breaches of planning conditions associated with property classifications, they are reported to the Planning Enforcement team.
Some visitor permits should be included	1	Free visitor parking permits are offered with new applications, but three years ago it was decided to remove the offer of free permits with renewals.

Points raised	Tally	Response
TMBC have not responded well to the virus - the offices are closed, but Tesco stayed open This makes it difficult to renew permits	1	In line with the Council's Digital Agenda, we have an online system that allows residents to manage and renew parking permits and season tickets from home, at any time rather than have to make journeys in to Council offices. This is particularly relevant in the current Covid-19 pandemic.
Residents should be able to buy visitor permits from the Castle	1	In line with the Council's Digital Agenda, we have an online system that allows residents to manage and renew parking permits and season tickets from home, at any time rather than have to make journeys in to Council offices. This is particularly relevant in the current Covid-19 pandemic.
Zone M should have a second restriction time in the afternoon	1	Initially the consultations that preceded the main permit parking schemes proposed longer time restrictions, but the consultation responses led to shorter restrictions to reduce residents and visitor needs for permits. However, there are a number of requests to extend permit parking restrictions to cover longer periods and where this has been done the schemes seem to operate more effectively.
Parking in Barden Road is more difficult due to the station bike storage works and recent fire	1	It is hoped that the parking arrangements in Barden Road can become more stable as the situation resolves.
Parking should be allocated to particular houses	1	Parking on the public highway cannot be allocated in this way.
Parking charges should be abolished as there is nowhere to park where I live	1	Parking pressures in residential areas are an indication that some form of parking control is needed.
Prevent pavement parking	1	Pavement parking (where there are no restrictions in place) is currently only enforceable by the Police, though this is under review at a national level.
Each permit area should be considered separately	1	Permit prices are set uniformly across the Borough.
An escalating price is unfair to those who have more cars but only park one on-street, though vary which vehicle it is	1	Permits can be swapped between vehicles by changing which vehicle is "active" on the online system.
Charge non-residents who park in the roads	1	Some permit parking schemes have elements of limited waiting or uncontrolled parking periods to allow non-resident parking - this was requested when the schemes were set-up as residents wished for easy access for their visitors.
The prices are too high - other parts of Tonbridge park for free	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for at least three years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.

Points raised	Tally	Response
Money from permits is not well used as there are potholes in my road	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for at least three years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate. Highway maintenance issues such as potholes are the responsibility of Kent County Council as they are the Highway Authority, rather than the Borough Council.
No improvement in service for the increase	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
We had a large increase in price last year	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
The %age price rise for residents is a higher rate than for businesses which is unfair	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
An 11% increase is too big and is just being used as a cash-cow for the Council	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
Permit charges are too low - they should be a deterrent	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
If permits are to stop commuters you should not have to pay where you live	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
There is no proposed increase in service level	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
Work vehicles (commercial vehicles) should be given dispensations to park in public car parks as its free to park after 6pm anyway	1	The facility to park overnight at no charge is already available in the car parks but few choose to do so, favouring the convenience of nearby on-street parking.
Swan Street (West Malling) should be residents only	1	The parking arrangements in Swan Street in West Malling were reviewed approximately 4 years ago and there was a wish to maintain some short-stay parking for the local businesses.

Points raised	Tally	Response
Money from permits should go to green travel initiatives, electric charging points and improvements to bus services	1	The price increase was considered appropriate by the Council to cover the costs of the Parking Service and the higher maintenance and patrolling requirements of permit parking areas. The proposed increase was scheduled for last year, but has been set back by 12 months due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
Parking in the West Malling business car park (Ryarsh Lane) should be available to residents as well until businesses go back to work	1	The Ryarsh Lane car park is a permit holder car park and we have pressure to increase the number of permits issued.
Less restrictions on Saturdays	1	The timing of permit restrictions is difficult and it is likely that we will not be able to please everyone as we have conflicting requests for longer restriction times with more enforcement, and calls for restrictions to be less invasive.
The rate for businesses needs to be controlled when they have been through so much this year	1	There have been a number of calls for business parking permit prices to increase or the permits to be removed altogether. We recognise the need to have some facility for local businesses and are retaining the permits but at an increased price.
Issue 10 free visitor permits with each permit	1	These are still offered with new permits, but the Council decided to withdraw free visitor permits with renewals three years ago.
School families should be within walking distance of the local schools	1	This is a matter outside the Borough Council's remit as it is linked to KCC as the Education Authority and the schools respective admission policies.
Slade residents should be allowed to park in the cars parks for free	1	This is not a facility that we can extend to residents.
You (KCC) will not install a speed camera to enforce the 20mph limit	1	This would be an issue to raise with KCC as the Highway Authority rather than the Borough Council as this would be their remit.
Prices should be on the amount of space vehicles take, not per household	1	Unfortunately this is not practical to administer as we do not have vehicle lengths available.
Visitor permits should be available online	1	Visitor permits are already available to residents online.
Overnight parking on double yellow lines is an issue	1	We aim to carry out as much enforcement as our patrolling resources allow.
Vehicles should display where the owner lives in relation to the vehicle	1	We are unable to do this as it would present a number of concerns about personal safety and security.
Concessions should apply to residents in older properties without any allocated parking	1	We cannot offer this, however this is already a factor of property prices as properties with off-street parking facilities tend to be priced higher than similar properties without parking.

Points raised	Tally	Response
Larger properties with off-street parking should pay more	1	We cannot provide this, however larger properties tend to be accompanied by off-street parking provision, with smaller properties less well catered for and have to rely on on-road parking.
Parking spaces should not be under trees	1	We have constant calls to provide more parking, and some of the available parking places are under trees. We are not looking to prevent parking where it is safe to do so, or to remove trees to facilitate more parking.
Residents with off street parking should not be allowed permits	1	We hope that the introduction of escalating prices will encourage more use of off-street parking facilities.
There should be incentives to those with hybrid and electric vehicles	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements, but parking electric vehicles on-street is problematic as it can require trailing cables for recharging which can cause a hazard.
Zone N should be split in to two zones	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Motorbikes should have cheaper permits	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Zone M should be split in to two zones	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Make more residents parking in Avebury Avenue	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Lansdowne Road should be residents parking only	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Its our right to park outside our houses	1	Whilst many may wish it, there is no right for a resident to park outside their own property on the public highway.
Permit restrictions in Lodge Oak Lane are unnecessary	1	We will investigate whether this would be feasible as an alteration to the existing arrangements.
Business permit price increases are disappointing	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.
First 2 permits should be free and pay more for additional permits	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.



Points raised	Tally	Response
Business permits for people working in resident areas should be the same as resident permit prices	1	The Council has considered the costs needed to maintain its services and that the prices for on-street parking have not changed for five years. The Council feels that the increase is proportionate and appropriate.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Annex 3 On-Street Parking Tariff Change – Consultation responses (redacted)

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1052	Yes	The permit it still fairly priced and I applaud your attempt to manage demand for the limited parking spaces	Yes	
1053	Yes	I support the principle, but the manner in which this is to be implemented will have little, if any, effect on reducing the parking problem - if that's the aim. I would suggest the following charging scheme for residents: first vehicle = £50/yr; second vehicle=£150yr; three or more £300/yr each. For businesses I would suggest £250/yr where space permits. In my view, this is the only way to effectively manage this. People need to be 'encouraged' to reduce the number of vehicles. I would also add that more council car parks should be available for use with a yearly purchased permit- for example, the car park in Waterloo Road would reduce local on-street parking congestion if residents were able to use this - a significant number of local residents do not have the luxury of a drive or garage. Many thanks for the opportunity to comment.	Yes	
1054	Yes	In support	Yes	
1055	Yes	Object because I think we should pay more! I don't think a £5 increase is going to make any difference to parking on the road. You are proposing £45 a year for a first car, I would happily pay three or four times that amount if it meant we had a smaller parking permit zone and I know others on my road feel the same. Also I feel that the increase should be much higher for a second car. Parking on our road needs to be improved but I think the council could find better ways to tackle it.	No	
1056	Yes	I think it right that people who 2 cars and use up a disproportionately amount of on street parking, making it harder for others to park, should pay more.	Yes	
1057	Yes	I think it's unfair that large vans owned by neighbours pay the same as I do with a hatchback as sometimes they take up 2 or even 3 spaces depending on where they park.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1058	Yes	<p>1. The increasing cost for 3rd/4th cars is a great idea</p> <p>2. Zone M is very big and we suffer from people in the upper reaches driving down to St Mary's Road / Woodfield Road and parking to shorten the journey to the station. Can zone M be divided to ensure parking is for local residents only?</p> <p>3. In an effort to improve environmental issues, can I suggest that discounts are given for low emission vehicles, or, conversely, high rates for high emission vehicles.</p>	Yes	
1059	Yes	I think it is fair for people to pay extra for additional cars as the spaces on the road are limited. The increased fee is also fair.	Yes	
1060	Yes	You state that you have not increased the on-street parking charges since 2016 but the parking permit scheme was not live in my area until this year so I think it is very unfair for us to have an increase to the price so soon after the introduction of the scheme.	No	
1061	Yes	<p>Not strictly true there has been no increase as you have removed the ten free visitors permits, so effectively that's a ten pounds increase.</p> <p>Also my area is I think poorly policed and, on many occasions,, I've been unable to find a space Not just outside my home or in my road but in the Slade area.</p> <p>Who would pay for more for a service that is not delivered, perhaps our area could have free access to the nearby car parks for free.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1062	Yes	<p>I feel the primary purpose of the parking permit scheme had been lost. Being a resident since its inception I know the frustration of commuters from outside the area leaving their cars all day stopping residents parking.</p> <p>In 2006 since I first had to pay for a permit it was £15 to cover the administration. It has since grown quickly, initially justified by including visitors permits, then taking them away.</p> <p>The residents parking permit should be £20 per year and not include visitors permits.</p> <p>The visitors permits are also extortionate, at £12 for 10 that gives an hour each it is the equivalent of parking in a town centre car park.</p> <p>There is an inconsistent approach to the times a permit is required in my zone too, some including Saturdays and some including an afternoon hour.</p> <p>These decisions are being made by people that the permits don't affect and clueless about the impacts of these decisions, as proven by the disgusting, patronising, and condescending response from Andy Edwards to a genuine operational failing of the online visitors permit scheme.</p> <p>It is being treated as an income generator when it should just be for administration.</p>	No	
1063	Yes	<p>I think you could leave it at least another year to increase the prices. Especially after the year everyone has had with Covid-19.</p> <p>People have been out of work and furloughed, maybe not everyone will be able to afford it I know it's only £5 but there are more important bills people have to pay than paying extra for a parking permit and we DON'T even get the free visitors permits now when we re new them.</p>	No	
1064	Yes	<p>Whilst in principle I agree with the charges - in the Barden area, spaces are at a significant premium. To that end I would ask you to consider not allowing any commercial vehicles to park on-street, so as to prioritise families that need spaces. There is ample overnight parking in the council run car parks that could be utilised by commercial vehicles. Families are having to resort to parking on double yellow lines due to a lack of available spaces - removing commercial vehicles from the equation would ease this a little.</p>	Yes	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1065	Yes	<p>The parking charge was introduced to stop the commuters from parking in residential streets in close proximity to the station. This doesn't seem the case now as it has continued to go up year on year and then taking away the visitor permits instead of an increase. If it is just to stop the commuters as first said then all you should have to do is prove where you live not pay extra to live there and as for it going up the more cars you have at your property this is discrimination for having more than 2 cars in your household. I have a car to travel to and from work as does my partner and my daughter who is only 18 and still lives with us has a car too for work and Uni.</p> <p>If you need to earn extra money as a council why not permit the whole of Tonbridge not just those who chose to live close to amenities!! Its just another form of tax!! :(</p> <p>Very unhappy with the proposal!!!</p>	No	
1066	Yes	<p>As all resident parking payments and applications are now online I do not see why fees should be increased as the system will be costing less in administration charges. Instead of increasing costs for car owners it would be helpful if charges were only increased for residents who own large cars, vans, or lorries for which they pay the same as for cars but often take up two parking spaces. Resident parking should be for private cars and not commercial vehicles.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1067	Yes	<p>I strongly object to parking permit increases due to the fact St Mary's Road only has a one hour restriction from 9:30am until 10:30am.</p> <p>This allows non residents to park here after the restriction ends often all day and is causing residents to park nowhere near their houses and on different roads.</p> <p>The main problem is staff from the police station are parking on this road from 12pm and parking here all day until the early hours of the following morning.</p> <p>I believe this is due to the fact that police officers have been moved from Tunbridge wells and Maidstone stations to Tonbridge and they simply do not have enough parking so they choose to park on our road and take up all the free spaces.</p> <p>When St Mary's Road is brought into line with other roads near the town and has a dual restriction then I would be willing to pay a small increase but at this moment in time the permit is not satisfactory for the residents on this road and is just another waste of our money.</p> <p>I also believe it it very unfair to charge residents that only have a morning restriction the same as a road that has a morning and an afternoon restriction.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	No	
1068	Yes	<p>Though I support the idea of higher charges for additional permits within the same household, I feel the decision to do away with a visible sticker to place in the car makes enforcement of parking restrictions more difficult. Without a sticker, it is very easy for non-permit holders to park for long periods, safe in the knowledge that they can't be challenged by local residents and that the chances of getting a ticket are fairly low, so probably worth the risk for them. I have been told that this is to save paper, but the amount of paper required even for the whole borough would be very small in the grand scheme of things.</p>	Yes	
1069	Yes	<p>The increase is ridiculous, you can never park along the road anyway. The lay-bys are always full. The only way you will control the parking is if you change the times to 24 hours a day permit holders only. You would then make more money as Residents would always require visitor permits. Also the increase for a third or fourth car is just an outrage. With the current economic state due to COVID-19 some family members have had to source jobs outside of the area, resulting in requiring more than two vehicles in that household. Surely after the year this has been this is not the time to hit the community with furthermore costs and outgoings.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1070	Yes	The residents of D1 parking zone do not have the choice to park anywhere else but on street, in most cases. Most residents could not afford to move to houses with off street parking, and it is very unfair to target, what is, not an affluent area, just because historically houses were built close to the town centre, by increasing park permit prices. For families with adult children living at home, who can't afford to move elsewhere, they should not have to pay £90 or more per year to park their vehicle on the street. The loss of 10 visitor parking vouchers being included in a residents parking permit has in effect put up the price of annual parking already, so to say parking charges have not increased is not true. For all of these reasons I object to increases in the price of residents parking permits. I do welcome the price increases for commercial parking permits though as they are very cheap at only a few pounds per week for a commercial business.	No	
1071	Yes	I think this seems reasonable given previous charges and the increasing number of multi family cars. I particularly support the reduced permit charges for carers  I would note that although you have not increased the parking charges for some time the removal of the visitors permits when purchasing an annual permit is an indirect charge so I do feel you could have made this a more accurate statement	Yes	
1072	Yes	I object to the price being increased, as I now have to pay for visitors permits, which means we have to plan in advance when we have visitors, or not have visitors to the house due to no parking being available when the parking is free.  The roads are already too busy with cars parking. The numbers of permits per house should be capped at 2. Most evenings there are no parking spaces available in zone b1 or b2, and therefore people are parking by Haysden when they live near the station. For a woman walking on their own this is not a safe walk. It is also not acceptable to expect residents who have paid for permits to park in sainsburys, and if before 6pm pay to park. There is no off street parking available.  I agree with carers passes being reduced in price, as these are also used by the district nurses who provide an amazing service to the community.	No	



Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1073	Yes	<p>1. There is no 'alternative off street parking' available.</p> <p>2. Our Household comprises of 3 adults who all have to commute to areas where there is no suitable public transport.</p> <p>3. When we first moved to Tonbridge the residents permit was £7 per year it comprised 10 visitor permits and a year long permit, and an annual reminder. The visitor permits were not free, they were part of the cost. The cost has not risen incrementally but in big % rises, with visitor permits being retrospectively being called free and a bonus, they were not, they were part of 'package'. The visitor permits have been removed recently from the package. So the fee has already recently been hiked up.</p> <p>4. We anticipate that our sons will need to live at home for many years to come as they will not be able to afford homes of their own, it is inequitable to charge one fee for car 1 &amp; 2 and then exponentially increase the fee for a 3rd car.</p> <p>5. Does the council wish to push the remaining owners of front gardens in Lavender Hill to dig up the front gardens and squeeze a car onto the insufficient space and thus 'bag' the adjacent 'drop kerb' space. This is just so unsightly and detrimental to preservation of green space in the road.</p> <p>6. This proposal just seems purely a way of squeezing money out of residents who do not own the far more costly properties in the borough with drives and off street parking.</p>	No	
1074	Yes	I broadly support the premise of the suggestion as parking is an issue and should be limited to 2 permanent cars per house (further cars should be charged substantially more) however I feel increasing the first car is not necessary given the economic climate.	Yes	
1075	Yes	I object to the proposal because charging £90 for third vehicle penalises households with grownup children who live at home because they cannot afford to buy or rent a home to move out. Also with this year of Covid money is very scarce and you want to take even more money from our pockets	No	
1076	Yes	The Slade has problem with parking, so any proposal that gets to the root of the issue - that some households have multiple cars - is worth considering. I would very much like though, if monies from parking could be funnelled into getting people out of their cars full stop. Better, safer, cleaner and healthier cycle paths would be key to this in my view.	Yes	
1077	Yes	This will not stop households having 3 cars it is just another way of the council raising money	No	
1078	Yes	No improvement in service. Website over complicated and annoying. Lack of APP	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1079	Yes	We have 2 cars and 1 van supplied by the company for work purposes only. I own a car, our son lives with us and owns a car and my husband has a work van. Why should we have to pay £90 for the 3rd vehicle?	No	
1080	Yes	It maybe a little more difficult to police but for those that do have off-road parking why permit them at all or if you have to why not raise the price more to discourage this. I agree on the tier system for 2+ cars. I would perhaps look at maybe adding more parking spaces especially where not under trees as I spend as much on car washes in the summer as I do my permit! Maybe a slightly bit to advanced but have a system showing where the owner of the permit lives in relation to where they have parked the vehicle, as through no fault of my own I have had to park more than 500 yards from my house due to lack of space.	Yes	
1081	Yes	I feel that the charges for anything more than one car permit per household should be increased substantially. There is not room on Victoria. Streets for more than one car per household. Business permits attached to residential property should also be much higher.	No	
1082	Yes	I have no objection to a small change in price, however I think this needs to be evidenced that it will improve residents ability to park near to their house. My wife and I both work for the NHS and return home late at night to find no parking anywhere on Offham Road - this is a regular occurrence.	Yes	
1083	Yes	We have only had parking permits in place for 2 months, so I do not think it is right or fair to be changing the way the payment system works. I think the current pricing structure already prevents people on our road from parking cars on the road without needing to create tiers. This newly proposed parking system is also unfair for people whose off street parking is limited. It is completely reasonable to have two cars in a household. In other boroughs (Greenwich) households get one free permit and then additional permits come at a cost. This would seem like a more fair system. Also I think that the visitor parking allowance is very poor as you can only have 10 vouchers across the year. This needs to be extended. As someone who has regular childcare support, it is very limiting.	No	
1084	No	Since lockdown and Covid 19 has adversely affected many people's income planning to increase parking charges is an additional and unmerited action. The number of cars regularly parked has decreased (primarily due to reduction in shoppers using our 1+4 hrs bays, meaning pressure on residents parking has reduced by 50% in my visual estimation. Secondly residents who may have travelled for work with a non permitted car are having to park so increasing 2/3rd car penalises these people and multiple person households who generally may be on lower income. If you pursue this policy you should delay it until an assessment can be made at least a year after a return to normal to assess working pattern and not then implemented for 2 yes to allow people adequate time to dispose of or seek alternative arrangements for 2nd or 3rd cars.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1085	Yes	The parking in the meadow lawn area is crazy every weekend. When you don't need a valid permit to park. Instead of increasing the cost of the permits increase the amount of time you need a permit to park. Then you will sell more permits as those who take the car to work every day will have to buy a permit for the weekend. It will also mean more revenue for the local car parks.	No	
1086	Yes	No issue with a £5 increase for the year. Would this also include a sheet of visitors permits, that seem to have not been mentioned, as in previous years?	Yes	
1087	Yes	The price rise for residents permits is proportionally much higher than for business permits which seems unfair and unjustified.  I broadly agree with rising tariffs for additional cars but the proposed tariffs for 3rd and 4th cars seems excessive particularly in areas where there is no option but to park on the road. This appears to disproportionately impact on families in denser housing areas with multiple adult families.  I agree that carers permits should be reduced in price.	No	
1088	Yes	Whilst the actual permit charge has not changed as stated, the visitor permit costs have increased from zero to £12 whether you use 1 or 10. If you have one visitor in the year the permit actually cost £52.	No	
1089	Yes	I don't object to the proposal but have noticed in past years that the name and car details of someone who lived with me many years ago was still on the system and I was told it was not possible to remove them. I hope this is no longer the case.	Yes	
1090	Yes	Struggle to park as it is as non residents park in street during the day. If you take away that non residents can't park on the street then I won't mind paying an increase.	No	
1091	Yes	We have one off road parking space and are a household of four adults. At the top end of The Drive where we live, there is always space to park. Whilst I agree with a slight price increase, I do not support the price jump for third to fourth car, it is too much.	No	
1092	Yes	You are correct you did not increase charges to permit but you now charge £12 for visitor permits that have always been free we now pay £52 where before the visitor permits were free so the increase was £12. Now you want to add £5 which makes total £17 increase in two years	No	
1093	Yes	A 11 percent increase is a big sum and to me it seems that the on street parking/ residents permits is just being used as a cash cow for the Council.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1094	Yes	The Slade area is very difficult for parking, more often than not when I return home from work I have to park illegally and get up before 7.30am to move into a space. There are so many cars that park during the week and before and after the permit time that aren't here at the weekend. This would lead me to believe they aren't residents, but people who have 'acquired' a permit. I have lived here 3 years and had as many parking tickets. If the slade is to be permitted it should be 24/7, then commuters would have to use the car parks AND therefore increase revenue to the council, negating any need for an increase.	No	
1095	Yes	Multiple car households should be penalized for taking up all the parking spaces. As other residents are struggling to park, me included which is frustrating.	Yes	
1096	Yes	The number of families that clog up the road with 2 or 3 vehicles many of which don't move from one end of a week to another are the problems. I believe one car at £40 and then a jump of £150 for the second car and £300 for a third which is in line with a Sevenoaks permit. Also I believe Meadow Lawn roads should be resident parking only to deter people parking around the restricted times and over the weekends to train it to London.	Yes	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1097	Yes	<p>The Proposed parking increases to parking charges is not in the best interest of residents for parking their cars, the majority of houses at the Vauxhall end of Pembury road do not have anywhere for the “encouraged off road parking” than an the majority of car are parked in the Doctors car park at weekends or in the bottom of Deakin Leas during the week, I for one refuse to be extorted by this increase when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an inadequate number of bays in the Vauxhall end of pembury road</li> <li>• KCC have refused to improve the safety of the road and parked cars after twice they have been driven into this year, one causing £4000 in damage to one of our cars</li> <li>• You will not install a speed camera to enforce the 20mph limit</li> <li>• And we are not guaranteed a space in the correct bay zone</li> </ul> <p>This is yet another money grabbing scheme to penalise residents after the council and KCC short-sightedly wasted the money back in the summer with alterations to Quarry hill and the bike routes, only to change it back when it didn't work.</p> <p>These changes are basically enforcing residents to pay regardless and with the addition of the new builds and such inadequate off road spaces for them the council are adding to the problem rather than making building companies provide adequate off road spaces for a reasonable number of cars or increasing the road parking to accommodate the increase in houses. I have already tried to get pembury road modified with the help of Frances Hoskins but neither the councillors nor KCC want to know.</p>	No	
1098	Yes	<p>This will not decrease the number of cars people have. We have two cars because we need them, not out of choice. Your suggestion of parting off the street is ludicrous - please let me know where? I would be happy to park somewhere and walk to my house, if fact because people who live in Woodside park in our road I rarely get to park near my house as it is. Just be honest , you need to raise more cash 0-make each permit £50.00 and make it residents only for 8- 10am and 2-4pm - that will create more space as it will stop the off to london for the day and police workers . Issue 10 visitor permits with each resident permit. What you propose will not stop people having cars nobody has a car for the sake of it - ridiculous notion!</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1099	Yes	I feel that increasing the charges isn't fair, particularly as I do not get a guaranteed parking space near my home. There are many times that I have come home from work and had to drive around for as much as half an hour to find a parking space even remotely close to my home. If the increase guaranteed me a parking space close to my home, then I would be happy to pay. We dont have the luxury of off-street parking, and where we live, there are too many cars to fit the number of spaces. It also doesnt help that after 4pm, many cars park along the road, with their drivers going to the train station and catching trains, thus, leaving no parking spaces for the residents. There have been many times where cars have been parked on double yellow lines due to the lack of parking spaces close to their homes, spaces taken up by non residents and commuters without permits. This has become less obvious since the permits in the windscreen have been abolished, however, local residents do know each others cars. If something was done about the non-residents parking their cars and then going to the train station, along with enough parking spaces for the residents, then the increase in the charge would be acceptable.	No	
1100	Yes	I support the permit scheme as a means of deterring non residence (commuters) parking in the street during the day. However I see no reason for the proposed increase of the permit.  The permit scheme, although it may address the issue of commuters, does not address residence who have commercial vans parked in the road and who do not purchase any permits whatsoever. This for me is a much bigger issue and is something that should be addressed.	No	
1101	Yes	Having multiple cars on these roads is unfair to others who only have one or two when trying to find parking. I would ask the council to consider putting lines in the bays so that there are actual parking spaces to prevent terrible parking!	Yes	
1102	Yes	Knowing full well the climate we are in, House prices at a all time high, so chance are there are many house holds with the majority of their children still living at home, who own cars, without off road parking, so this is a nice way for you to make so money out of everyone who are already struggling. I doubt you've even looked to see weather you have the infrastructure to accommodate if people are 'encouraged' to go to car parks and be charged a fortune for a season ticket.  Let's go over some of the recent changes this Council has made, the High Street, 1st attempt you put the bus stops in the road, so traffic came to a complete standstill every time, so you had to rework that and still is less than ideal with them sticking halfway into the road when stationary, but you have loading bays for lorries that completely move them out the way of traffic, why couldn't you use them also as bus stops as most deliveries are not during rush-hour. Also that mess you made on the A26 by the Shell garage and Waterloo road, what a waste of time and money that was, putting a bus stop in the middle of the road, making it all single lane so again it all came to a standstill. No confidence in this Council or the changes your making, wasting so much money that could have been put to better use.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1103	Yes	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I have recently moved into the area and do not have a drive so I have to park in the street.</p> <p>I think this increase is not fair as it is penalising everyone who does not have a drive as I have to pay more for my car to be on the road but if someone has two cars but a drive they only pay for one car.</p> <p>I agree with the sliding scale for if you own one or more cars but the price should stay the same for people without drives and the increase to the £45 if you do and then increase the more cars you have.</p> <p>It's a simple right to be able to park outside your house.</p> <p>With elderly neighbours, how do you accept them to pay the increase or if they can not to park somewhere and walk?</p>	No	
1104	Yes	<p>I object to paying more for a space to park when there are too many cars for amount of spaces! Outside our property are three spaces which invariably are used by people going to the pub. The sign says no parking from 9.30 to 11.30 am. So anyone without a permit can park all day and all night without a permit. Everywhere else around us says 9.30 to 11.30 and 4 to 6pm. Why? Is it because it's outside the pub? People without permits use these spaces to visit the park for the day, to walk to the town and not pay for parking ticket. There is even a lady who drives to park her car there and sits and eats her lunch!! People with huge work vans park there at weekends because they don't need a permit. Meanwhile we have to find spaces some distance from our home. If you insist on increasing charges this parking sign needs to be changed so that it is the same as everyone else's!</p>	No	
1105	Yes	<p>Residents with permits on Swan Street already struggle to park as it is as the council allows free short-stay parking on Swan Street for people coming into the village. It seems ludicrous to charge more for those with 1-2 cars when we already have to park in the local car parks after hours to get a space.</p> <p>The council should not be allowing free short-stay parking to non-residents at all. I am also surprised people can get more than 2 permits per household. It should be capped at 2, considering the demand for spaces is so high.</p>	No	
1106	Yes	<p>Whilst I appreciate that parking charges have to increase and that you wish to try and bring into line with those of Tunbridge Wells etc; I would like to point out that East Malling is mainly a residential area and a village. We do not have a large commercial shopping area and I fail to see why we should have our parking permits raised. I agree that multi car households be charged accordingly as this would hopefully result in the decrease of cars on our roads, but being a sole car user the increase is not warranted.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1107	Yes	<p>Strongly support the tiered charges for multiple car ownership.</p> <p>The people with two or more cars clogging up our narrow streets should be deterred.</p> <p>I would, however, welcome back the voucher system for guests. It only has to be one or two temporary permits per year. I'm sure you can sort out the administration to allow this. It would be extremely helpful for the occasional visitor.</p> <p>I would also welcome less restrictions on a Saturday while fully support the parking restrictions during the week.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	Yes	
1108	Yes	<p>I don't understand why I should be penalized further for living in an area that has permits. There is not any off road parking in my area so I don't get any choice but to have a permit. As my children get older and choose to drive the costs get more and more for again living in an area without off road parking. Would it not be better to make the whole of Tonbridge a permit zone and increase your income that way.</p> <p>In a household of 4 adults the permits could cost us £315 per year for a situation we have no control over.</p> <p>What about giving each household 1-2 permits for free each year and then charge more for 3 cars or more?</p> <p>Just another form of council tax.</p>	No	



Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1109	Yes	I feel it is rather unfair to increase the prices of parking permits especially as parking wardens do not patrol the residential roads in Borough Green, only the Western Road Car Park. I have paid for a permit every year since the permit came into effect in 2007 and the warden has barely been down my road in all those years. I never get parked in my road or surrounding area and always have to park in the car park while those who do not pay for a permit gets to park in the road with no ramification for not paying for a permit or receiving a penalty charge notice for being parked in the road for more than the allocated time on a daily basis. I also see you are basing the price increase in line with that of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Sevenoaks District Council. One, both Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks are towns and Borough Green is only a village and secondly wardens are continuously walking around patrolling the residential streets and the car parks in both towns every day. It is, therefore, for those reasons I am objecting to the price increase proposal as I do wonder the need for paying for a permit especially when in a couple of years when you review your prices again you will be looking to charge in excess of £50.00 for the privilege.	No	
1110	Yes	I have one car and often find it extremely difficult to find parking on my street. There are many with drives and off road parking who don't use them and park in the street anyway and others with multiple cars oer household taking up parking space for those who really need it. I think in todays world we have to accept that many households have 2 cars so it is right the charge is the same for a second car but above this it is perfectly reasonable to charge extra and try to discourage households from parking more than 3 cars on the street. Multi occupancy households should have provision for parking or planning permission should be denied.	Yes	
1111	Yes	I support but I would like to see more residents parking in Avebury avenue from river lawn rd to Jimmy's cafe either leaving tickets machines but making for residents parking the time I come home and there no where to park in D1 " yes I no we can park in D2 but" and there's no one park from river lawn to where the D1 starts, plus then we have to put up with the ford garage parking in residence spaces.	Yes	
1112	Yes	I do not think that an increase in tariff charges for on street parking is necessary. Especially as those who do pay for on street parking permits are not guaranteed a space near their home at many points during the week anyway, or even at times when the permit restrictions do not apply outside the stated permit restriction times. myself and my partner (both TMBC permit holders) have often found on many occasions that we have to park quite a distance away from our home, so therefore I object to an increase in permit parking charges.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1113	Yes	<p>I object to the rise of the parking fee. I rarely get a space, due to a number a of cars that just park there without a permit anyway and people who park inconsiderably. I have to park up priory road the majority of the time</p> <p>. With the high price of living around here and contributing through tax etc I believe this rise is out of order.</p>	No	
1114	Yes	I support the sliding scale as a means to control the number of cars per household but I do not support the increase in the basic rate. The cost to residents should be to cover the basic administration as was originally intended when introduced.	No	
1115	Yes	<p>The question "do you object or support the proposal" is too simplistic as I support part of it but object to another part of it. So I have had to put object.</p> <p>Support - the introduction of a higher charge for three or more vehicles. This is a good idea for three cars and over. As many households have two cars I think it is fair to keep the price the same for the second car, please do not increase it for a second car. However for a third car or more I think this is a good idea. Three cars from the same household would take up a significant part of our available street parking, so this should be discouraged.</p> <p>Object - prices being higher elsewhere is not a reason to increase prices in our council area. Prices elsewhere may be higher, lower, the same - the area demographics, average pay, availability of street parking, resources for enforcement will all be different in different areas. This should have no bearing on our prices and should not be the justification. The justification should depend on what is required to run the parking scheme in this area by this council. Since moving to my property I now have to pay to park my car and have my garden waste collected, which were included in my council tax previously. This is additional tax. I object to any increase in the cost, particularly if the sole reason for it is comparison to other areas.</p>	No	
1116	Yes	<p>There are only three cars that pay for this outrages parking fee,my household two permits, 86 one permit. Nobody parks there all day apart from public house drink drivers when it's open, and school parents , its a very unfair charge, kings Rd exempt Tudeley Lane exempt, parts of lodge oak lane exempt, it seems only social housing affected. It wouldn't be so bad if the times were changed and I could park my car at three o'clock to four . Very unfair. Very unjust. This needs to be addressed properly and fairly. Commuters do not park in this area!! If it could be scrapped in Tudeley Lane why not in lodge oak Lane . School traffic is awful they park on double yellow lines on corners why aren't they told not to. Very unfair sort it please. When we can't park and our tyre touches the yellow line we have been given parking tickets? School time free for all.. wheres the justice ?? Rich get richer poor get poorer!!</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1117	Yes	Firstly the on street parking permit scheme was originally introduced to stop commuters taking up parking spaces used by residents, the charges imposed we were told reflected the cost of administrating the scheme, not a money making exercise for the council, as all the parking plans seem to be these days. Secondly , the fact other councils have differing tariffs should have no bearing on Tonbridge, Would the council have reduced the charges if neighbouring councils parking charges were less? I think not. With the expected increase in council tax and the lowering of services supplied I think the council are squeezing enough money from residents and should look at other cost savings, for example the total waste of the pointless exercise on Quarry hill and subsequent reinstatement.	No	
1118	Yes	There are cars in this road that are infrequently used and remain in the same parking spaces for weeks on end. I approve the rising scale to discourage car collectors and enthusiast from acquiring more cars.	Yes	
1119	Yes	Whilst I support the increase in parking charges something needs to be done about how many business permits can be issued. We have limited residents bays in George Street for the 15 houses, but S Tyres on Quarry Hill park at least 2/3 cars/vans in the street every day as well as parking their customer cars too. This stops us residents parking in the street and then we have to find alternative parking elsewhere which is quite often 2/3 streets away. I appreciate business permits are dearer but when the businesses move in they should only be allowed 1 business permit? Can more parking bays in the street be added/reviewed?	Yes	
1120	Yes	Given that people's disposable income is at an all time low given the pandemic this year and the increase in unemployment to come during early 2021, this proposal feels ill timed and outdated.  As a Council I believe you should be supporting local residents, particularly ones without private parking, by trying to reduce additional charges such as these. Most residents have a permit because they have to have a car(s) for employment, which then enables the payment of their council tax.  This feels like an old fashioned stealth tax, which should not be implemented, particular while private sector workers are seeing a vastly reduced income and often job loss.	No	
1121	Yes	I would like to strongly object to the increase in permit charges. Currently I am paying for a permit for an hour a day only. The road is increasingly busy with NON resident parking, so how you can justify an increase when I can rarely park on my road is beyond me. Until there is an increase in time zones particularly in the afternoon, there is no logical standing how you can put up permit charges. The parking issues up ST Mary's road are horrendous and I doubt you will find any resident up this road supporting this ridiculous idea!	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1122	Yes	I would also like to see the current 09:30 - 10:30 extended across the working day or at least another hour added to the afternoon e.g. 17:30 - 18:30 to prevent non-permit holders - e.g. those who travel by train later in the day - parking in the street making it impossible for residents to park in the early evening.	Yes	
1123	Yes	There are 4 adults living at this address - we all work in places where we are unable to get to by public transport or have commitments needing a car. We live in a terraced house with no parking available so all our cars have to be parked on the street- we have no choice and your proposed permit charges are unreasonable. The original scheme was brought in to be non profit making and to deter rail commuters from parking on the surrounding roads NOT to be punitive to residents. I am opposed to these charges	No	
1124	Yes	While there was not a resident's permit increase in 2018, the 10 visitors permits which used to be included were withdrawn, effectively increasing the cost of the permit by £10.	No	
1125	Yes	I counter propose £40 for the first car and £50 for the second car to try to encourage less cars per household. Then any subsequent cars as per your proposal. If a household needs two cars, perhaps for work reasons, they would pay the same as in your proposal (£45+£45). I just want to put this forward, in case it is a viable option. Also 2020 has been a really tough year with many people losing income.	No	
1126	Yes	The increased rate is, in this current time, a ridiculous thing to do. I live in a busy street, where most days I struggle to find a parking near my house. There are so many commercial vans parking in our road overnight which take up more space so why should I be asked to pay more when I can't park outside my home and commercial vans taking up more space pay the same rate as me. I really am most annoyed by this proposal.	No	
1127	Yes	We think for £45 a 'few' visitors permits should be included and that the price for a second car should be higher than the price for the first car – at least in our area (Slade) where parking is at a premium and the roads are very narrow thus multiple-car ownership should be discouraged.	Yes	
1128	Yes	I think increased charges should apply for the second car onwards, not just from the third.  Also while the West Malling Business car park sits empty as most users are working from home now, local residents (many working from home now too) can't find any parking spaces! It's a ridiculous situation, the parking restrictions in this car park should be revised to include local residents until such time as local businesses go back to working in office.	Yes	
1129	Yes	The parking along our road has been basically inaccessible all year due to the new station bike storage works and now due to a recent fire the road is closed off, further reducing parking. For these reasons I feel a rise in parking fees is unfair. I do however support the rising fees for more than 2 cars per household, being near the station it is becoming increasingly difficult to park at all, let alone near my house.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1130	Yes	I agree on the plan to discourage multiple car ownership especially where on-road parking is the only option and in short supply.	Yes	
1131	Yes	I live on a road where there is a lot of inconsiderate parking at all times by parents collecting their children from the Grammar School. An increase in the number of street patrols would be welcome.	Yes	
1132	Yes	I have recently reduced to 1 car which my wife and i share. My concern about the new plan is that i have 3 children who will soon be at driving age and will probably all want to get cars. It seems targeted at households with older children who due to circumstances are not ready willing or able to leave home.	No	
1133	Yes	I hope you are referring to all vehicles and not just cars. There are many work vans as well as motorbikes parked in my road. We also had a mobility scooter that was not being used parked here last year too. In my road, we only park one side of the road which means there are not enough spaces even if each house only had one vehicle. Would it be possible for work vehicles to be given some kind of dispensation to park in public car parks as it's free parking there after 6o'clock anyway.	No	
1134	Yes	Although It is understandable that fees have to increase, I would comment that the last price hike was unannounced and the withdrawal of a certain number of permits for guests was also withdrawn. It seems that the innocent motorist who does not have a drive is being penalised again. If the cost has to go up £5.00 that is bearable but the parking for visitors is not !	No	
1135	Yes	<p>The recent proposals put forth go against what we initially proposed when the first round of consultations occurred.</p> <p>It is ridiculous to expect households to have to pay double or more when it reaches 3+ vehicles per household. Unfortunately I live in a household where we all work in different places and each require our own vehicle in order to get to our place of employment.</p> <p>There is also no penalty for commercial vehicles parking on a residential street. They take up multiple spaces in the road and often prohibit non-commercial vehicles from parking anywhere near their own homes.</p> <p>Our original suggestion was to have a tiered system in which ordinary cars paid one fee and commercial vehicles paid a higher fee as they take up more room in the road.</p>	No	
1136	Yes	Our family income is now substantially less than it was last year so I think you'll understand that I cannot support the increase in the charge for our single car. However, any scheme that discourages those who have drives and continue to park on the road unnecessarily is a good move. I would support adding a second restricted parking period in Woodside Road, Tonbridge, to help discourage this (i.e 14.30-15.30 as well as existing 9.30-10.30).	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1137	Yes	You are charging to park where I live . There is no where to park where I live and you know it. So how do you have the audacity to put up charges. You don't even supply us parking , what it exactly are these charges for, for you to administer it? This is very wrong. Parking should be abolished. It's crippling business . This should be taken to parliament.	No	
1138	Yes	I frankly find it discussing that I have to pay to park out side my own house as it stands. Comparing Tonbridge residents to other more affluent areas is also completely in fair. You state that the charge has not gone up but in real terms it has as we no longer receive the £10 visitors permits. With council taxes already on the rise I view this as just another money grabbing scheme and I strongly object.	No	
1139	Yes	I do not mind the charges going up but when you say that they did not go up before it is not altogether the truth. The actual permit did not go up but there were no free visitor permits so we had to buy them so the cost did increase.	Yes	
1140	Yes	At this time due to the pandemic I cannot see how you can expect people to pay more when many are losing their jobs shame on you {	No	
1141	Yes	We feel we are being unfairly penalised in regards to parking charges. Parking on our road and in our local area is very tricky and it is often hard to get a parking spot after 6pm. There are multiple households on our street with more than one car and would like to suggest that the charge for second vehicles is higher than you have proposed.  Due to the climate crisis there should be higher tariffs for households with two or more vehicles and the money should perhaps be used to spend on green initiatives in the local area, or electric charging points. Whilst train services are very good we would like to suggest improvements to bus services and timetables to encourage more public transport use.	No	
1142	Yes	The increase is not justifiable considering the lack of parking available for the area. Barden Road is one of the busiest with part of the road being designated to visitors/short stay anyway. The reason Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells Is more expensive is because the average household income is higher and that is why it reflects in their parking charges.	No	1
1143	Yes	I strongly feel that the time restrictions should be reviewed and changed from 1 hour per day 10 hours per day.	Yes	
1144	Yes	I would request that permits be limited to a max of 2 per household and business permits for residential areas be restricted, especially where the business already has off street parking within their demise.	Yes	
1145	Yes	Request that permits be limited to 2 per household and that business permits in residential areas should be greatly restricted, especially where the business has available parking within their own demise. Although we have permits, we are often unable to park as many of the spaces are being used by the businesses or their visitors.	Yes	1

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1146	Yes	<p>When there is no guarantee of being able to park near my house it seems unreasonable to add to the price of permits. There will be some people who are hard up due to Covid so an increase is unfair.</p> <p>There should be 24/7 permit requirements so that people don't just park in these streets when residents have to pay £40-45 a year for the pleasure. And this should then be monitored closely.</p> <p>If you give certain bays to certain houses then an increase in charge would be ok.</p>	No	
1147	Yes	<p>I don't feel it's fair for us residents to pay more money towards having a permit for a area that isn't even being patrolled. We still get non residents parking on street throughout the permit time taking what would be the residents spaces. They also park inconsiderately leaving us residents no choice but to park else where or over hanging yellow lines! Why should we even pay for the permit if we can't even park on the street we've paid for! In all fairness, Residents of the street shouldn't have to pay for it full stop, due to the amount of council tax we pay it should be included. In my opinion.</p> <p>I also find it hard to understand, how a scheme that has barely been running 3 months on this road is subject to a price review already, when it was you that originally set the price at the first consultation.</p>	No	
1148	Yes	<p>The proposals seem reasonable and I would like to publicly support both the proposed reduction for care workers and the increased charges for more than two cars.</p> <p>I would hope, however, that the online system will be substantially improved. The current system is bizarre and abysmally documented. For example if I log into my account it provides details about the visitor parking permits I have purchased but no details at all of my parking permit.</p>	Yes	
1149	Yes		Yes	
1150	Yes	<p>Whilst an increase of £5 is not all that much when consideration is given to what that amounts to spread across a year, I feel that the plan to increase any parking costs during a global pandemic is somewhat inconsiderate. There are families who may be struggling with basic household bills, putting food on the table etc as it is. £5 may not sound like a lot, but to some that could be significant. I feel these kind of decision when costing anything should be left until COVID is behind us.</p>	No	
1151	Yes		Yes	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1152	Yes	<p>I support the proposals to charge more for extra cars after the second. I do think more needs to be done about those who have driveways and don't use them, or put more cars on the road because they can. E.g. they could have 2 car drive way (no charge) then 2 more cars on the road for the basic fee.</p> <p>Additionally, more needs to be done regarding businesses that have residential addresses (ie, running a business from home) who then capitalise by using a residents permit rather than a business permit. A basic check could be completed to see whether a business is registered to the address before granting the permit to ensure that the permit is correct and you are receiving the correct dues.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that zone N should also be split into two zones as it covers quite a wide area especially in comparison to some other zones.</p>	Yes	
1153	Yes	<p>I think the proposal of paying more for each additional car is a good one as parking is becoming more and more difficult. I would ask though that the visitors permits be available to buy from the castle as before as the online system is difficult to navigate, especially for some of the older residents.</p>	Yes	
1154	Yes	<p>I appreciate the fact that other boroughs charge more, but it seems that the parking around the area I live in, doesn't warrant the increase. If I leave my house with my car after 6pm, and don't return before 8/9pm I am unlikely to find a space within 2-3 roads from here. I'm not willing to pay more when I can't park on my own road that I live on. Also, when other cars can't be bothered to try to find parking elsewhere and park on the double yellows at the end of the bays making it impossible to turn down this road, or hit our cars because they are too lazy to find a space, i'm not willing to pay more for that.</p> <p>As there are no set parking bays and houses can have as many cars as they like, it's near on impossible to guarantee a space. On occasions i've had to park near Barden Park road because there are no spaces and then you also restrict where D2 parking is, so either you lift the restrictions so that we have half a chance of parking somewhere and increase the charges, or you don't increase the charges at all. Or bay all the parking spaces to at least provides cars with some guidance on how to park, because it takes a car to park directly outside of their house to put out all the parking down the road, or one car to park to far away from another car but not leaving enough space for a car to park. Or a moped to take up a space? I think it needs to be considered more before suggesting increasing the permit costs.</p>	No	
1155	Yes	<p>When the permit was first introduced it was supposed to benefit residents, cost £5 and this , it was stated, was to cover administration costs. It is now apparent that the permit is no longer to benefit residents but, it would seem, just another way to provide revenue for the council.</p>	No	



Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1156	Yes	<p>My objection is centred around the second vehicle charge - it is too low!!!</p> <p>There are is a large proportion of terraced houses, including mine, in the streets that are covered by the parking charges.</p> <p>Each house is only 1 vehicle wide at best, not to mention the areas of the roads where there are additional restrictions (yellow lines, junctions etc.)</p> <p>If every house had only one car with a parking permit, there would not be enough space for them all to park, so I don't see why a second permit should not also attract an increased charge.</p> <p>I suggest £65 for a second permit would be appropriate.</p>	No	
1157	Yes	<p>The residents of Griggs way have had restricted parking in place just for the past few months. To raise the tariff after such a short amount of time is unfair.</p> <p>Also considering the past 12 months where thousands of people have lost their jobs and livelihoods due to covid 19 , it is highly inappropriate to consider, let alone asking for residents to pay more money to park outside their own homes . Shocking I believe is the appropriate word and at christmas too!</p>	No	
1158	Yes	<p>Good idea. I would actually favour a price differential between 1st and 2nd permits too. For example, rather than £45, £45, £90, £135 go to £30, £60, £90, £135. (Currently we have 3 permits at our property....but we do have 2 spaces on drive)</p> <p>It would also be a big help if you could buy visitors permits on line for a 24 hour period.</p>	Yes	
1159	Yes	<p>The increase is broadly inline with inflation over 5 years so I do not object but I would not support similar further increases in the near future. However, you omit that visitors' permits are no longer given free, effectively being a £10 increase in this period - I was very disappointed with the illogical response I got from you at the time and the lack of further responses.</p> <p>I support the increased charges for 3+ cars.</p>	Yes	
1160	Yes	<p>I object to the increase in charges. The cost of the permit has technically increased by £10 recently with the removal of the 10 visitor permits.</p> <p>I would suggest that business permits increase if they still insist in parking in all areas of D1 and D2, so that residents are not penalised.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1161	Yes	<p>There are far too many household with more than one or two cars in the roads and not enough spaces to fill them.</p> <p>It is highly annoying when you have heavy shopping and you can't park outside your own house. For a small increase of charge this may help to reduce it.</p> <p>Charging people who don't live in the road and park up to go shopping down the high street may also be a good idea, although we note the restrictions have increased to a Saturday which is a start.</p>	Yes	
1162	Yes	I object to an increase if there is no control on the number of permits given out. Parking is getting ridiculous in the Meadow Lawn area.	No	
1163	No		Yes	
1164	Yes	I support the principle of escalating charges depending on how many vehicles a house hold parks on the road and the £5 increase for residents first vehicle seems modest. However I would request that the council considers a lower charge for motorcycles as at the moment I pay the same charge for a small motorbike for on road parking as I would for a large 4X4 car. A cheaper motorcycle / scooter permit would reflect the much smaller amount of parking space taken up by bikes / scooters and might encourage folk to get onto two wheels, thus reducing traffic congestion. It would also be in line with how most car park charging works. It would also be really helpful if the council could try to ensure there were dedicated motorbike / scooter parking spaces in the residents parking areas. The latter would help prevent bikes / scooters from being knocked over by cars whilst parked.	Yes	
1165	Yes	<p>I object to the raise in cost of 1 permit as we are not getting anything in return! We are not paying for a parking space and the permit is not stopping non-residents from parking here.</p> <p>Parking is terrible up here and as a single woman I'm afraid to go out in case I end up having to park streets away to walk home in the dark.</p> <p>Paying for a permit in this road is like forking our for an expensive waterproof coat with holes in it.</p> <p>I do agree however with the increase for multiple cars, I also think larger 4x4's and vans should be charged more as they're taking up more space.</p>	No	
1166	Yes	The permits are to stop people who don't live in Sussex Road parking there. Therefore if you live there I don't see/think why we should have to pay for a permit. Surely the revenue from fines should pay any necessary running costs? Also make the permit parking 24hrs a day that way only residents can park there. For example if I get home during school drop off times I can't park in my own road even though I the pleasure of paying £40 per year to do so!!!!!!!	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1167	Yes	Considering the small amount of parking available in specifically Woodside Road it would have been good to have a considerably higher permit payment for a second vehicle in this road, and possibly a ban on large commercial vans being parked here overnight by some residents that take up at least 2 places. It is good to see regular visits by traffic wardens to penalise non permit holders when those who do hold permits often find it difficult to park.	Yes	
1168	Yes	I think this is a good idea - i also think it would be a good idea to review the visitors parking permits!	Yes	
1169	Yes	I agree strongly to the increased rate after two cars per family at the standard rate .	Yes	
1170	Yes	With there effectively only one space in front of each house, I will be pleased to see higher fees for additional vehicles per house. While I appreciate that families increasingly have a car each, those cars are taking road space that can make it very difficult for those of us with one car to park in our own road. I would like you to go even further, with the second car at a higher rate, and anything over 2 cars being at the daily permit rate. Thank you for asking our opinion on this.	Yes	
1171	Yes	<p>1. Comparing parking charges with others just leads to a constant upward spiral.</p> <p>2. TMBC have not responded well to the virus, as the Kings Hill office has been closed, (Tesco have stayed open!), making it more difficult to renew - and the current permit system does not issue reminders.</p> <p>3. Penalising multi-car households with the proposed tiered approach seems wrong as does suggesting people should park off-road - other comments elsewhere suggest that more loss of front gardens to parking is not a good thing.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1172	Yes	<p>This change inadvertently penalise people who can not afford the luxury of off street parking, which is especially limited in my postcode.</p> <p>There are no proposed increases in service levels, or the amount of time the parking restrictions will be monitored. So I do question what benefit the customer gets out of these price increases, considering the councils costs will likely be the same plus inflation.</p> <p>The council appears to just be increasing the price, because their neighbours in Sevenoaks &amp; Tunbridge Wells happen to charge more. This is not a valid argument to change rates, nearly a comparison with what residents of those areas were prepared to pay when they decided to live there. The council has not presented an evidence based argument to increase prices, but more a 'what can we get away with considering what other councils are doing'.</p> <p>If you're going to blindly penalise those without off street parking because space is an issue, you should also blindly penalise those with larger properties who benefit from the luxury of off street parking and lower insurance costs for their vehicles.</p> <p>If this public service is operating at a deficit I would support you increasing the standard rates with an uplift equal to CPI from this year in order for the council to not be out of pocket over their operating costs for parking monitoring. I'm strongly opposed to any other change if no proportionally equal levy is placed on those residents with larger properties benefiting from off street parking.</p>	No	
1173	Yes	<p>1. I do not see how a "one-size-fits-all" policy can work for Tonbridge. Every street is different and they should be divided into sensible categories. Parking spaces are at a premium in Lavender Hill. It is often not possible to find a free space, and the situation will presumably worsen after the planned redevelopment in Drayton Road (currently this serves as an overflow when there are no spaces in Lavender Hill).</p> <p>2. The Council should be ambitious in its efforts to improve the environment. Incentives should be given to those with hybrid/electric vehicles, and no one should be permitted more than two permits for petrol/diesel vehicles. Businesses with more than two vehicles should be forced to park them elsewhere.</p> <p>3. It does not seem fair to price permits by comparison with Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells. Both areas are surely more affluent than Tonbridge.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1174	Yes	Please also look at introducing a second chargeable period each day in zone M as there are an increasing number of cars parking at lunchtime/early afternoon that do not leave until the evening, thereby making resident parking more difficult. This situation is likely to deteriorate further once the residential development at the Pembury Road end of St Mary's Road is completed. Thank you.	Yes	
1175	Yes	I support the increase in cost for multiple vehicles but this should begin at two vehicles.  This also won't change the overparking in our zone if the parking restrictions are still only for an hour a day. Many vehicles parked in the road do not have a permit because if you move the vehicle before half nine, you don't need one.	Yes	
1176	Yes	I work as a nursery nurse. I am classed as a key worker and have worked through the pandemic. In order to park outside my workplace I have to pay for a business parking permit out of my own money. Knowing that the price of the permit may go up to £175, in these difficult times, is disappointing. Also I have noticed that you are reducing the carers parking permit by £25, which doesn't seem fair to myself or others in my position who are also caring for members of our society.	No	
1177	Yes	I object to having to pay more in parking charges.  Since the scheme started, I have been paying more to park but with less on-street parking availability. When permits were introduced, parking availability was deliberately reduced by adding yellow lines where previously they were not deemed necessary. Every new build and every property which converts their front garden into a drive (or widens it) reduces on-street parking still more which unfairly affects residents in older properties.  Given that all new builds include allocated parking (amount depending upon property size etc), I think a similar rule or concession should apply for residents who live in older properties without any parking allocated.	No	
1178	Yes	I actually think you should go further and increase the second and third car prices more. From an environmental perspective, we should be looking to reduce car use and incentivising people to use public transport more. But related to that you ALSO need to be improving public transport and reducing its price to make it a viable option so people don't need extra cars.	Yes	
1179	Yes		Yes	
1180	Yes	I agree to a £5 increase	Yes	
1181	Yes	Parking around Baltic and Woodland Road has been a daily challenge, even vans and cars parking on double yellow lines about 9pm knowing they will leave at 6am the next day is an issue. Anything to support parking restrictions a bit more would definitely help.	Yes	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1182	Yes	<p>The visitors permits cannot carry an expiry date. It is not fair in respect that you have to buy them visitors and maintenance such as boiler service or emergency call out. If you don't use them we are just making an unsolicited payment to the council pockets.</p> <p>The permit scheme doesn't even work correctly when using the parking website you find you have to telephone in to receive technical advice to go to another website!</p> <p>Now you're asking for more money to keep in line with other council areas. Has it been considered that they should be coming in line with T&amp;M and they are changing too much. Also the price should reflect the size of the vehicle.</p> <p>Now the council wan</p>	No	
1183	Yes	I think it is grossly unfair that you charge for on street parking at all, and charge for visitor permits. This is a rise in Council Tax by stealth.	No	
1184	No	<p>I support the price increase, however, I have a request:</p> <p>Please add the apartments in Waterside Reach (Sovereign Way) to Zone N. Residents do not have any residential parking options. Our only option is to pay £1,000+ for a season ticket, which is an incredibly high price for those simply living on sovereign way - not commuters. Alternatively, you could offer discounted season tickets to residents, discounted to the equivalent price of the residents permit. There is plenty of parking availability in the sovereign way car parks (mid and north), so there would be no impact on parking for the town centre.</p>	Yes	
1185	No	I live in the flats on Sovereign Way. We have no other option but to buy a season ticket for the Sovereign Way car parks. This costs approx £1000 a year - Nothing like the £40 you are quoting for other residents parking elsewhere in Town. please look into allowing our residents discounted season tickets for those car parks	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1186	No	Since I moved in to newly built apartment I'm paying outrageous amount of parking money as builder did not have us the parking and the reason was council did not allowed to have everyone a parking space. So, I am paying £1200/ year. Which is totally unacceptable compared with other residents who only pays £40/year. Why can't we added to the same parking zone and charge the same amount and not the business rate? I'm a resident of Tonbridge and pay high amount of council tax despite having only 1 bed apartment. This is so unfair with the new build apartments. I would request council to include us in the parking zone and provide the permit which is affordable to us. I'm on the verge of loosing my job and cannot keep up with the outrageous charges for parking my car and that t far away from the apartment. Please consider us for the permit which we can afford.	No	
1187	No	I feel that residents should be entitled to reduced rates. I am paying for an off peak permit (I am a nurse at the nhs hospital) and sometimes I get annual leave and have to pay for a full day of parking. It is a lot of money per year especially when the underground parking is so high. I've had my car hit on many occasions which is also adding on money.	Yes	
1188	No	Request waterside reach buildings are added to Zone N, or a discounted season ticket is provided to residents on sovereign way equal to that of resident permits in Zone N (£40/£45).	Yes	
1189	No	I am requesting our buildings (Sovereign Way) are added to Zone N, or a discounted season ticket is provided to residents on sovereign way equal to that of resident permits in Zone N (£40/£45).  As a local resident of Tonbridge it seems both vital and fair to ensure those living here aren't expected to pay excessive four-figure parking fees.	No	
1190	No	I am requesting our buildings (Sovereign Way) are added to Zone N, or a discounted season ticket is provided to residents on sovereign way equal to that of resident permits in Zone N (£40/£45).  As a local resident of Tonbridge it seems both vital and fair to ensure those living here aren't expected to pay excessive four-figure parking fees.	No	
1191	Yes	With many people struggling this is not the time to increase fees.  There are too many work vans with permits, especially in D1&2 who take up the space of 1.5/2 cars - instead of increasing the standard permit please consider introducing a size scale ie cars and vans which would take into account the spaces used. Please also consider increasing the. Business permit not the residents - a business can park in the public car parks leaving spaces for residents and any increase in their fees are part of their expenses and does not eat into their income.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1192	No	I'd like Sovereign Way added to Zone N! Paying £1000+ for the right to park near my home is extortionate.	Yes	
1193	No	Residents of Sovereign Way (Blue Bell Court, Azure Court, Cornflower Court and Orchid Court) to be entitled to Zone N parking permits.	Yes	
1194	No	Hi I'm a resident of ashby point we are unable to use our allocated space at the moment and have to find alternative parking, If residents would be able to get the resident permits for the sovereign way car park that would help us out so much, it would make parking so much easier and not just for our building other building around us would also benefit from this.	Yes	
1195	No	I'd like the parking for our area to be updated to zone N. Or a discounted rate for residents of sovereign way. There is little parking in the area and it's expensive. It would be good to standardize the parking for the local residents	Yes	
1196	No	Residents of Sovereign away (Blue Bell Court, Azure Court, Orchid Court, Cornflower Court) to have permits for Zone N.	Yes	1
1197	No	Hi I live in Ashby Point Walter's farm road we have a allocated space that we are unable to park in at the moment, we are having to find alternative parking, if we were moved into zone N then it would make a massive difference to our building parking but also the buildings around us making it easier for us.	Yes	1
1198	No	<p>I live in Ashbys point, and have no options for on street or affordable parking. I only have 2 choices which is to pay TCHG or the council around £1000 a year for a parking permit. I feel this is very unfair, and would like to have my property added to Zone N or have an option for a discounted parking permit for Sovereign Way car parks at a cost to match that of the street parking scheme.</p> <p>I do think the cost increase are reasonable, and support the change, but would like to have the same options as other local properties.</p> <p>The Sovereign Way car parks are never even half full, and during the lockdown season earlier in the year when we were able to park there, and also using TCHG's discounted scheme to use the same carparks, there was never a lack of spaces, and shows there would be no loss in revenue to offer this service to us.</p>	Yes	
1199	No	I support the proposal only on the proviso that Ashbys Point is included in zone N	Yes	
1200	Yes	I strongly support this proposal to reduce the number of vehicles parking on the road. However, I think the cost should increase even for a second car. The parking on Danvers Road is abysmal so anything to reduce the number of cars would be appreciated. The houses aren't huge so I doubt many people need regular access to 2 cars on the road!	Yes	



Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1201	No	I object as residents of Walter's farm road and Ashbys Point are not included in the Zone N parking permit. There is a clear lack of parking available in this area. Whether this be addressed by including us in zone N or making use of the grossly underused Sovereign Way car parks but not at the cost of £1000+ per year. You run schemes elsewhere for residents to have permits in car parks that do not cost that amount and it is grossly unfair that every other road around here can apply for a permit for £40. The clear lack of parking available to residents here needs to be dealt with.	No	
1202	Yes	Business not residents should pay more.  We do not need to follow other councils, we should be independent.  Cgg he argue for the size of transport and the discs they take - cars and vans and commercial vehicles. Not per household.	No	
1203	No	I live in Ashby's point and think the carpark charge from tchg is extortionate especially for shared ownership. It would be a huge help to all that live in Ashby's point and sounding buildings if we could park in zone N.	Yes	
1204	Yes	I think its a brilliant plan to ease parking congestion and reduce car pollution by encouraging people to catch public transport and not own multiple cars. As a teacher I work long hours and at least 2 nights a week we cannot park on our own street and have to drag marking, shopping and other stuff to the house from far away while people leave their second and third cars in our street and don't move them for weeks at a time. We have had vans and cars parked outside our house that have been left for over 4 weeks without being moved and that was before coronavirus! There are very few houses in the area that actually need more than 2 cars and if they really do they should be willing to pay a bit extra for it. In conclusion, this is a brilliant initiative which will encourage people not to have 'spare cars', will ease parking for people who work long hours and will encourage people to catch public transport.	Yes	
1205	Yes	Having been a resident of Barden Road for over 25 years, I feel we pay enough for the parking permits already. It is extremely hard to find a parking space in our road as it is, so I find it unfair to be charged for a permit which doesn't guarantee a space. Due to Covid, many families are struggling financially, I feel this is not the right time to be raising prices just because you haven't done it for a while!	No	
1206	No	Object, as Ashby's Point is not included in Zone N. I can see Sovereign Way car park from my flat and it is under-utilised. It is never full, and I would say only a handful of people pay for a season ticket. If Ashby's Point is included it would create an extra income as many of us would pay for a permit for £40/£45 a year.	No	
1207	No	This does not allow residents of Ashbys Point to apply for a permit.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1208	No	I am a resident that uses the sovereign way car parks. The price difference between a residents permit at £40 and the permit i have to pay for at near £1000 is crazy. I am only renting my flat so to have to pay an extra £1000 a year for my permit is very unfair towards myself and other residents in this situation. To add to this, I cannot use the closest car park next to waitrose, I have to park further away as this car park does not allow long stays, which is ridiculous as the car park is never full anyways. A huge reduction is needed in the price for residents, not necessarily to £40 but much closer to that number than £1000. It would also be great if the carpark for waitrose could allow long stay for residents, as it would give this car park much more use.	Yes	
1209	No	I strongly object as zone N does not include Ashby's Points or surrounding flats.	No	
1210	Yes	There are not enough spaces per vehicles at the moment. Instead of putting up the cost for the current residents, perhaps look at extending the permit times and do not have any more properties built in the area without adequate parking. Us residents are captive to the costs of parking permits and will pay whatever the charge through necessity, permits are not a luxury! It is unfair that we are penalised. I appreciate that perhaps putting up the cost for those with more than two vehicles could be beneficial but otherwise this is opportunism to a captive client base. It feels very unfair, especially during a time of unprecedented social and economic upheaval. I object to this.	No	
1211	No	<p>Why are residents of waterside reach not entitled to apply for a SINGLE permit yet there is a scheme where by a house hold can park more than one car on the road ? This is an unfair system.</p> <p>The council approved the development of these flats without enough provisions in the first place for residents parking.</p> <p>The residents of the flats pay a substantial fee in council tax yet have very few of the benefits that other households across Tonbridge benefit from - parking being one and recycling being the other.</p> <p>There is ample parking available in the botany carpark (waitrose) consistently so would the council please give us the same parking consideration that it does to other residents across Tonbridge.</p> <p>A season ticket for a resident in order to park costs over £1000 in comparison to a £40 charge.</p> <p>future developments in Tonbridge MUST must have a parking space for each unit created, it is ESSENTIAL and should be part of planning permission.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1212	Yes	<p>I support the change for higher charges for any additional cars after the first, but I feel the permit for the first car should remain at 40 GBP at this time, particularly in light of the ongoing covid related economic hardships.</p> <p>Any changes should not penalise 1 car permit households in my opinion. I fully support the reduction for carers.</p>	Yes	
1213	Yes	<p>I have lived here since 2015. Since then on Nelson Avenue you have removed some parking and restricted us from parking elsewhere yet D1 can park on our road. On top of this we now do not get 10 free parking tickets when we pay for £40 so it has already increased by £10. So why should you put it up more. There are many other issues regarding parking that is not relevant to this consultation but is necessary to discuss.</p>	No	
1214	No	<p>Outrageous to increase charges to park outside your own dwelling and also to increase charges for additional cars.</p>	No	
1215	No	<p>We have lived in bluebell court for over 2 years. When buying our flat we where told we could park locally for free.</p> <p>Just a few weeks ago they made the only free parking available to us, pay and display. As our work situation has changed we have been in able to afford to park and have to park over a mile away.</p> <p>We also live in affordable housing and since there is no reduction for local residents makes it impossible for us to afford .</p> <p>I would like to request a reduction to local residents or be brought into local zone to allow is to park locally.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	No	
1216	Yes	<p>Why the increase at such bad timing</p> <p>We keep being put up but yet no wardens to check those who don't abide by rules and regulations</p> <p>Our parking is a nightmare in Barden with business permits</p> <p>The online system is a nightmare</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1217	Yes	My husband can never park along our road, let alone outside our house. Local schools use the area to collect their children from school and local businesses and people use the street to park rather than town. So there are less spaces for residents. I have epilepsy and my parents have to care for me at times and the payment for visitors is high for us and at times they can not park safely to help me. I feel the money does not get used well as we have 5 reported pot holes in the road and we are being penalised for living along this road to have to pay for somewhere where we can not park anyway!!	No	
1218	No	On the basis that Waterside Reach residents without allocated parking are ineligible for on street permits at the prices one can obtain within zone N in other parts of the town.	No	
1219	No	Currently, residents on our street are having to pay up to £1000 for a parking permit, which is ridiculous. We would like to be put under Zone N, or pay residential parking costs like other areas.	Yes	
1220	No	Because the extent of the consultation does not allow Ashby's point residence to apply for one. I believe it is very unfair on residents, such as myself who are very limited to park at our homes.	No	
1221	No	I dont support this!	No	
1222	No	I live in Bluebell Court, Tonbridge. I do not have a parking space and it was not an option for me to have a space when we purchased the property. I used to go into work Monday to Friday which meant I could rely on the off peak parking permit for waitrose carpark. Due to covid 19 I am now working from home and it is likely to be indefinitely. I therefore have relied on the free parking spaces near the Halfords car repair shop. These spaces have recently been changed to zone n meaning that I no longer have an option for parking that doesn't cost a fortune. I know about the parking permit in waitrose but it costs almost £1000 pa which means it's unrealistic/ unaffordable. I have no options for parking and I have been refused to be added into zone n, despite receiving support from our MP Tom Tugendhat. I am having to park in business car parks as I simply don't have anywhere to park my car. Again, I stress that I only have 1 car and no parking space underneath Bluebell Court. The parking in Tonbridge has become impossible. This is my home and I should be able to park my car within a reasonable distance from my home. This is possible but TMBC are not allowing this to happen.	No	
1223	No	I feel the cost of parking for residents in Sovereign Way is already excessive. We're charged a far higher amount for parking than other zones within Tonbridge. We should have charges lowered rather than increased.	No	
1224	No	I object to this because the extent of the consultation does not allow Ashbys Point residents to apply for such permits.	No	
1225	Yes		No	1
1226	No	We have a huge issue with the parking, with not enough parking space allotted for the development it is very expensive to park near the flats almost 1000£	Yes	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1227	Yes	<p>With the year we have had so far &amp; many people struggling financially &amp; the government supporting households &amp; businesses I think its unfair to increase the parking charges at all.</p> <p>Yes the fee has remained the same but we no longer get a free sheet of visitors &amp; the cost of the sheets have done up so we are theoretically paying more.</p>	No	
1228	No	The plan does not include addressing the parking for residents of Ashby's Point, where although there is allocated parking, the landlord charges £960 per year which is totally unaffordable and unexplainable in an "affordable housing" development. Lack of affordable parking for these residents has directly led to parking chaos on Medway Wharf Road. Residents of this development should be allowed a residents permit for zone N.	No	
1229	No	Please can we be put into a zone or resident parking	No	
1230	Yes	<p>PLEASE stop penalising the people who live in South Tonbridge. The prices go up and up. We have two cars and it's too much money to find already. Others who live in Tonbridge Park for free. It's only us few near the station and it's not fair.</p> <p>To say it hasn't been increased is absolutely not true.</p> <p>You stopped us receiving free visitor permits. That was a massive increase in one hit. How would you feel if you couldn't let someone park outside your house without driving to the council and spending £12 on a sheet of parking vouchers?</p> <p>Just stop and think.. You are picking on a few postcodes to get more funds.</p>	No	
1231	No	Objecting on the bases that Ashbys point is not included in zone N	No	
1232	No	I think paying over £950 a year for parking is too much for a resident, we should have a parking permit like other residents for £40 and be included in a parking zone	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1233	No	I think residents in waterside reach should be added to zone N and pay a normal charge of £45 a year for parking. £950 is too much for a resident	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1234	Yes	<p>Strongly object.</p> <p>The parking costs have risen already and we have now also lost access to free parking permits that used to be part of the cost so that shouldn't cost more, particularly as they used to be used to justify the cost going up that specific year.... the service has gone online which shouldn't cost us more particularly as the council used to make such a massive deal about lost paper permits and getting your permit from the office because it took up time and resources.....we are not Tunbridge Wells or any other local area, we are Tonbridge and everything else in our town reflects that including lower housing prices, a degrading town, and economical status of most residences, therefore comparing it with other area price rises is ridiculous and opportunistic in an attempt to make back parking fines for during the first lockdown. If nothing else it is downright nasty to introduce higher prices when people have lost jobs, finances, business's, and people they love. I think the idea to introduce different tariffs for numerous cars makes sense as does higher prices for vehicles over a certain size as in the case of our "replacement" parking bay which barely holds two smaller cars but allowed you to sell off a bay for financial gain under the guise of "right of access" which if your truly honest with yourself we can all agree is a term thrown around depending on whether it benefits you or not. I propose a freeze on the current tarrif whilst we are still in a pandemic and global crisis (if you needed a better reason I'm really not sure what that could be) and then this time next year depending on the current situation to re visit this idea then.</p> <p>I have seen some small honest acts from the council to enhance our town but as a whole the continuous road mess ups and "innovative" design to our town which has created constant traffic, ridiculous shop rent prices which forced our town to be empty even before the pandemic and a list as long as your arm of other things suggests those who make these decisions either are completely dillusional, only motivated by their yearly appraisal box ticking exercise to receive their bonus or don't live here so are clueless of what Tonbridge is and needs. It saddens me greatly .</p> <p>I will await the outcome of this propersition in the hopes our voices can actually make a difference when money is involved.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1235	No	To have to pay so much for parking in your own home is just theft. I would like to request that our buildings on sovereign way are added to zone N, or a discounted season ticket is available to residents equal to that of residents in zone N. (£40/£45).	No	
1236	No	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>Hope you're well and thanks for reading,</p> <p>I currently live in azure court and have the sovereign way complex parking permit, at a cost of nearly 1k a year,</p> <p>Would it be possible to raise a discussion in the department of allowing a residential permit in these areas, I appreciate the car parks are for public and business use too, but I find the sovereign way car parks usually very empty, and from my own observations may not impinge on public business access due to Sainsbury's and Waitrose having there own parking systems.</p> <p>The disparity between amount paid for residents in our development compared to other areas where residential parking permits are available is substantial, especially considering parking in some of the zone N areas to be in high demand and short supply.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if there's a wish to discuss, and thanks again for taking the time to read my comment,</p> <p>Kind Regards and Many Thanks, [REDACTED NAME] [REDACTED NUMBER]</p>	No	
1237	No	<p>Since working from Home in 2020 I cannot afford to keep my car in a carpark paying over £6 a day so have had to leave it with a relative and have not had my freedom to travel. Usually I would be at work from 8am-6pm but due to the COVID-19 pandemic this has not been possible.</p> <p>I would like to request that our buildings on sovereign way are added to Zone N, or a discounted season ticket is available to residents equal to that of residents in Zone N (£40/£45).</p> <p>If there was a cheaper alternative for residents this would have a massive impact on me and my partner and I wouldn't not have to rely on her when not working as a carer to drive me where I need to go</p>	No	



Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1238	Yes	We have just one car, why don't you increase the tariff for the second car upwards. Also, you could encourage people with a drive to actually park on it!  £40 p.a. is enough to pay with the amount of cars that park on our road.	No	
1239	No	Very disappointed to see that the council have let residents of Ashby's Point down again with this proposal. It is deeply unfair that we are left to the mercy of our greedy, cowboy led housing association and their developer mates for our parking.  If residents of Ashby's Point can't be included in Zone N, can an equivalently priced ticket for the Sovereign Way Car Parks be an option?	No	
1240	No	Objecting on the basis that Waterside Reach residents without allocated parking are ineligible for on street permits at this price.	No	
1241	Yes	Firstly I do not believe that any resident that falls in an area that is permitted and has access to off street parking is going to choose to purchase a permit rather than use their own free parking. You are simply going to penalise residents that do not have off street parking that require more than one vehicle. Also, if a resident has off street parking they are not going to choose to park in the road from an insurance premium perspective.  Secondly in the argument for the increase the council has looked at Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells, however there has not been a consideration of an area such as Maidstone that has considerably lower permit costs. Is the cost even justified if another council has a permit that is almost half the cost.  Thirdly there are a number of principles that the council must take into account including the sufficient availability of parking. I do not feel this is the case for the St Marys Road area of Tonbridge. I feel that resources would be better used aligning restrictions across the town so that local roads are not used by commuters and so stop residents being able to park. This is an issue at the moment and has been brought to the councils attention. I would be happy for an increase in the permit if I was able to park in my own street and not have to battle with commuters for space.	No	
1242	No	Our buildings should be able to join Zone N	Yes	
1243	Yes	There are far too many cars especially large cars and vans taking up the roadway.	Yes	
1244	Yes	Completely unfair, people have to park their work vans ect. Just another way for you to take money off residents. People are struggling to buy food and pay for everyday expenses , just seems ill timed and greedy	No	1

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1245	No	I think this is a really good idea. Although it would be better to introduce a higher charge from the second car (so £45 first car, £60 second, £90 third etc). I'd also suggest increasing it to cover a wider part of town. So many people park in residential roads where there isn't space and cause problems. Start charging them. And fine them for parking on the pavements, too.	Yes	
1246	No	These charges seem proportionate and fair. Many people I have spoken to are in favour.	Yes	
1247	No	I feel it is wrong that I should pay to park where I live. We should have permit parking like all other residents in the town of Tonbridge! I request that we can be added to to zone N permit scheme. There is ample parking spaces to provide this for residents with no excuse.	No	
1248	Yes	I think it fair that those parking more than two cars on the street should pay more for subsequent vehicles. Although, in effect by not giving permit holders visitor permits, the price has gone up recently I can see that the Council needs our support. I do think that the rate for businesses needs to be controlled when they have been through so much this year.	Yes	
1249	Yes		Yes	
1250	No	I am a resident at Bluebell Court, and I find it unacceptable that as a resident I have to pay to park on a daily basis such outrageous costs . Other residents are given permits from here to Tunbridge wells, it seems that as residents of this development we are treated extremely unfairly. I am politely requesting that we be added to Zone N.  Thank you	No	
1251	Yes	.	Yes	
1252	No		No	
1253	Yes	I think these are fair.	Yes	
1254	Yes	I think this is quite outrageous. Having to pay to park outside your own house is bad enough, let alone having to pay £135 for being the fourth member of your family to own and park a car. As a family of four, plus partners making a family of 6, this is appalling. We are having to remain in one family unit while we are trying to save for houses. After this year, people are struggling financially, including people in my household so increasing the price of permits will just make this worse for so many people. We have just signed a three year tenancy agreement which we have to honour so this is a huge kick in the teeth and a total abuse of power because you know people have to pay whatever you make the price.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1255	Yes	<p>Just because other councils charge higher parking permit fees is not a justifiable reason to increase them.</p> <p>Sliding scale will not deter those wanting to park multiple vehicles - providing only 1 or 2 permits per household is the only way to do this.</p> <p>Or charge based on vehicle emissions per household as LB Haringey did.</p> <p>Penalising those (by increased costs) who live on a permit road by increasing fees is not justifiable - where is the transparency on how much it costs to administer the scheme - if this was shown, a more considered view can be given - it appears this scheme is looking to justify increases fees just because other councils (in more affluent areas!) have.</p> <p>What is even more galling is having paid for one resident's parking permit for the 18 years I have lived in the same house - it must be on one hand I can count the times vehicles with no permit have been ticketed (this is pre-electronic permits) - so why have the scheme when this is not backed by the penalties for those that do not comply?</p>	No	
1256	No	<p>Since the covid-19 situation I am now working from home much more than previously. Prior to this I was able to use the off-peak permit and park in the botany carpark and paid around £270 for the year. Since working from home I have now had to pay for a full time parking permit which costs around £1000 per year. As a resident I feel that we should be eligible for a more reasonable price to park close to where we live.</p>	No	
1257	Yes	<p>Tired of the motorist always being punished. Quarry Hill Road and Rock Road in Borough Green where we reside has a majority of houses with no driveways or off-street parking available. We have no choice but to park in the 'residents parking areas' on the road. We feel yet again that we are just the easy target to prise yet more money out of our pockets especially after a year when most people (my wife and myself included) have been on reduced wages and lost contract work meaning more income lost. You should be ashamed for even contemplating such and idea after one of the worst years mankind has had since the 2nd world war. You disgust me.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1258	No	<p>I am a resident of Azure Court and pay nearly £1000 per year to park my car near to where I live. I would like to raise a discussion in the department of allowing a residential permit in the Sovereign Way public car parks. I have found that these car parks are very quiet and usually mostly empty due to the proximity to Waitrose and Sainsbury's car parks and from my own observation would not impinge on public business access because of this.</p> <p>The disparity between the amount residents in our complex pay compared to other residential parking areas is substantial, particularly as the parking in Zone N areas is in high demand and short supply.</p> <p>Many thanks for taking the time to read my comments.</p> <p>Kind regards [REDACTED NAME]</p>	No	
1259	No	On the basis that Waterside Reach residents without allocated parking are ineligible for on street permits at this price.	No	
1260	No	I work at Hilden Oaks School in Dry Hill Park. There is no effective public transport available from my home in Platt to Tonbridge so I have to drive. As there are only a few off-street parking spaces available on the school premises and no long-stay public car parks within walking distance, I have to park on the road. Whilst I would be prepared to pay £40/45 per annum for a parking permit (the same as residents) I don't agree with TMBC discriminating against people trying to do an honest days work (rather than claim benefits) by charging an extortionate £175 per individual business parking permit or risking daily parking fines!! Contrary to what you may think, people who work for Educational Trusts only earn similar salaries to their counterparts in state schools - which isn't much!!!	No	
1261	No	Increasing charges to park outside people's own homes is silly. We already pay enough through council tax... after the year we've had, people may not be able to afford these changes.	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1262	Yes	<p>Blue Bell Hill Village was being used as a commuter car park with cars parked anywhere and everywhere which is why the parking permits were introduced. It is better than it was but the scheme is not being managed on a regular basis and we still get commuter parking which makes it unfair to residents paying for a parking permit. We have had several abandoned vehicles (ones that did not look delapidated dented etc.) and pre Covid that have sat in the same place for months and did not receive one ticket. Therefore for the above reasons we feel we need to object to the proposed rise in charges. If the scheme was managed on a regular basis to deter commuter parking then we would support the proposed change.</p> <p>We pay for two parking permits but only one vehicle is actually on the road at any one time. We wonder if this could be the case for households with three vehicles where they may only have two vehicles on the road at any given time but would need to pay a premium for the third vehicle.</p>	No	
1263	No	Our development at Waterside Reach is not currently eligible for reduced rate on-street parking. We request that it be include in these arrangements.	No	
1264	Yes	Good to see that more than 2 cars per property will now cost more and that the price for carers has been reduced.	Yes	
1265	Yes	<p>We live in a terraced house. We have nowhere to park other than the road, parking on a drive would be nice. My wife needs a car as do I and because of the price of housing my children are still living at home. My eldest drives to work and is on basic living wage, she is not in a position to pay the increased charge that is proposed.</p> <p>As it is we have difficulty parking in the road or anywhere close to the house. A rise in the cost of a permit is understandable but not by the tiered charges proposed. £40 is more than enough for a car but I feel a higher rate should be charged for commercial vehicles taking up two spaces or more on occasions.</p> <p>We work shifts and often find that during school drop off and collection times there are no spaces in or around Sussex Road at all. Amending the restriction times would be more beneficial (e.g. morning 8am to 10am and afternoon 2.30 pm to 4.30pm). All school families should be within walking distance of the local schools.</p>	No	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1266	Yes	We had a large increase in cost last year and the removal of the 10 visitor permits. You have reduced your costs through not having to send any paper documents and having everything online. The scheme is designed to support local residents to be able to park near their own homes and protect areas where non-residents could take up all the spaces e.g near the railway station and shopping centres. There should be an absolutely minimal charge for this. We are residents of these roads and should not have to pay these ever increasing costs in order to park our cars. I strongly object to any further increases.	No	
1267	Yes	<p>We are a village with limited amenities and not akin to a town like Sevenoaks or Tunbridge Wells with a vast array of shops and restaurants, therefore not warranting an increase.</p> <p>Wardens are never seen doing rounds to enforce the parking charges, the price of permits keep going up whilst there are residents who don't bother to pay for a permit and never face any repercussions so they are laughing at people who keep paying for yearly permits. This makes a mockery of the paid permit system.</p> <p>Most residents can't actually park outside their own properties and have to rely on the safety of a car park which is not very safe or secure.</p> <p>It's an extra expense that most people can ill afford to pay in the current financial climate.</p>	No	
1268	Yes	I think the scaling cost is a great idea. Parking on Lavender Hill is always really difficult, there are almost never any spaces at peak parking times, and this might encourage people to park elsewhere. I also love the cost change for carers, I think that's so important. Thank you for showing support!	Yes	

Response ID	Resides in permit area	Comment (redacted)	Approve?	Duplicate response?
1269	Yes	<p>So you no longer give us a permit, and you no longer give us visitor permits and yet you want us to pay more?!</p> <p>Saying that you want to charge us more because Tunbridge Wells charges more is not a good enough excuse, its reminiscent of when you tell a child if all your friends jumped off a cliff would you!</p> <p>As I have to pay for this stupid permit to park anywhere near where I live, even though my car is normally at work during the permit requiring hours I refuse to pay more for that.</p> <p>If all the money this scheme raised actually went towards enforcing the restrictions, and we had a warden come round every day during the permitted hours then I maybe more inclined to understand the rise in charges but as we don't see a warden round here with any regular frequency, asking for more money is ludicrous!</p>	No	

This page is intentionally left blank



## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### CABINET

16 March 2021

#### Report of the Chief Executive and Management Team

#### Part 1- Public

#### Executive Non Key Decisions

#### 1 CORONAVIRUS UPDATE

**This report provides an update as to how the Council and our communities continue to respond and adapt to living with coronavirus, and recommends that the ongoing actions are endorsed.**

#### 1.1 Strategic Context

- 1.1.1 The last report to Cabinet in January 2021 was at a time when Covid-19 levels had risen dramatically across the country, including Kent and Tonbridge & Malling.
- 1.1.2 Whilst at the time of writing we are still in a lockdown in England, the levels are falling from the earlier peaks and the government has recently announced a roadmap for the country to exit from the restrictions. For those interested in data, the following web links provide useful information. [Interactive Map | Coronavirus in the UK \(data.gov.uk\)](#) and [Coronavirus \(COVID-19\) - Kent Public Health Observatory \(kpho.org.uk\)](#)
- 1.1.3 We continue to operate in the Emergency Structure in accordance with the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 led by the Kent Resilience Forum (KRF). The borough council is an active partner in the forum and through this approach we work strategically and operationally with many partners across Kent, sharing expertise and learning from experiences. This collaborative approach is serving Kent well.
- 1.1.4 The majority of our staff continue to work from home in accordance with government direction. As outlined in the last report, we do have staff who need to attend the offices to deal with post, scanning and access to records. In addition there are staff working from other locations including car parks and country parks, with a further cohort who are working around the Borough undertaking regulatory inspections on site. In addition, we have Covid enforcement responsibilities which necessitate staff undertaking visits to premises across the Borough.

1.1.5 This report focuses on three key areas:

- 1) the government's roadmap
- 2) arrangements for both symptomatic and asymptomatic testing
- 3) the Vaccination programme

In addition, included in this report is a short high-level summary of the Chancellor's budget insofar as it affects businesses and our communities. Further relevant information will of course be presented to Advisory Boards and/or Cabinet in due course.

## 1.2 Roadmap

1.2.1 The easing the lockdown will be carried out in stages. The roadmap sets out indicative "no earlier than" dates for the steps which are five weeks apart and is based on the advice of the Chief Medical Officer.

1.2.2 It is important to stress that the dates indicated in the roadmap are dependent on the data and are subject to change if the four tests are not met. The Prime Minister has emphasised that the roadmap sets out "*the dates by which we hope we can do something at the earliest*". Announcements will be made 7 days in advance of moving to the next step.

1.2.3 There are 4 steps in the roadmap and a very brief summary of some (not exclusive) key points is as below noting that these are **indicative** dates:

### **Step 1**

- From **Monday 8 March** all schools and further education settings reopen
- From Monday 8 March, two people will be allowed to meet in an outdoor public space and Care home residents will be able to be visited indoors by a single, named individual
- Until 29 March, the "stay at home" instruction remains, but from 29 March onwards that guidance will be lifted. However, many lockdown restrictions will remain. People should continue to work from home where they can, and minimise all travel, wherever possible
- From **29 March**, people will be able to meet outside in groups up to a maximum of 6 people (the Rule of 6) or with one other household. People from different households will still need to socially distance from each other.
- From 29 March, outdoor sports facilities will reopen and formally organised outdoor sports for adults and children can restart. Children will be able to access any outdoor childcare and supervised activities.

**Step 2**

- No earlier than **12 April**, non-essential retail and personal care premises and indoor leisure facilities such as gyms and spas will be permitted to reopen.
- Overnight stays away from home, in this country, will be permitted
- Public buildings, such as libraries and community centres, would be able to reopen, along with the majority of outdoor settings and attractions
- Hospitality venues will be able to open for outdoor service
- All children would be able to attend any indoor children's activity, including sport, and weddings, receptions, and commemorative events including wakes will be able to take place with up to 15 attendees (in premises that are permitted to open)
- People should continue to work from home where they can, and minimise domestic travel where they can. (International holidays will still be prohibited).

**Step 3**

- No earlier than **17 May**, all but the most high-risk sectors would be able to reopen. In all sectors, COVID-Secure guidance would remain in place.
- The Government will lift most legal restrictions on meeting others outdoors, but gatherings of more than 30 people outdoors will remain illegal
- The Government will continue to advise the public to work from home where they can.
- Sectors which would reopen include: indoor hospitality (with no requirement for a substantial meal to be served alongside alcoholic drinks); Remaining outdoor entertainment, such as outdoor theatres and cinemas; Indoor entertainment, such as museums, cinemas and children's play areas; hotels, hostels and B&Bs; adult indoor group sports and exercise classes; some large events, including conferences, theatre and concert performances and sports events.
- Weddings, receptions, funerals, and commemorative events including wakes would be able to proceed with up to 30 attendees.

### **Step 4**

- No earlier than **21 June**, Government aims to remove all legal limits on social contact
- Reopen the remaining closed settings, including Nightclubs and enable large events, including theatre performances
- Remove all limits on weddings and other life events

1.2.4 Management Team are working through the roadmap, cognisant that these are indicative dates only at this point, and putting in place plans for reopening of services and facilities. Further details will be reported through Advisory Boards as appropriate.

1.2.5 All Advisory Boards, Committees, Cabinet and Council continue to be held virtually by Microsoft Teams. The legislation permitting virtual meetings remains in place until 7 May 2021. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee meets on 11 March 2021 to consider virtual meetings and homeworking.

### **1.3 Testing Update**

1.3.1 As mentioned in the last report, the national programme of symptomatic testing, booked via the national portal, continues to be in place and is a vital element in the management of the pandemic. Within the borough, Members are aware that for some time there has been a walk-in symptomatic facility at Ditton community centre, and a mobile drive in facility at the Council offices in Kings Hill offering the lab-based polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests. At the beginning of March, the NHS announced the opening of a new symptomatic testing facility in the Upper Castle Fields car park in Tonbridge. This is a welcome addition to serve residents in the southern part of the Borough.

1.3.2 Symptom free testing, through the 'rapid result' lateral flow antigen tests, is also an important strand in helping to contain any outbreaks. Lateral flow test sites in our borough are located at Larkfield library and at the Hop Farm. Results from these tests are generally available within 30 minutes. Staff who are going into the office or working 'out and about' in our communities are actively encouraged to have lateral flow tests.

1.3.3 As progress is made through the various stages of the Government's roadmap, the venues for all testing sites will be subject to review, as premises are able to return to their primary use, and also in response to levels of positivity in the community. Members will be advised of any future changes.

## **1.4 Vaccination update**

- 1.4.1 As Members are aware, the rollout of the vaccination programme led by the NHS has been a real national achievement. At the time of writing this report, 17.2 million adults across England have received a first dose vaccination.
- 1.4.2 The programme is being managed through a number of routes. The initial tranche of vaccinations were primarily managed through GP surgery collaborations and Primary Care Networks. Members will however be aware of the increasing rollout of mass vaccination centres across the country as the programme expands to include more cohorts. Further information on Kent Vaccination programme can be found [Covid-19 vaccination :: Kent and Medway Clinical Commissioning Group \(kentandmedwayccg.nhs.uk\)](https://kentandmedwayccg.nhs.uk)
- 1.4.3 The opening of one of these mass vaccination centres at the Angel Centre in Tonbridge has been a real boost for our communities. This resulted from some detailed conversations with the NHS, local MPs and of course the Leisure Trust.
- 1.4.4 The arrangements for the capacity and opening hours of the facility remain entirely with the NHS and its partners. However, it is anticipated that the facility will be open until at least 31 May 2021, based on the agreement for use of the building.
- 1.4.5 At the time of writing, the take up of vaccinations in our communities has been very high. Over 99% of all those people in the first two cohorts i.e. all those over 80 years of age, have received at least their first vaccination. For cohort 3 (over 70's) the vaccination rate is over 97%.
- 1.4.6 The supply of vaccines across the country has been well documented by others. There will be a verbal update on the current position on the night of Cabinet.

## **1.5 Chancellor's Budget**

- 1.5.1 The Chancellor, Rishi Sunak, presented his Budget on 3 March 2021 and this included a number of initiatives to support individuals and businesses during the pandemic, and hopefully as we emerge from the pandemic.
- 1.5.2 More details will of course be shared via appropriate Advisory Boards, but the headline issues (not exclusive) are:
- 1) There is an extension of the existing 100% business rates relief for Retail, Hospitality and Leisure for the three months from April to June 2021.
  - 2) There will be a new 66% relief for the same premises from July 2021 to March 2022, capped at £2m per business for properties which were required to be closed on 5 January 2021 and £105k per business for other eligible properties.

- 3) The government will provide 'Restart Grants' in England of up to £6,000 per premises for non-essential retail businesses and £18,000 per premises for hospitality, accommodation, leisure, personal care and gym businesses.
- 4) The government is providing local authorities in England with an additional £425m of discretionary business grant funding. (Individual allocations, and the criteria surrounding this is awaited).
- 5) The Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS) and support for self-employed people are to be extended to the end of September 2021.
- 6) There will be additional support for eligible working tax credit claimants in the form of a one-off payment of £500
- 7) The government is extending the temporary £20 per week increase to Universal Credit standard allowance for a further 6 months.

1.5.3 As Members will appreciate, the Council is presently in the process of billing for council tax and business rates in readiness for the new financial year. At the time of writing, discussions are taking place about how the business rates reliefs in (1) and (2) above can be accommodated.

1.5.4 Businesses will of course be eager to receive the Restart grants that have been announced. We await the guidance and funding, and then we will be in a position to roll out the grants to those who are eligible.

## **1.6 Next Steps & Corporate Strategy**

1.6.1 We now have a roadmap for exit from this pandemic, but at this point it is still a rapidly changing environment. Recently, we saw the response to the emergence of the South African variant in a neighbouring authority for which door to door community surge testing was undertaken in a post code area. It is anticipated that in March the Government will also publish a plan for dealing with local outbreak and variants of concern.

1.6.2 As mentioned at para 1.2.5, all Advisory Boards, Committees, Cabinet and Council continue to be held virtually by Microsoft Teams. Where permitted public speaking has also been facilitated, and all meetings are live streamed on YouTube. The legislation permitting virtual meetings remains in place until 7 May 2021. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee meets on 11 March 2021 to consider virtual meetings and homeworking.

1.6.3 Members will recall that at its meeting on 3 June 2020, Cabinet adopted a one year Addendum to the Corporate Plan. Various reports have been submitted to a range of Committees and Advisory Boards, and continue to be reported further over the coming months. At its meeting in January 2021, Cabinet resolved that the Corporate Plan Addendum should be reviewed at the end of the first year (2020/21) and this should be the subject of a specific report in the summer.

## **1.7 Legal Implications**

- 1.7.1 The statutory framework governing the response to the pandemic continues to evolve in response to the restrictions placed on both individuals and Local Authorities. It is an absolute requirement that we implement any new responsibilities and restrictions in a timely fashion. This must continue to be a corporate priority.
- 1.7.2 The legal implications for any proposals emerging from the Corporate plan Addendum, will be assessed at the time of individual reports to Members.

## **1.8 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.8.1 The Council set the budget for 2021/22, and the associated 10 year medium term financial strategy (MTFS), at its meeting on 23 February 2021 taking on board anticipated recovery from the pandemic. It is acknowledged that the projections made about recovery are only assumptions, and therefore the budget and MTFS need to be regularly reviewed.
- 1.8.2 Cabinet had recommended to Full Council during its consideration of the budget that the ethos of 'essential spend' be carried over into 2021/22 to protect the Council's finances.

## **1.9 Risk Assessment**

- 1.9.1 The Council's Strategic Risk Register is regularly updated and the most recent iteration is on the agenda for Audit Committee on 6 April 2021.

## **1.10 Equality Impact Assessment**

- 1.10.1 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 users.

## **1.11 Policy Considerations**

- 1.11.1 Community
- 1.11.2 Business Continuity/Resilience
- 1.11.3 Healthy Lifestyles
- 1.11.4 Climate Change
- 1.11.5 Customer Contact
- 1.11.6 Health and Safety
- 1.11.7 Human Resources

**1.12 Recommendation**

1.12.1 That the Council's ongoing actions in respect of the response to Covid-19 be  
**ENDORSED.**

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Sharon Shelton

Julie Beilby

Julie Beilby

Chief Executive for Management Team



## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### CABINET

16 March 2021

#### Report of the Management Team

#### Part 1- Public

#### Executive Non Key Decisions

#### 1 NEW HOMES BONUS SCHEME

On 10 February 2021, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published the paper 'The Future of the New Homes Bonus: consultation'. Responses are requested by 7 April 2021, and this report sets out an indicative response to the consultation.

#### 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This consultation seeks views on the future of the New Homes Bonus (NHB), from 2022/23 onwards.

1.1.2 The consultation covers a number of options for reforming NHB to provide an incentive which is more focused and targeted on ambitious housing delivery, complements the reforms outlined in the government's Planning White Paper, and dovetails with the wider financial mechanisms the government is putting in place, including the infrastructure levy and the Single Housing Infrastructure Fund.

1.1.3 The return date for responses to the consultation is 7 April 2021 and a copy of our proposed response, based on information available at the time of writing, is attached at **[Annex 1]**. The paper can be found at the following link:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/the-future-of-the-new-homes-bonus-consultation/the-future-of-the-new-homes-bonus-consultation>

#### 1.2 Background

1.2.1 The NHB was introduced in 2011 to provide a financial incentive to reward and encourage local authorities to help facilitate housing growth in their areas.

1.2.2 NHB rewards local authorities for each additional new build and conversion using the national average band D council tax rate. Long-term empty properties brought back into use are also included and there is a premium for affordable homes. In two-tier areas payments are split (district 80% county 20%).

1.2.3 The Scheme initially made payments for 6 years (an initial in-year payment and 5 years' worth of what became known as legacy payments), with all eligible growth counting towards authorities' allocations. In 2018/19 the payment period was reduced to 4 years and a baseline introduced below which NHB would not be paid. For the year 2020/21 the payment period was reduced to 1 year (no legacy payments on that year's allocation) and again in 2021/22 (no legacy payments on that year's allocation) presumably because of this pending consultation.

### 1.3 'The Future of the New Homes Bonus: consultation'

#### Overview

1.3.1 A summary of the main points from the consultation is given below:

- The new scheme will be in place for 2022/23.
- The government do not intend for the new scheme to include legacy payments.
- There is no mention as to whether the final legacy payment for 2019/20 due in 2022/23 (value £829,000) will be paid alongside the replacement for NHB. *The MTFFS assumes this payment will be honoured.*
- Asks whether there should be a change to the current split of NHB in two-tier areas; the affordable housing premium should be maintained; the reward should be maintained for bringing long term empty properties back into use; and seeks views on the data used, i.e. to use the most recent year of housing delivery or a three-year average.
- The paper includes six Options (A to F), but these are not mutually exclusive.
- 10 of the 30 questions relate to the baseline below which NHB would not be paid. The paper considers three options, raising the generic threshold (Option A) a tailored local threshold based on historic growth (Option B) or a hybrid approach (Option C). The paper states that the government wants the threshold to be significantly higher than the current 0.4% baseline. *At the current 0.4% baseline NHB is not paid on approximately the first 240 properties.*
- An option for funding from NHB to be potentially repurposed to equalise the amounts raised from the new Infrastructure Levy; reflecting that land value uplift is greatest in areas where development values are high.
- Asks whether some of the NHB could be distributed based on Modern Methods of Construction (MMC), with either a proportion set-aside for MMC properties (Option E) or the entire allocation being dependent on a minimum percentage of MMC properties being constructed (Option F).

- Asks, as was previously suggested in the 2015 consultation, whether an up-to-date Local Plan (or at least working towards one) should be a requirement to receive NHB, with potentially lower allocations for those authorities without an up-to-date Plan.

1.3.2 Responses to these and other questions raised are to be found at **[Annex 1]**.

### *Conclusions*

1.3.3 The Council has done what was asked and encouraged growth in house building. We are one of the best performing district councils in the south east in this respect. The consequent NHB allocations helping to mitigate in part what can only be described as **devastating reductions in core funding of more than 65%** since 2010/11. Only to now find this funding stream at risk.

1.3.4 NHB was intended to be a powerful, permanent incentive to deliver new houses. The latest proposed changes further undermine the original objective of NHB and put some authorities, particularly district councils, financial sustainability at risk. As a result, it will come of no surprise that our preference is **for the pre-existing scheme and four years of payments to continue**. *But likelihood remote.*

1.3.5 The intention not to reintroduce the concept of legacy payments gives an in-year reward only which, all other things being equal, **of itself reduces the NHB allocation by 75%** from that received under the pre-existing scheme. To make up for that dramatic reduction would require a four-fold increase in the payment rate notwithstanding any increase in the baseline.

1.3.6 To put the current and suggested baselines into context based on each in-year reward is to be for one year only, no legacy payments:

Baseline	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%
No. of Properties	237	356	474	593
NHB	£455,000	£282,000	£110,000	£0

1.3.7 Compared to the 2021/22 NHB allocation of circa £2.2m. **A reduction of at least £1,750,000 or 80%**. Each stepped increase in the baseline places additional and increasing funding pressure particularly on district councils and the services they provide. A higher payment rate, dependent on the rate and baseline used, **of little or no value** to many councils including high performing authorities that have done what was asked and encouraged housebuilding.

1.3.8 Clearly, in such a scenario, there is need for protection, as some authorities, particularly district councils, **financial sustainability will be at risk**.

1.3.9 You could be forgiven for thinking the consultation is more about reducing the size of the funding envelope to deliver a saving / redistributing resources than it is to do with 'sharpening the incentive' for continued housing growth. In that case **why**

**not** keep the basics of the scheme as now (albeit no legacy payments) and apply a three-fold increase to the payment rate and increase the baseline to 0.6% both in the interests of simplicity and transparency and to aid financial planning. Such a scheme delivering a significant saving on the requisite funding envelope compared to the pre-existing scheme.

1.3.10 To do more knowingly placing an untold number of councils' financial sustainability at increased risk.

1.3.11 Introducing further layers such as the new infrastructure levy, modern methods of construction and local plan progress into the NHB regime would **only complicate matters unnecessarily whilst adding little to 'sharpen the incentive'**.

## **1.4 Legal Implications**

1.4.1 None.

## **1.5 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

1.5.1 Members no doubt are aware that NHB has formed a critical component of the Council's finances since its introduction receiving sums in excess of £3m under the original scheme and around £2m under the revised scheme following the 2015 consultation.

1.5.2 For medium term financial planning purposes, it was assumed there would be a replacement NHB scheme, but the funding envelope and sum awarded much reduced. In the latest iteration of the MTFS it is assumed overall government grant funding will reduce to £2.4m in 2023/24 and a hypothetical example of how that might be made up is business rates baseline (£1.5m) business rates growth (£200,000) and NHB replacement (£700,000).

1.5.3 What we might expect to receive following this latest consultation is not possible to determine other than it could be zero. Based on the hypothetical example above that would require the other elements of government grant funding to be higher than that assumed by some margin if the funding gap is not to increase.

1.5.4 Moving from £3m to £2m to £700,000 stark, moving from £3m to £2m to zero incredulous. But for now, suggest we 'take a deep breath' and wait to see what does come of these proposals.

## **1.6 Risk Assessment**

1.6.1 Dependent on the outcome of the consultation the funding gap could be more than that currently reflected in the MTFS and, in turn, put financial sustainability at greater and greater risk.

## 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.

## 1.8 Recommendations

1.8.1 Cabinet is asked to:

- 1) **approve in principle** the indicative response to 'The Future of the New Homes Bonus: consultation' as attached at **[Annex 1]**; and
- 2) **give delegated authority** to the Leader and Cabinet Members for Finance, Innovation & Property and Strategic Planning & Infrastructure to make any appropriate adjustments to the indicative response should any new information need to be added in advance of the deadline of 7 April 2021.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Neil Lawley  
Nigel DeWit

Sharon Shelton

Director of Finance and Transformation on behalf of the Management Team

This page is intentionally left blank

## The Future of the New Homes Bonus Consultation

### Pre-amble and Headline Response from Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council

The Council has done what was asked and encouraged housing growth in their area. We are one of the best performing district councils in the south east in this respect. The consequent NHB allocations have helped to mitigate in part what can only be described as **devastating reductions in core funding of more than 65%** since 2010/11. However, what is proposed would put this funding stream at risk for many councils.

NHB was intended to be a powerful, permanent incentive to encourage housing growth. The latest proposed changes further undermine the original objective of the NHB and would put at risk the financial sustainability of some authorities, particularly district councils. As a result, it will come as no surprise that our preference is **for the pre-existing scheme and four years of payments to continue, without change.**

The intention not to reintroduce the concept of legacy payments gives an in-year reward only which, all other things being equal, **itself reduces the NHB allocation by 75%** from that received under the pre-existing scheme. To make up for that dramatic reduction, a four-fold increase in the payment rate notwithstanding any increase in the baseline would be required.

To put the current and suggested baselines into context, based on each in-year reward is to be for one year only, no legacy payments:

Baseline	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%
NHB	£455,000	£282,000	£110,000	£0

Compared to the 2021/22 NHB allocation of circa £2.2m. **A reduction of at least £1,750,000 or 80%.** Each stepped increase in the baseline would place additional and increasing funding pressure on local authorities, in particular district councils and the services they provide. A higher payment rate, dependent on the rate and baseline used, would be **of little or no value** to many councils including high performing authorities that have done what was asked and encouraged housing growth in their areas.

Clearly, in such a scenario, there is a need for protection, as some authorities, particularly district councils, would face the prospect of their **financial sustainability being put at serious risk.**

One could be forgiven for thinking the consultation is more about reducing the size of the funding envelope in order to deliver a saving / redistributing resources than it is to do with 'sharpening the incentive' for encouraging housing growth. In that case, **why not** keep the basics of the scheme as now (albeit with no legacy payments) and apply a three-fold increase to the payment rate and increase the baseline to 0.6% both in the interests of simplicity and transparency and to aid financial planning? Such a scheme would deliver a significant saving on the requisite funding envelope compared to the pre-existing scheme.

To do more would knowingly placing an untold number of councils' financial sustainability at increased risk.

Introducing further layers such as the new infrastructure levy, modern methods of construction and local plan progress into the NHB regime would **only complicate matters unnecessarily whilst adding little to 'sharpen the incentive'**. NHB payments would not be the primary motivator for achieving and/or supporting these other objectives.

### **Responses to the Consultation Questions**

**Question 1:** *Do you believe that an incentive like the Bonus has a material and positive effect on behaviour?*

**Yes, in part, although it is not the primary influence.** The Council has done what was asked and encouraged housing growth. We are one of the best performing district councils in the south east in this respect. The consequent NHB allocations have helped to mitigate in part what can only be described as **devastating reductions in core funding of more than 65%** since 2010/11. However, what is proposed would put this funding stream at risk for many councils.

**Question 2:** *If you are a local authority, has the Bonus made a material impact on your own behaviour?*

The Council's focus has and continues to be on supporting sustainable development that addresses assessed needs. NHB awards are a benefit of achieving this objective. We do not obstruct sustainable housing growth and we have been rightly and properly rewarded for our housing supply performance.

**Question 3:** *Are there changes to the Bonus that would make it have a material and positive effect on behaviour?*

**No.** But further changes, as proposed, could have an adverse impact going forward and place a number of councils' financial sustainability and the services they provide at risk.

**Question 4:** *Should the government retain the current 80/20 split in any reformed Bonus, or should it be more highly weighted towards the District Councils or County Councils?*

**Yes.** The current split was considered appropriate at the introduction of the New Homes Bonus Scheme and we do not believe anything has happened over that time to warrant a change. A change in the current 80/20 split would simply see resources shift from one tier of local government at the expense of the other, placing further increased funding pressure on the tier from which the resources are taken. There would be no net gain in the funding of services and infrastructure by making this change.



**Question 5:** *Should the affordable housing premium be retained in a reformed Bonus?*

**Yes.** Ensuring that affordable homes are sufficiently prioritised within supply should continue to be rewarded. This is particularly important for local authorities where there are high housing pressures and the gap between house prices and earnings is significant, making it very challenging for many local residents to access the housing market.

**Question 6:** *Is £350 per additional affordable home the right level of premium, or should this level be increased or decreased?*

The premium has not changed since the introduction of the scheme. The main allocation, in contrast, has been uplifted each year in line with the increase in the national average band D council tax rate. Given this, it is suggested that the current premium be increased to £500 in lieu of an inflationary uplift over that time. This would be a reasonable change.

**Question 7:** *Should a reformed Bonus continue to reward local authorities for long-term empty homes brought back in to use?*

**Yes.** Bringing long-term empty properties back into use should continue to be rewarded.

**Question 8:** *Should the Bonus be awarded on the basis of the most recent year of housing delivery or the most recent three years?*

Based on the most recent year of housing delivery.

**Question 9:** *Do you agree that the baseline should be raised?*

**We disagree.** The baseline under the current arrangements can be adjusted to ensure the costs of the NHB scheme stay within the funding envelope. There is no compelling need to make any changes to the baseline unless the funding envelope is to be reduced.

One could be forgiven for thinking the consultation is more about reducing the size of the funding envelope in order to deliver a saving / redistributing resources than it is to do with 'sharpening the incentive' for encouraging housing growth. In that case, **why not** keep the basics of the scheme as now (albeit no legacy payments) and apply a three-fold increase to the payment rate and increase the baseline to 0.6% both in the interests of simplicity and transparency and to aid financial planning. Such a scheme would deliver a significant saving on the requisite funding envelope compared to the pre-existing scheme.

To do more would knowingly place an untold number of councils' financial sustainability at increased risk.

Introducing further layers such as the new infrastructure levy, modern methods of construction and local plan progress into the NHB regime would **only complicate matters unnecessarily whilst adding little to 'sharpen the incentive'**. NHB

payments would not be the primary motivator for achieving and/or supporting these other objectives.

**Question 10:** *If the baseline is to be raised, should it be raised to 0.6%, 0.8% or 1% of housing growth since the preceding year?*

See response to question 9.

To put the current and suggested baselines into context, based on each in-year reward is to be for one year only, no legacy payments:

Baseline	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%
NHB	£455,000	£282,000	£110,000	£0

Compared to the 2021/22 NHB allocation of circa £2.2m. **A reduction of at least £1,750,000 or 80%**. Each stepped increase in the baseline would place additional and increasing funding pressure on local authorities, in particular district councils and the services they provide. A higher payment rate, dependent on the rate and baseline used, would be **of little or no value** to many councils including high performing authorities that have done what was asked and encouraged housing growth.

Clearly, in such a scenario, there is a need for protection, as some authorities, particularly district councils, would face the prospect of their **financial sustainability being put at serious risk**.

There is no justification, especially now given the current wider economic context, for the baseline to be raised. However, if this inevitable, it should only be raised to 0.6%, subject to the suggested changes outlined in our response to question 9.

**Question 11:** *Why should the government opt for the baseline you have recommended in answer to the previous question? A higher baseline could potentially be combined with a higher payment rate (so as to keep the total level of funding broadly constant). Alternatively, the same payment rate could be maintained (in which case total funding would fall).*

See response to question 9 and 10. The government should opt for no change, because there are no compelling reasons for a change to be made. Local authorities have no direct influence or control over contextual factors such as the state of the economy and the housing industry which have such a significant bearing on housing delivery locally. Now, given the current context, is the least appropriate time to consider raising the baseline. That would be a hindrance not a help.

**Question 12:** *If the baseline is to be raised, should this change be combined with higher payment rate?*

See response to question 9,10 and 11.

A higher payment rate, dependent on the rate and baseline used, would be **of little or no value** to many councils including high performing authorities that have done what was asked and encouraged housing growth in their areas. If the objective of a

higher payment rate is to keep the total level of funding broadly constant, the most effective and least complicated way of achieving this would be by making no changes.

**Question 13:** *Should the government adopt a new payment formula for the Bonus which rewards local authorities for improvement on their average past performance with respect to housing growth?*

**No.** The NHB scheme is based on a simple calculation of housing supply performance, why complicate matters? This proposal would be unfair and would only benefit those local authorities who have, historically, under-performed on housing delivery.

It would be unfair on those authorities who have made a significant contribution to housing growth in the last 5-10 years, where the prospects of improving on the average past performance, especially in the current economic climate, are very limited. This change is not justified and would pose a risk to the financial sustainability of district councils that have played an important role in boosting housing supply over the past decade.

**Question 14:** *If the government is to adopt such a payment formula, above what percentage (x%) of average past net housing additions should the Bonus begin to be paid? In other words, what should the value of x be?*

See response to question 13.

**Question 15:** *If the government is to adopt such a payment formula, over what period should the annual average of past net additions be calculated? Should it be a period of 5 years or 10 years?*

See response to question 13.

**Question 16:** *Should the government adopt a new hybrid payment formula for the Bonus which rewards either improved performance or high housing growth? Please explain why or why not.*

**No.** See response to question 13.

**Question 17:** *Above what percentage (x%) of average past net housing additions should the Bonus begin to be paid? In other words, what should the value of x be in this proposed hybrid payment formula?*

See response to question 16.

**Question 18:** *Above what percentage (y%) increase in the authority's housing stock should the Bonus be paid? In other words, what should the value of y be in this proposed hybrid payment formula?*

See response to question 16.

**Question 19:** *Do you agree with the proposal to repurpose the Bonus to balance the effects of the Infrastructure Levy by providing an incentive to authorities to bring forward development in lower value areas?*

**We disagree.** NHB is un-ringfenced so that councils can choose how to allocate the funding to meet local priorities and support day-to-day services. On the other hand, section 106 agreements and Community Infrastructure levy, in the main, fund capital infrastructure projects necessary to support housing growth. Repurposing the NHB in this way would add to already severe revenue budget pressures. It would also, by definition, redistribute resources where, despite having done what was asked and encouraged housing growth, a council would not receive the level of reward it might otherwise have done.

The effects of low developer contribution income in lower value areas should not be intertwined with NHB, but as a standalone issue.

Furthermore, what is proposed is not an effective solution. The value of a housing market reflects the balance between supply and demand. A lower value market area is typically characterised by a low level of demand relative to the supply. It is not the case that supply is low because the local authorities are lacking an incentive to boost housing growth. There are many authorities in lower value areas who have taken positive approaches to encouraging the development of new homes to help sustain local communities and economies.

There are several reasons why the demand for housing in these locations may be low. These could include the accessibility of the location from other larger towns and cities, the health of the local economy, crime and safety statistics, etc. In such areas, the NHB award is likely to be low already and may be non-existent if the baseline figure is to be increased. This proposed option would not present a meaningful solution to the issues that have been identified.

**Question 20:** *What, in your view, would be the advantages and disadvantages of repurposing the Bonus in this way?*

See response to question 19.

**Question 21:** *If the option is to be pursued, should this reform to the Bonus be postponed until the new planning system is enacted?*

**We disagree** with the proposal to repurpose the NHB in this way for the reasons set out above. A better understanding of the reasons for lower value market areas needs to be established first before considering appropriate solutions.

**Question 22:** *In your view, what levers do local authorities have at their disposal to encourage uptake of MMC, and how impactful is such encouragement likely to be?*

Given that Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) as an industry is not very mature, we have not had the opportunity yet to consider possible levers to encourage uptake. However, we recognise that faster, more efficient forms of construction could result in the supply of more affordable products which means that there is an opportunity to consider the role of MMC in addressing local affordable

housing needs. There is also scope to consider how MMC can help address net zero carbon targets set at the local level.

**Question 23:** *Should the Bonus include a premium for new homes built using MMC? Please explain why or why not.*

No, the Bonus should not include a premium for new homes built using MMC, at this stage. More evidence needs to be gathered on the capacity of MMC in England and the opportunities for delivery across the regions and districts before such a decision is made. It would be unfair to introduce such a premium if the opportunities of using MMC are unevenly distributed across local authorities or the industry cannot keep up with demand. This decision needs to be evidence driven.

**Question 24:** *If you are a local authority, would such a premium make a material impact on your behaviour? Would it, for example, encourage you to look for opportunities to bring through developments that are amenable to the use of MMC?*

It is unlikely that such a premium would make a material impact on our behaviour towards encouraging housing growth. We would view MMC from the perspective of how it could address our assessed housing needs in a timely, cost effective (affordable) and energy-efficient way.

**Question 25:** *How onerous a data burden would this option impose on local authorities? Do you agree with the proposal to collect the MMC data at the point at which a local authority signs off a building as habitable?*

Given our current resources and priorities, including getting an up-to-date Local Plan in place, and the fact that this premium would not have a material impact on our behaviour towards encouraging housing growth, this option would impose an unnecessary burden upon us.

**Question 26:** *Should the government make it a condition of receiving the Bonus that  $w\%$  of net additional homes used MMC in order for the Bonus to be paid? If so what should the value of  $w$  be?*

No. The purpose of the New Homes Bonus is to incentivise housing growth. Introducing a condition of payment based upon a certain % of net additional homes using MMC may blunt that incentive for some local authorities, especially those where the opportunities to harness that technology are limited. Furthermore, it is premature to consider introducing such a requirement in the absence of a sufficient evidence base (see also response to question 23).

**Question 27:** *Why should or shouldn't such a condition be introduced?*

See response to question 26.

**Question 28:** *Do you think that local authorities should be required to have a local plan, or demonstrate satisfactory progress towards one, in order to receive funding?*

Local authorities should not be required to have an up-to-date local plan in order to receive funding. Many local authorities have endeavoured to get an up-to-date local plan in place but their control and influence on the speed of the process ceases at

the point of submission. After this point, if how and when the plan progresses to adoption is determined by the appointed planning inspectors who are responsible for the examination stage. The length of the examination stage is difficult to predict, it has been known to last 2-3 years. It would be unfair to make it a requirement to have an up-to-date local plan in place in order to receive funding because the final progression to this point is ultimately out of the control of local authorities.

However, there may be merit in considering payment on the condition that local authorities have made satisfactory progress towards adopting an up-to-date plan. This would be dependent upon a reasonable definition of 'satisfactory progress'. This requirement should only be considered once an adopted plan is more than five years old. It should take into account a combination of factors including the number of years post the five-year period and whether the Regulation 19 stage has been reached in the preparation process. This is an appropriate stage to make this judgement because it represents when the Council has prepared its full pre-submission plan.

It should also consider those circumstances where a local authority had previously made significant progress towards an adopted plan, e.g. reached the examination stage, but where they have been forced to restart the plan-making process because of an inspector's decision. It would be harsh to ignore these earlier endeavours of the local authorities when making this judgement.

Furthermore, changes to national planning policy and legislation are already providing a basis for efficiency in local planning and it is fundamentally wrong for these areas of public policy to be mixed other than in measuring the outcome of new homes delivered on the ground. Introducing further layers would only complicate matters unnecessarily whilst adding little to 'sharpen the incentive'.

**Question 29:** *Do you think the bonus should be paid at a reduced rate until such time as a local authority has an up-to-date local plan in place, and should it be 25%, 50% or 75%?*

**No.** It would be harsh to introduce a reduced rate because progression to an adopted plan is not wholly within the control and influence of local authorities (see response to question 28), yet they would be the party that is penalised. The management of the process to adoption transfers from local authorities to the planning inspections at the point of submission. After this point in time, how the plan progresses (or otherwise) to adoption is determined by the examination inspectors. Local authorities have no certainty about this stage of the process and how long it will take and whether the outcome will be an adopted plan. Despite the Planning Inspectorate providing guidance about the examination phase, it is evident that the timelines set out are rarely achieved, with some examination phases extending over 2-3 years. Local authorities are unable to control this, which is why it would be unreasonable to introduce a reduced rate until such time that an up-to-date local plan is in place.

**Question 30:** *If you are a local authority, would this encourage you to develop or maintain an up-to-date local plan?*

It would be a secondary consideration because the driving force for adopting an up-to-date local plan is the desire to have a plan-led system locally where there is a degree of certainty about how assessed needs will be addressed in a sustainable way, supporting local communities and economies whilst protecting areas and assets of particular importance. Please also see response to question 28.

This page is intentionally left blank



## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### CABINET

16 March 2021

#### Report of the Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive

#### Part 1- Public

#### Executive Non Key Decisions

#### 1 EAST PECKHAM PARISH COUNCIL – REQUEST FOR COMPUSORY PURCHASE ORDER

##### 1.1 Background

1.1.1 On 15th March 2021 East Peckham Parish Council resolved to make a request to the Borough Council, under section s.39(7) of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908 (“Allotments Act”), to make a Compulsory Purchase Order in respect of allotment land at Church Lane, East Peckham.

1.1.2 The land is occupied as allotments by the Parish Council under a lease. The Parish Council are currently negotiating with the landowner to purchase the site. The Parish Council wishes to purchase the land compulsorily in the event that those negotiations are unsuccessful.

##### 1.2 Legal Implications

1.2.1 Under section 39(7) of the Allotments Act, a Parish Council cannot exercise Compulsory Purchase powers itself. Instead, the PC must make a request of the Borough Council to make the order on its behalf.

1.2.2 In the event the Borough Council decline to make the Order, the Parish Council may approach the Secretary of State directly to make the Order on its behalf.

1.2.3 If the Council resolves to make a CPO, there are a number of formal processes to be followed before the land vests in the Parish Council. The Order must be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment for approval. The landowner(s) may object to the Order, and if that is the case a CPO Public Inquiry may need to be held. The PC must also continue to negotiate with the landowner for the purchase without compulsion. In the event those negotiations are unsuccessful, the Borough Council can then serve notice or make a General Vesting Declaration, in order to allow the Parish Council to take possession of the land- subject to compensation for the land being agreed or resolved through the Lands Tribunal.

### 1.3 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.3.1 Section 39 of the Allotments Act requires a Parish Council to pay all of the costs of the Borough Council in making a CPO on their behalf. In addition, the recommendation in this report is that the Borough Council would only resolve to make an Order after an acceptable Costs Indemnity Agreement was put in place. Overall, therefore, the Order would be cost-neutral to the Borough Council.

### 1.4 Risk Assessment

- 1.4.1 The making of a CPO on behalf of the Parish Council in these circumstances presents a low risk to the Council, provided that an appropriate costs indemnity agreement is in place.

### 1.5 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.5.1 Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and (iii) foster good relations between people from different groups.
- 1.5.2 The decisions recommended through this paper have the capability of directly affecting people with a protected characteristic (age), as allotments may more likely be used by older people (although it is acknowledged this is not exclusively the case). The provision of allotments provides opportunity for outdoor exercise and activities which can promote wellbeing which otherwise may not be available to older people. A decision to make the Order could promote (by the continuation of Allotment provision) equality of opportunity for people with a protected characteristic. Conversely, if the Order is not made, it may ultimately result in the loss of allotment land and a consequent reduction in opportunities for people with a protected characteristic.

### 1.6 Policy Considerations

- 1.6.1 Community
- 1.6.2 Equalities/Diversity
- 1.6.3 Healthy Lifestyles

### 1.7 Recommendations

- 1.7.1 That Cabinet **RESOLVE** to:
- (i) **MAKE** a Compulsory Purchase Order under s.39 Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908 on behalf of East Peckham Parish Council in respect of the allotment land at Church Lane, East Peckham;

- (ii) **DELEGATE** to the Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive any further decisions required for the preparation, drafting, completion, making and submission of the Compulsory Purchase Order to the Secretary of State; and
- (iii) In the event that the Order is confirmed by the Secretary of State, **DELEGATE** to the Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive authority to serve such notices or make such General Vesting Declarations as are required to give effect to the Order and vest the title to the land in the Parish Council.

**SUBJECT TO** the Parish Council entering into a CPO Costs Indemnity Agreement on terms acceptable to the Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive.

Background papers:

contact: Kevin Toogood

Nil

Adrian Stanfield

Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 13

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 14

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



By virtue of paragraph(s) 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 16

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