

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

held at Tunbury Hall, Walderslade

On

Tuesday 15 November 2016

Present: Cllrs Balcombe (Chairman), Ms Dorrington, Elvy, Mrs Gadd, Gledhill, Jones, Mrs Phibbs, Rillie, Shelley, Smith, Walker, Winnett, Wright

In attendance: Mr Harris, Clerk Mrs Collier, Deputy Clerk

Others: 6 Members of the Public

Apologies: Cllrs Base, Mrs Brooks, Hammond, Homewood
Borough Councillor Sullivan

* * * * *

AGENDA ITEM 1 - Declarations of Interest additional to those contained in the Registry of Members' Interests

52. - There were no declarations of interest additional to those contained in the Register of Members Interests.

AGENDA ITEM 2 - Apologies for absence

53. - Cllrs Base, (holiday), Mrs Brooks (care of elderly relative), Hammond (working), Homewood (KCC meeting)
Apologies and the reasons for their absence were noted and accepted.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – Chairman's Announcements

54. Cllr Balcombe reported on his attendance at Aylesford Church's Community Service and the Royal British Legion's Remembrance Day Service.

AGENDA ITEM 4 - Adjournment of the meeting to allow for public participation (subject to the limitations of Standing Order 29 d)

55.1 –Resident of Bull Lane, referred to his attendance at the TMBC presentation on the Draft Local Plan (DLP) in Aylesford on 28 October. He stated his disappointment that there were no representatives from Trenport or Southern Water. His particular concern is the future of the SW sewage works. It was agreed in 2006 that there would be no further expansion of the works but there has been a noticeable increase this year in the size and number of hgvs going through the village. He thanked the Clerk for investigating his query regarding how sewage from Peters Village will be disposed of (pipe to the works to be laid from Wouldham) but how is the waste from all the other developments already agreed (Station Road, Preston Hall, Hermitage Lane) to be disposed of, let alone the potential for 1000s more houses in the DLP.

The Clerk responded that he will make further enquiries with SW and TMBC. He also added that one of the main points in the Council's proposed comments to TMBC on the DLP is that as part of any new development the SW lorries should be taken off Bull Lane.

Resident stated that the provision of all local infrastructure such as roads, doctors and schools will have to be increased if the proposals in the DLP are agreed. Current provision will not be sufficient.

The Clerk clarified that the Parish Council comments on the Plan indicated that these infrastructure improvements need to take place as part of any new development.

Resident asked why Trenport are proposing to build on grade 2 land when they have other areas of brownfield sites available. The Clerk responded that he understood TMBC policy is to increase the boundaries of existing residential areas such as Eccles, rather than create any further self contained new sites such as Peters Village.

55.2 - Cllr Gledhill stated that he wished to ensure Eccles residents that the three Eccles local ward would do everything in their power to preserve the ambiance of Eccles village whilst ensuring that any future developments enhance the area not destroy it. He particularly shared the concerns of residents regarding traffic both now and in the future.

55.3 –Resident of Rochester Road, Aylesford, referred to the current traffic problems in and around Aylesford which he envisaged getting even worse as Peters Village is occupied. He had noted the proposed comments of the Parish Council on the DLP that new/improved road infrastructure would be required before any development could go ahead but where would land for these roads be found?

The Clerk clarified that the Parish Council is only a consultee on the DLP. It has no direct influence on the decisions to be made. If TMBC and KCC agree that road improvements are a condition of any development and those road improvements are not possible, then the development cannot go ahead.

The Clerk added that this is the first round of consultation (deadline for comments 25 November 2016), it will be revised and there will be a second consultation and then a public inquiry.

55.4 – Cllr Shelley reminded everyone that the DLP is available on the internet, or direct from TMBC or a hard copy to view in the Parish Office and that all individuals are invited to review and encouraged to comment.

55.5 – Cllr Jones stated he shared Eccles residents concerns about the lack of information, venue and timing of the information session on the DLP held on 28 October. He thanked the local resident who had taken this on board and arranged another session in Eccles on 6 November which had been attended by over 250 people.

55.6 – Resident of Burham informed the meeting about the traffic issues being experienced in Burham, particularly Church Street, since the opening of the new bridge. It is being used as a rat run and speed limits are regularly ignored. Despite pleas to Trenport there has been no support or solutions forthcoming. She warned Eccles residents as she would not want to see the same things happening in their village.

55.7 –Resident of Aylesford, expressed his concern at the short period of time the public have been given to respond on the DLP. Very few people even know of its existence, there has not been sufficient information sent out. Local Borough Councillors should have taken it on board to inform people and ensure they are representing the people who elected them. References in the DLP to ‘Quality of Life’ are a joke. Nothing is taken into account when developments are agreed. The Preston Hall development roads are too narrow, the Hermitage Lane retail development has caused huge traffic problems, traffic cannot cope with the expansion of the South Aylesford Retail Park.

Cllr Balcombe stated that the Parish Council has objected to every application for expansion of the SA Retail Park based on the fact that the site cannot cope with existing traffic and is regularly gridlocked.

55.98 –Resident of Rochester Road, Aylesford, added his concern at the lack of information and timing of TMBC’s DLP information meeting.

Cllr Balcombe stated that the Parish Council will make every effort to increase notification of future TMBC meetings, once we receive the information ourselves, including noticeboards, website, local shops, pubs and local garage.

Councillors thanked the public for their attendance and involvement and reopened the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – Law and Order in the Parish

56. **Police Reports** – No report to this meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6 - To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the Council Meetings held on 20 September 2016

57. These Minutes were proposed as a correct record of the meeting by Cllr Balcombe, seconded Cllr Wright and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

AGENDA ITEM 7 - Matters Arising from the previous minutes (including those which required Members’ action)

58. There were no Matters Arising.

AGENDA ITEM 8 - Committee Reports/Minutes: to consider and adopt; to deal with any matters arising

59 - Policy and Resources – 4 October 2016

Proposed by Cllr Balcombe, seconded Cllr Wright as an accurate record of the meeting and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

There were no matters arising.

60. Policy and Resources – 1 November 2016

Proposed by Cllr Balcombe, seconded Cllr Wright as an accurate record of the meeting and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

Matters Arising

60.1 – Page 1, 3.2 – **Financial Risk Assessment 2016/17** – Distributed to all Members. It was proposed by Cllr Balcombe, seconded Cllr Gledhill, that this document be accepted – attached at **Appendix A** to the bound copy of these minutes.

61 – **Planning – 4 October 2016**

Proposed by Cllr Wright, seconded Cllr Gledhill as an accurate record of the meeting and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

There were no matters arising.

62 - **Planning – 1 November 2016**

Proposed by Cllr Wright, seconded Cllr Gledhill as an accurate record of the meeting and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

62.1 - Matters arising – Page 4, 5.4. **TMBC Local Plan Consultation** – It was agreed to discuss the Parish Council’s response at Agenda Item 12 – 68. below.

63 – **Environmental Services – 27 September 2016**

Proposed by Cllr Elvy, seconded Cllr Mrs Gadd as an accurate record of the meeting and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

There were no matters arising.

64 – **Environmental Services – 25 October 2016**

Proposed by Cllr Elvy, seconded Cllr Wright, as an accurate record of the meeting and actions included to be accepted. **AGREED**

Matters Arising

64.1 – Page 4, 9. Blue Bell Hill Pond Site – Cllr Smith asked when the tidying work for this area will be carried out. The Clerk responded that some work has been done but we are awaiting delivery of some new trees. He will pursue delivery and advise Cllr Smith accordingly. **Clerk**

AGENDA ITEM 9 - **To receive the observations of the County Councillor**

65. Cllr Homewood was not in attendance and there was no report.

AGENDA ITEM 10 - **To receive the observations of the Borough Councillors**

66. There were no Borough Councillor reports.

AGENDA ITEM 11 - **Accounts for Payment**

67 - Payment list distributed to all Members and attached at **Appendix B** to these minutes.

21 payments totalling £5090.28 were checked and proposed for payment by Cllr Mrs Gadd, seconded Cllr Elvy. **AGREED**

AGENDA ITEM 12 - **To consider any other items of correspondence/Any Other Business**

68.1 – Parish Council response to the **TMBC Draft Local Plan Consultation**

A draft response (as at **Appendix C** attached to the bound copy of these minutes) had been circulated to all Members and to members of the public on request.

The Clerk detailed each response to questions 1 – 15 and then each Member present was given the opportunity to comment.

Q1. Do you agree or disagree with this set of objectives for the new Local Plan?

The Clerk clarified these objectives set out the way TMBC intend to take forward government policies and initiatives whilst reflecting local needs and requirements.

Response agreed.

Q2. Do you agree or disagree with this set of building blocks for the Local Plan strategy?

The Clerk clarified that Bushey Wood has already been identified in the previous Local Plan as an area of opportunity.

Response agreed.

Q3. Do you agree or disagree with this set of guiding principles?

Response agreed.

Q4. Do you agree or disagree that this potential approach to a development strategy could provide a sound direction for the new Local Plan to take?

Aylesford Quarry. Amended as follows:

‘The Council believes that the quarry site provides a great opportunity for the provision of leisure and community use. It is not appropriate that housing is provided at this site unless it is considered necessary as the only means of delivering a leisure and community project which provides significant and much needed community benefit. Housing can never be considered or provided in isolation. Any development at this site will have to give serious consideration to road infrastructure improvements.’

Members also commented that it was their understanding that several years ago the previous Quarry owners indicated that when sand extraction finished at the Quarry the area would go back to a community leisure facility.

Q5. Should the new Local Plan continue to support and focus new economic development at and around existing economic hubs such as the Tonbridge Industrial Estate, New Hythe Lane, Kings Hill, Hermitage Lane and Quarry Wood or should an alternative strategy be considered?

Response agreed.

Q6. Should we consider a wide range of employment gathering uses within existing economic hubs in the borough?

Response agreed.

Q7. Should the Local Plan be supportive of more mixed-use developments, including start-up units within residential schemes?

Response agreed but to add *'Its concern about the impact of increased car parking in those residential areas including any commercial vehicles being used as part of the business.'*

Q8. Q9. Q10. Relate to Tonbridge Town Centre

Responses agreed.

Q11. Do you agree or disagree that the Local Plan should put land into the Green Belt east of West Malling?

Response agreed.

Q12. Are there any other parcels of land in the borough that you think could be justifiably (as measured against the five purposes) put in, or alternatively removed from the Green Belt, without putting at risk the requirement of the Local Plan to positively address assessed needs in a sustainable way?

Response agreed.

Q13. In delivering new development, what features are important to you locally? Please can you rank the following in order of importance, giving 1 for the most important down to 7 for the least important.

It was agreed to change round priority 1 and 2 thus making:

- 1) *Controlling housing densities*
- 2) *Providing publicly accessible open space*

Are there any other priorities that you think should be considered when delivering new development.

It was agreed to add: *Infrastructure improvements including school provision, both primary and secondary, medical facilities such as doctors surgeries, open space and recreational facilities, flood risk prevention and water supply. This would be the Council's top priority.*

Q.14 and Q15. No comment response agreed.

Final response as sent to TMBC is attached at **Appendix D**.

68.2 – Street Naming – RBLI development rear of Hermitage Lane.

‘Richard Corben Way’ has been requested by the RBL. It was **agreed** to support this to TMBC, with a second choice of ‘Corben Way’.

Clerk

AGENDA ITEM 13 - Chairman to move that: ‘The press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as publicity for any confidential aspects of the business identified in agenda items 1 – 12 above would be likely to prejudice the public interest.’

69. There were no confidential items of business this evening.

AGENDA ITEM 14 - Closure of the meeting

There being no further items of business, meeting closed at 8.43pm.