(For Democratic Services use)

Decision Number: 01 (2014/15)

Portfolio Holder Executive Decision Statement

The Local Authority (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012

Subject: SDC response to Gatwick Second Runway Consultation

Details of Decision taken: SDC's response to the consultation is agreed.

Reason for Decision: Areas to the south-west of the District, in particular, are affected by the noise of aircraft arriving or departing Gatwick. The operator's own assessments show that a second runway would increase noise levels and the areas affected in Sevenoaks District. The response sets out SDC's opposition to a second runway and suggests that the airport operator must do more to investigate and implement measures to reduce aircraft noise and its impact. This is consistent with the position that SDC has taken on previous consultations related to Gatwick and aviation.

All Documents considered:

- SDC's Proposed Response
- 'A Second Runway for Gatwick' (Gatwick Airport Limited)

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected by the Member when making the Decision:

The alternative of not responding to the consultation was rejected on the basis that SDC would miss a valuable opportunity to comment on these proposals.

The alternative of supporting or not objecting to the proposal was considered but rejected on the basis that it would be inconsistent with SDC's previous position on Gatwick and the position of organisations like Edenbridge Town Council and the local MP.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications of the Council sending this response.

Legal Implications and Risk Assessment Statement

There are no legal implications of the Council sending this response.

Equality Impacts (Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty)

Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate	No	The decision to send the Council's response to this consultation would not have the potential to discriminate against different groups in the community or

When completed a copy of this record must be sent to the Democratic Services Section by e-mail and a signed copy by internal mail

(For Democratic Services use)

Decision Number: 01 (2014/15)

Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
against different groups in the community?		promote equality of opportunity.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		N/a

Local Member (s), other Portfolio Holders and/or Directors/Heads of Service Consulted

Richard Morris – Chief Planning Officer
Discussions also held with Cllr Orridge.

Details of any conflicts of interest
a) declared by any executive member who is consulted by the Decision Taker

b) and any details of dispensations granted by the Chief Executive in respect of any declared conflict

Decision taken by:	Portfolio Holder for Local Planning and Environment
Signed by Portfolio Holder	[redacted]
Date of Decision	19 May 2014
Record made by:	George Lewis
Date of record:	21 May 2014

When completed a copy of this record must be sent to the Democratic Services Section by e-mail and a signed copy by internal mail