

## **LOCAL PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2013 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr. Mrs. Hunter (Chairman)

Cllrs. Bosley, Clark, Gaywood, Mrs. Morris and Williamson.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Mrs. Dawson, Mrs. Purves, Mrs. Sargeant and Searles

Cllrs. Ayres, Mrs. Ayres and Orridge were also present.

### 9. Minutes

Resolved: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2 July 2013, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 10. Declarations of interest

No additional declarations of interest were made.

### 11. Actions from Previous Meeting

The actions from the previous meeting were noted.

### 12. Update from Portfolio Holder

The Portfolio Holder for Local Planning and Environment advised that he had monthly meetings with Officers. He referred Members to the performance indicators referred from Cabinet and also updated Members on the procedures in place since the Dunbrik fire. Waste was currently being transported to the Pepper Hill and North Farm sites at no extra cost to the Council as under the current agreement KCC were required to pay for any additional expenditure incurred.

### 13. Referrals from Cabinet or the Audit Committee

#### a) Performance Monitoring (Minute 29, Cabinet 12 September 2013)

Members considered the 'red' indicators relating to the Planning Service as referred by Cabinet.

Resolved: That no further action need be taken at the moment as the Officer commentaries fully explained the situation.

### 14. Housing and Energy Conservation Officer

The Housing Policy Manager gave a [presentation](#) on the roles and responsibilities of the Energy Conservation and Initiatives Officer who was unfortunately unable to attend.

## Local Planning and Environment Advisory Committee – 24 September 2013

In response to questions he advised that 'Energy week' would be promoted with Staff, and a Member training event could be arranged if it was believed the need was there.

It was agreed that local members contact the Housing Policy Manager/Energy Conservation and Initiatives Officer with any properties would qualify for the retrofit project.

### 15. Conservation Areas and Permitted Development Rights

The Acting Planning Services Manager gave a [presentation](#) updating Members on the number of applications made under the new permitted development rights received since the legislation came in to force; explained how conservation areas were designated; and advised on current staffing constraints and workload prioritisation.

Members asked who put forward requests to designate conservations areas, whether there were size limitations, and generally what the process was and how long it took. The Acting Planning Services Manager advised that there were no size limitations as long as the application met the criteria of being of archaeological and historical interest. With regards to timescales it was not possible with current workload and staffing resources to bring forward applications within desired timescales and as a question of prioritisation. There was no formal process set up and therefore there was a potential opportunity for the Committee to be involved in setting one up, if they believed this was required.

*Action 1: The Acting Planning Services Manager to circulate the list of current applications for conservation area status for Members to comment on prioritisation.*

The Chief Planning Officer added that if an area met NPPF tests and was at particular risk of development this would be taken into account when deciding priorities. He also affirmed that there was an opportunity to devise defined criteria which Officers could begin drafting and bring forward to a future meeting. In response to questions, the Chief Planning Officer reported that there had been a recent change in the regulations on permitted development rights and it was now permissible to charge a limited fee to recover an element of the cost involved in administering the new process.

### 16. Approval of Neighbourhood Plan Areas for Chevening and Hextable

Members considered a report outlining the details of the requests received from Chevening and Hextable Parish Councils, to designate the parishes as Neighbourhood Plan areas in order to potentially bring forward a Neighbourhood Plan. Only a Parish Council could bring forward a Neighbourhood Plan. Edenbridge and Ash had already been designated, Otford had completed the 6 week public consultation process and Officers were working towards bringing forward their area designation request to the next committee. Officers were also working with Shoreham Parish to bring forward an application, and Sevenoaks Town Council had an Officer working on bringing forward an application. Having a designated plan area allowed the Parish Council to apply for funding from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to develop their Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan would have no affect until it was adopted which was a lengthy process, but once it was part of the Development Plan it then became a material planning consideration.

## Local Planning and Environment Advisory Committee – 24 September 2013

Resolved: That the Portfolio Holder for Local Planning & Environment, be advised to approve the designation of Neighbourhood Plan Areas for Chevening and Hextable for the areas set out in Appendices A and B of the report.

### 17. Airports Commission - Long Term Capacity Options

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report which advised that the Airports Commission (or Davies Commission) had been established to consider the need for additional UK airport capacity and recommend to government how this could be met in the short, medium and long term. The Commission was due to report to the Government on its recommendations after the next General Election. It had published the list of options for long term airport capacity proposed to it for public consultation. All members had been consulted on the proposals in August 2013. The report provided a summary of the comments from Members and the main issues for Sevenoaks District raised in the submissions, in particular those by the operators of Gatwick Airport, Kent County Council and the Mayor of London, and asked Members to recommend the approach the Portfolio Holder should take in responding to the Airports Commission's consultation by 27 September 2013.

The Committee was [addressed](#) by Edenbridge Town Councillor King, and the Chairman of Edenbridge Town Council and Sevenoaks District Councillor Orridge. Edenbridge Town Council's [letter to Sir Howard Davies](#) and [letter of support from Sir John Stanley](#) to the Secretary of State for Transport were tabled for information for anyone that had not already seen them. Among many concerns and issues raised, great concern was expressed at the lack of independent noise pollution monitoring and lack of ability to take a more fully representative part of the consultation process, illustrated by the rejection of this Council's and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council's application to join GATCOM.

Members were in general support of the letter to Sir Howard Davies by Edenbridge Town Council. Discussion centred on a possible second runway at Gatwick Airport as the most significant and likely to happen and impact on residents within the District. It was clear that expansion had to take place somewhere and it appeared to be a balancing act between the benefits to the local economy and the detrimental effect of noise pollution. Concern was expressed about the current number and possible increase in night flights and Members discussed the possibility of requesting no night flights between midnight and 5.00 a.m. Compensation or trade offs were also discussed as being a way forward to counteract the additional noise pollution, and Members were keen to see affected residents in receipt of some form of compensation.

Resolved: That the Portfolio Holder be asked to respond to the consultation on behalf of the Council expressing support for the letter written by Edenbridge Town Council and including issues discussed at the meeting including:

- a) the ability for the Council to take a fully representative role within any consultation process;
- b) a recognition of the potential economic benefits but a request that any detrimental impact on residents arising from noise, night flights, infrastructure problems, be mitigated or compensated in some way; and
- c) an expression of regret that GATCOM had dismissed the application to join.

## **Local Planning and Environment Advisory Committee – 24 September 2013**

### 18. Work Plan

Members discussed the draft work plan and the following was agreed:

- to add the Otford Neighbourhood Plan, and Planning Enforcement Charter to the meeting in November 2013
- to add the Shoreham Neighbourhood Plan, CIL Governance Arrangements and Statement of Community Involvement to the meeting in March 2014
- (see Minute 15) a report to be brought back on designated conservation area priority processing.

Members acknowledged that the work plan was fluid and subject to change.

THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 8.52 PM

CHAIRMAN