



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE **PLANNING, HIGHWAYS & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE** HELD ON **WEDNESDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2019** AT 19:30PM IN THE **GIBSON SUITE** AT THE KINGS HILL COMMUNITY CENTRE

Present: Cllr A Board (Chair), Cllr C Bridger, Cllr R Cassidy,

Apologies: Cllr M Colman, Cllr D Hurring, Cllr A Petty

Also in attendance: Ms Georgina Jackson (Deputy Clerk)

**PHE18/376. To receive and accept Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Colman, Hurring and Petty with reasons for absence. It was **RESOLVED** that apologies be accepted.

**PHE18/377. To receive Declarations of Interest & Lobbying**

A Declaration of Interest was received from Cllr Board regarding Item PHE18/404 to PHE18/406 - Allotments. Cllr Board has an approved dispensation to discuss allotment items.

**PHE18/378. Minutes** – The minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019 were presented for approval and signature.

**PHE18/379. Chairman's Announcements** – to receive announcements.  
There were none.

**PHE18/380. Public Session (to allow members of the public present to raise issues on items on the agenda)**  
There were none

### Planning

**PHE18/381. Liberty Property Trust's Planning Applications – to consider applications and agree response.**

**PHE18/382.** The parish council have carefully considered the applications including the comments that have been made on the planning portal and the observations and representations made by the local residents who attended the Extraordinary General Meetings held on 23rd November 2018 and 13th February 2019.

**PHE18/383. TM/18/03030/OAEA – Development Site between 1 Tower View and 35 Kings Hill Avenue, Kings Hill**

Outline Application: redevelopment to provide up to 7 Class C3 residential units, together with landscaping, open space and other associated works. All matters reserved for future approval except for access (Site 5.1).

Kings Hill Parish Council object to this planning application for the following **Clerk**

reasons:-

- Concerns are maintained over the further loss of land allocated for employment. Whilst the marketing of this site is noted, this appears to be only of very large office spaces, even if the building is subdivided for more than one occupier. We are aware of the popularity of Churchill Square and the new building (Building 80) constructed in 2017 which we understand is fully let. This provides small suites for small and/or start up businesses for which there appears to be significant demand. With today's business practise typically requiring smaller office spaces on shorter leases for flexibility, we therefore question whether the marketing of such large units sufficiently demonstrates that there is no demand for commercial use of this land, or just no demand for the large units that were marketed.
- There are significant concerns over the additional traffic that this site together with the other applications cumulatively will generate where accessed through Kings Hill. Even as phase three now begins to be built out and these proposed new sites, there are of course still only two means of access and egress for the ever increasing number of residents. Whilst the A228 is dual carriageway between the main entrance/exit Tower View and either the A20 or M20 which is where the majority of traffic travels to and from, there are quite often significant difficulties in residents trying to leave Kings Hill in the mornings. The single carriageway A228 south towards Mereworth and Tonbridge and beyond is heavily used but often backs up. The traffic frequently blocks the exit out of Kings Hill, giving rise to prolonged traffic queues and all the cumulative wasted time as people seek to leave Kings Hill on a daily basis for employment off Kings Hill, or pursuit of leisure activities. We attach photos for the mornings of 12th September 2018, 18th October 2018, 19th December 2018 and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Such is the issue the Parish Council have for some time been seeking amelioration arrangements through contact with our county councillor and KCC highways. These issues currently exist and were highlighted to us by residents at our recent public meeting as well as being referred to in some of their objections; phase 3 is already expected to add to the problems and we raise concerns over any further development eventually leading to further gridlock.

Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 states "Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks would be severe".

It is felt, and the attached pictures show, that the cumulative impact of more houses will have a severe impact on the surrounding road network. The existing number of houses already creates gridlock. This is a material planning consideration that will create major highway issues due to increased traffic generation and vehicular access.

Kings Hill Parish Council and Mereworth Parish Council have employed a consultant to undertake a highway appraisal in respect of the local plan. The comments within the report are pertinent to this application in respect of any further housing numbers and their effect

on the road network (the full report is also attached).

- o The Local Plan's assessment fails to recognise that the width of A228 Malling Road in the vicinity of its junction with Kent Street is unable to cope with the existing traffic flows on the route and the additional traffic that will be generated by the proposals for additional housing will exacerbate congestion and poor highway safety.
  - o There is no feasible or realistic solution to widen or improve A228 Malling Road to accommodate the additional traffic that will be generated.
  - o The significant impact from the proposed developments in terms of capacity and congestion and highway safety cannot be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
  - o The proposals have therefore been prepared by a strategy that fails to meet the infrastructure requirements and cannot therefore satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement for soundness, as required by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. The NPPF states that "Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed", there appears to be minimal if any mitigation for transport.
- We note the proposal to provide further traffic lights to the Tower View/Ashton Road roundabout, however these are shown as being installed on the Tower View exit arm. Rather than assisting residents leaving Kings Hill, this is likely to further restrict egress. What is required instead is a means of leaving the exit clear so that exit off of Kings Hill is as unhindered as possible.
- Similar queuing occurs at the Tower View/Kings Hill Avenue roundabout in the mornings where the incoming business traffic has priority. There are often a number of cars queuing on the Tower View arm heading north to exit Kings Hill and on the exit arm of the new unnamed road through phase 3, similarly queueing to exit Kings Hill. Phase three has yet to be built out and occupied and hence this situation can only get worse, without calculating the additional effect of these latest proposals. The parish council feel there already a need for traffic light signalling to balance priorities and improve traffic flow in and out of Kings Hill.
- We note from the traffic assessment that it is deemed from data collection and software modelling that there will be minimal queueing as a result of this new application. This appears incongruous with residents current experience and we raise concerns that there appear to be little, if any proposals for mitigation. The parish council is aware that this roundabout is to be the subject of a traffic assessment review during the build out of phase three, but already raises concerns that this may conclude a similar result that no mitigation is required, despite residents existing concerns and issues.

- Residents have raised concerns regarding the fact that there is no pedestrian crossing on Kings Hill Avenue. If TMBC are minded to allow residential use then a suitable pedestrian crossing should be provided for safety of school pupils and pedestrians who need to access the school site and the centre of Kings Hill.
- One of the greatest concerns is the lack of accessibility of GP doctor appointments. Kings Hill parish council have been working with the West Malling Group Practise to try to improve accessibility and availability for residents, following concerns raised. The situation is already considered to be seriously oversubscribed; indeed the practise is no longer accepting direct applications for new patients. As stated above, this situation is already occurring, before the 635 homes from phase three are built and occupied. The documents highlight that there are only 10 FTE GP's for the 20,616 residents registered with West Malling Group Practice, although West Malling Group Practice have informed us that the current number is actually 6 FTE. It states Watringbury have 11 doctors for 7,716 people and 9 doctors at Thornhill Medical practise for 14,113 patients. Despite such limited provision already for the residents of Kings Hill, the documents suggest there will only be a moderate adverse impact on the medical service and make no clear offer of mitigation. The West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group have stated the mitigation required which the parish council wholeheartedly support, if TMBC are minded to grant consent. The parish council are keen to see the majority of this contribution being for the West Malling Group Practice to improve the current poor ratio and also allow residents from the new areas to register and therefore have a doctors surgery within walking distance.

Paragraph 8(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 refers to

*"to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support health, social and cultural well being"*

This application is not socially sustainable for the low number of doctors per resident as detailed above. This is before the number of houses proposed for the local plan and this application.

The parish council and residents alike are concerned over the impact on the local infrastructure. Kings Hill has been designed to be attractive to young families and has proved very successful and popular in this respect. However, although there is reference to pre school provision within the documents, the parish council is aware of the severe over subscription of pre-schools and the pre school attached to the community centre is full and has a waiting list of 95 for 2019. The parish council seeks a contribution be provided for pre school, if TMBC are minded to grant consent.

Although there is a large number of secondary schools within an hour's travel radius of Kings Hill most are oversubscribed and all require bus or private travel. The implication of this is increased

traffic movements and expensive travel costs. This is a deficiency in a social facility and a contribution should be made towards a new local secondary school which would allow for sustainable travel and to meet the future needs of ongoing developments.

- This site is accessed off a private commercial road which is closed at least once a year but could be more often. Even if only closed once a year (typically Christmas Day), this does leave residents unable to leave Kings Hill on a day when there is no public transport. The effect is that these residents need to forward plan and park their vehicle elsewhere, if they are not to be prevented from travelling on a typical family celebration day and national bank holiday. Due to the extent of private roads, not only would this mean residents having to park some impractical distance away from their home to safeguard their accessibility and freedom, the impact on other areas would be significant and displace other residents. The cumulative effect is likely to be significant harm to highway safety, which is the test in Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- There is reference within the submission that the emerging local plan should be disregarded on the basis it is not yet adopted. However, the creation and submission of the local plan has engaged with the local population who have been able to comment and provide their views with a view to shaping the plan for the future. Whilst the plan is now for review with the allocated planning inspectors, it is deemed to be a material planning consideration now as it is a proposal for how the future should be shaped; to pay no regard at this interim stage would be contrary to the intentions of the local plan.
- The parish council remains concerned that the applicant's advisers suggest expired consents for the previously consented business uses should be a material consideration. Kings Hill is significantly more developed than it was at the time such consents were granted and it is requested that the conditions of today afford greater weight than expired consents of the past.
- There are several references to sustainable transport and good links to public transport however this site is considerable walking distance from the railway station. Whilst there are some frequent bus services this does not typically apply off peak or evenings and weekends when there are considerably less or no services. The implication of this is that car ownership is virtually essential for residents of Kings Hill which gives rise to increased car travel and need for sufficient parking.
- The documents advise that parking provision in developments over the last ten years has typically been underprovided, which is clearly evident when looking at any of the areas of phase two at evenings and weekend when most of the roads are full of parked cars along one or both sides, including inconsiderate and often dangerous parking. However, the parking provision proposed in this application is based on providing at or just above the level of minimum parking required, based on the Kent Design Guide IGN3. This publication is dated 2006 and hence is the very document that has lead to

underprovision over the last ten years.

- The parish council has challenged the travel plan for phase 3 due to the stated low numbers of traffic movement and low threshold of improvement target. We are concerned this low bench mark is not applied to this current application.

**PHE18/384. TM/18/03032/OAEA – Heath Farm, Wateringbury Road, East Malling**  
Outline Application: Redevelopment to provide up to 40 Class C3 residential units, together with landscaping, open space and other associated works. All matters reserved for future approval except for access (Site 5.5).

Kings Hill Parish Council object to this planning application for the following reasons:-

**Clerk**

- The Heath Farm, Wateringbury Road site would be contrary to the prospective new local plan, as this site is within a proposed extension to the green belt. This is classed as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account.

There is reference within the submission that the emerging local plan should be disregarded on the basis it is not yet adopted. However, the creation and submission of the local plan has engaged with the local population who have been able to comment and provide their views with a view to shaping the plan for the future. Whilst the plan is now for review with the allocated planning inspectors, it is deemed to be a material planning consideration now as it is a proposal for how the future should be shaped; to pay no regard at this interim stage would be contrary to the intentions of the local plan.

- The Kent Design Guide states

“Developments should be permeable and linked to the surrounding network, allowing safe, direct routes for pedestrians and cyclists”.

With the access to this site being on the Wateringbury Road the surrounding road and path network to anywhere other than Kings Hill does not offer a safe route which is a specific requirement. There will be access via Kings Hill for bus services but this is not the quickest most direct route therefore this would force people back into their cars to a failing road network. If you arrive into Kings Hill from this site you are along way from the facilities in the centre.

- Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 states

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks would be severe”.

It is felt that access via Wateringbury Road would have a severe impact on the surrounding road network.

- Sustainable Transport. Paragraph 104 states that planning policies

should aim to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. Vehicle journeys will be used heavily at this site due to its location. Its only accessibility is by foot to the Kings Hill network. There appears to be no other general bus services at this site.

- The parish council has challenged the travel plan for phase 3 due to the stated low numbers of traffic movement and low threshold of improvement target. We are concerned this low bench mark is not applied to this current application.

**PHE18/385. TM/18/03031/OAEA – Development Site North of 51 Amber Lane, Kings Hill**

Outline Application: Redevelopment to provide up to 85 Class C3 residential units, together with landscaping, open space and other associated works. All matters reserved for future approval except for access (Site 5.4).

Kings Hill Parish Council object to this planning application for the following reasons:-

**Clerk**

- Strongly object on the means of access to this site. Amber lane already suffers from on street parking which already has stopped an emergency vehicle from accessing this road. The on street parking is clearly evident in the documents submitted and these appear to be a day time photograph when the parking issue is minimal. The residents of Kings Hill feel that that the means of access should not be from Kings Hill as there would be a severe impact on the road network and therefore this application should be refused.
- This area is currently used as open space for dog walking and other recreation. The proportion of green and open space is linked to self-reported levels of health and mental health. The loss of this land has the potential to impact on the surrounding residents well being.
- There are significant concerns over the additional traffic that this site together with the other applications cumulatively will generate where accessed through Kings Hill. Even as phase three now begins to be built out and these proposed new sites, there are of course still only two means of access and egress for the ever-increasing number of residents. Whilst the A228 is dual carriageway between the main entrance/exit Tower View and either the A20 or M20 which is where the majority of traffic travels to and from, there are quite often significant difficulties in residents trying to leave Kings Hill in the mornings. The single carriageway A228 south towards Mereworth and Tonbridge and beyond is heavily used but often backs up. The traffic frequently blocks the exit out of Kings Hill, giving rise to prolonged traffic queues and all the cumulative wasted time as people seek to leave Kings Hill on a daily basis for employment off Kings Hill, or pursuit of leisure activities. We attach photos for the mornings of 12th September 2018, 18th October 2018, 19th December 2018 and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Such is the issue the Parish Council have for some

time been seeking amelioration arrangements through contact with our county councillor and KCC highways. These issues currently exist and were highlighted to us by residents at our recent public meeting as well as being referred to in some of their objections; phase 3 is already expected to add to the problems and we raise concerns over any further development eventually leading to further gridlock.

Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 states

*“Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks would be severe”.*

It is felt, and the attached pictures show, that the cumulative impact of more houses will have a severe impact on the surrounding road network. The existing number of houses already creates gridlock. This is a material planning consideration that will create major highway issues due to increased traffic generation and vehicular access.

Kings Hill Parish Council and Mereworth Parish Council have employed a consultant to undertake a highway appraisal in respect of the local plan. The comments within the report are pertinent to this application in respect of any further housing numbers and their effect on the road network (the full report is also attached).

- o The Local Plan’s assessment fails to recognise that the width of A228 Malling Road in the vicinity of its junction with Kent Street is unable to cope with the existing traffic flows on the route and the additional traffic that will be generated by the proposals for additional housing will exacerbate congestion and poor highway safety.
  - o There is no feasible or realistic solution to widen or improve A228 Malling Road to accommodate the additional traffic that will be generated.
  - o The significant impact from the proposed developments in terms of capacity and congestion and highway safety cannot be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
  - o The proposals have therefore been prepared by a strategy that fails to meet the infrastructure requirements and cannot therefore satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement for soundness, as required by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. The NPPF states that “Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed”, there appears to be minimal if any mitigation for transport.
- We note the proposal to provide further traffic lights to the Tower View/Ashton Road roundabout, however these are shown as being installed on the Tower View exit arm. Rather than assisting residents leaving Kings Hill, this is likely to further restrict egress. What is required instead is a means of leaving the exit clear so that exit off of

Kings Hill is as unhindered as possible.

- Similar queuing occurs at the Tower View/Kings Hill Avenue roundabout in the mornings where the incoming business traffic has priority. There are often a number of cars queuing on the Tower View arm heading north to exit Kings Hill and on the exit arm of the new unnamed road through phase 3, similarly queueing to exit Kings Hill. Phase three has yet to be built out and occupied and hence this situation can only get worse, without calculating the additional effect of these latest proposals. The parish council feel there already a need for traffic light signalling to balance priorities and improve traffic flow in and out of Kings Hill.
- We note from the traffic assessment that it is deemed from data collection and software modelling that there will be minimal queueing as a result of this new application. This appears incongruous with residents current experience and we raise concerns that there appear to be little, if any proposals for mitigation. The parish council is aware that this roundabout is to be the subject of a traffic assessment review during the build out of phase three, but already raises concerns that this may conclude a similar result that no mitigation is required, despite residents existing concerns and issues.
- One of the greatest concerns is the lack of accessibility of GP doctor appointments. Kings Hill parish council have been working with the West Malling Group Practice to try to improve accessibility and availability for residents, following concerns raised. The situation is already considered to be seriously oversubscribed; indeed the practice is no longer accepting direct applications for new patients. As stated above, this situation is already occurring, before the 635 homes from phase three are built and occupied. The documents highlight that there are only 10 FTE GP's for the 20,616 residents registered with West Malling Group Practice, although West Malling Group Practice have informed us that the current number is actually 6 FTE. It states Wateringbury have 11 doctors for 7,716 people and 9 doctors at Thornhill Medical practice for 14,113 patients. Despite such limited provision already for the residents of Kings Hill, the documents suggest there will only be a moderate adverse impact on the medical service and make no clear offer of mitigation. The West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group have stated the mitigation required which the parish council wholeheartedly support, if TMBC are minded to grant consent. The parish council are keen to see the majority of this contribution being for the West Malling Group Practice to improve the current poor ratio and also allow residents from the new areas to register and therefore have a doctors surgery within walking distance.

Paragraph 8(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 refers to

*"to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring*

*that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support health, social and cultural well being"*

This application is not socially sustainable for the low number of doctors per resident as detailed above. This is before the number of houses proposed for the local plan and this application.

The parish council and residents alike are concerned over the impact on the local infrastructure. Kings Hill has been designed to be attractive to young families and has proved very successful and popular in this respect. However, although there is reference to preschool provision within the documents, the parish council is aware of the severe over subscription of pre-schools and the preschool attached to the community centre is full and has a waiting list of 95 for 2019. The parish council seeks a contribution be provided for preschool, if TMBC are minded to grant consent.

Although there is a large number of secondary schools within an hour's travel radius of Kings Hill most are oversubscribed and all require bus or private travel. The implication of this is increased traffic movements and expensive travel costs. This is a deficiency in a social facility and a contribution should be made towards a new local secondary school which would allow for sustainable travel and to meet the future needs of ongoing developments.

- There is reference within the submission that the emerging local plan should be disregarded on the basis it is not yet adopted. However, the creation and submission of the local plan has engaged with the local population who have been able to comment and provide their views with a view to shaping the plan for the future. Whilst the plan is now for review with the allocated planning inspectors, it is deemed to be a material planning consideration now as it is a proposal for how the future should be shaped; to pay no regard at this interim stage would be contrary to the intentions of the local plan. **This site is allocated as green belt in the proposed local plan.**
- The parish council remains concerned that the applicant's advisers suggest expired consents for the previously consented business uses should be a material consideration. Kings Hill is significantly more developed than it was at the time such consents were granted and it is requested that the conditions of today afford greater weight than expired consents of the past.
- The secondary means of access for emergency/fire fighting vehicles is noted. Kings Hill Parish Council raises significant concerns over the route through existing heavily congested roads to the proposed emergency access serving application site 5.4 and questions its viability. Furthermore, there is significant concern that this route is to pass through and, in its creation, inevitably destroy areas of ancient woodland which should be preserved in perpetuity for the benefit of

current and future generations.

- Residents fear that this application would have an adverse impact on nature conservation interests and biodiversity opportunities by being so close to ancient woodland. This is a material planning consideration and should be taken into account. Not only would you have loss of open land but there would be indirect violations such as lights and noise and habitats will suffer.
- There are a number of references to sustainable transport and good links to public transport. However, some of the sites are some considerable walking distance from the bus stop and the railway station is a considerable walk. Whilst there are some frequent bus services, this does not typically apply off peak or evenings and weekend when there are considerable less or no services. The implication of this is that car ownership is virtually essential for residents of Kings Hill, which gives rise to increased car travel and need for sufficient parking.

**PHE18/386. TM/18/03034/OAEA – Development Site North and East of Jubilee Way, Kings Hill**

Outline Application: Redevelopment to provide up to 210 Class C3 residential units, together with landscaping, open space and other associated works. All matters reserved for future approval except for access (Site 5.2 – 5.3).

Kings Hill Parish Council object to this planning application for the following reasons:-

**Clerk**

- Concerns are maintained over the further loss of land allocated for employment. Whilst the marketing of this site is noted, this appears to be only of very large office spaces, even if the building is subdivided for more than one occupier. We are aware of the popularity of Churchill Square and the new building (Building 80) constructed in 2017 which we understand is fully let. This provides small suites for small and/or start up businesses for which there appears to be significant demand. With today's business practise typically requiring smaller office spaces on shorter leases for flexibility, we therefore question whether the marketing of such large units sufficiently demonstrates that there is no demand for commercial use of this land, or just no demand for the large units that were marketed.
- There are significant concerns over the additional traffic that this site together with the other applications cumulatively will generate where accessed through Kings Hill. Even as phase three now begins to be built out and these proposed new sites, there are of course still only two means of access and egress for the ever increasing number of residents. Whilst the A228 is dual carriageway between the main entrance/exit Tower View and either the A20 or M20 which is where the majority of traffic travels to and from, there are quite often significant difficulties in residents trying to leave Kings Hill in the mornings. The single carriageway A228 south towards Mereworth and Tonbridge and beyond is heavily used but often backs up. The traffic frequently blocks the exit out of Kings Hill, giving rise to prolonged traffic queues and all the cumulative wasted time as people seek to

leave Kings Hill on a daily basis for employment off Kings Hill, or pursuit of leisure activities. We attach photos for the mornings of 12th September 2018, 18th October 2018, 19th December 2018 and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Such is the issue the Parish Council have for some time been seeking amelioration arrangements through contact with our county councillor and KCC highways. These issues currently exist and were highlighted to us by residents at our recent public meeting as well as being referred to in some of their objections; phase 3 is already expected to add to the problems and we raise concerns over any further development eventually leading to further gridlock.

Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 states

*“Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks would be severe”.*

It is felt, and the attached pictures show, that the cumulative impact of more houses will have a severe impact on the surrounding road network. The existing number of houses already creates gridlock. This is a material planning consideration that will create major highway issues due to increased traffic generation and vehicular access.

Kings Hill Parish Council and Mereworth Parish Council have employed a consultant to undertake a highway appraisal in respect of the local plan. The comments within the report are pertinent to this application in respect of any further housing numbers and their effect on the road network (the full report is also attached).

- o The Local Plan’s assessment fails to recognise that the width of A228 Malling Road in the vicinity of its junction with Kent Street is unable to cope with the existing traffic flows on the route and the additional traffic that will be generated by the proposals for additional housing will exacerbate congestion and poor highway safety.
- o There is no feasible or realistic solution to widen or improve A228 Malling Road to accommodate the additional traffic that will be generated.
- o The significant impact from the proposed developments in terms of capacity and congestion and highway safety cannot be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
- o The proposals have therefore been prepared by a strategy that fails to meet the infrastructure requirements and cannot therefore satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement for soundness, as required by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. The NPPF states that “Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed”, there appears to be minimal if any mitigation for transport.

- We note the proposal to provide further traffic lights to the Tower View/Ashton Road roundabout, however these are shown as being installed on the Tower View exit arm. Rather than assisting residents leaving Kings Hill, this is likely to further restrict egress. What is required instead is a means of leaving the exit clear so that exit off of Kings Hill is as unhindered as possible.
- Similar queuing occurs at the Tower View/Kings Hill Avenue roundabout in the mornings where the incoming business traffic has priority. There are often a number of cars queuing on the Tower View arm heading north to exit Kings Hill and on the exit arm of the new unnamed road through phase 3, similarly queueing to exit Kings Hill. Phase three has yet to be built out and occupied and hence this situation can only get worse, without calculating the additional effect of these latest proposals. The parish council feel there already a need for traffic light signalling to balance priorities and improve traffic flow in and out of Kings Hill.
- Due to sites 5.2. and 5.3 only having one means of access and egress via Jubilee Way onto Tower View all residents leaving their home need to head south on Tower View adding to the incoming business traffic and adding to the congestion of the Kings Hill Avenue/ Tower View roundabout. Access back into Jubilee Way from within Kings hill will either add to the congestion of the Ashton Way roundabout or cause potential tail backs on Tower View utilising the slip road which is of huge concern given that this is the main exit artery of Kings Hill.
- We note from the traffic assessment that it is deemed from data collection and software modelling that there will be minimal queueing as a result of this new application. This appears incongruous with residents current experience and we raise concerns that there appear to be little, if any proposals for mitigation. The parish council is aware that this roundabout is to be the subject of a traffic assessment review during the build out of phase three, but already raises concerns that this may conclude a similar result that no mitigation is required, despite residents existing concerns and issues.
- One of the greatest concerns is the lack of accessibility of GP doctor appointments. Kings Hill parish council have been working with the West Malling Group Practise to try to improve accessibility and availability for residents, following concerns raised. The situation is already considered to be seriously oversubscribed; indeed the practise is no longer accepting direct applications for new patients. As stated above, this situation is already occurring, before the 635 homes from phase three are built and occupied. The documents highlight that there are only 10 FTE GP's for the 20,616 residents registered with West Malling Group Practice, although West Malling Group Practice have informed us that the current number is actually 6 FTE. It states Watringbury have 11 doctors for 7,716 people and 9 doctors at Thornhill Medical practise for 14,113 patients. Despite such limited provision already for the residents of Kings Hill, the documents suggest there will only be a moderate adverse impact on the medical service and make no clear offer of mitigation. The West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group have stated the mitigation required which the parish council wholeheartedly support, if TMBC are minded to grant consent. The parish council are keen to see the

majority of this contribution being for the West Malling Group Practice to improve the current poor ratio and also allow residents from the new areas to register and therefore have a doctors surgery within walking distance.

Paragraph 8(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 refers to

*"to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support health, social and cultural well being"*

This application is not socially sustainable for the low number of doctors per resident as detailed above. This is before the number of houses proposed for the local plan and this application.

The parish council and residents alike are concerned over the impact on the local infrastructure. Kings Hill has been designed to be attractive to young families and has proved very successful and popular in this respect. However, although there is reference to preschool provision within the documents, the parish council is aware of the severe over subscription of pre-schools and the preschool attached to the community centre is full and has a waiting list of 95 for 2019. The parish council seeks a contribution be provided for preschool, if TMBC are minded to grant consent.

Although there is a large number of secondary schools within an hour's travel radius of Kings Hill most are oversubscribed and all require bus or private travel. The implication of this is increased traffic movements and expensive travel costs. This is a deficiency in a social facility and a contribution should be made towards a new local secondary school which would allow for sustainable travel and to meet the future needs of ongoing developments.

- This site is accessed off a private commercial road which is closed at least once a year but could be more often. Even if only closed once a year (typically Christmas Day), this does leave residents unable to leave Kings Hill on a day when there is no public transport. The effect is that these residents need to forward plan and park their vehicle elsewhere, if they are not to be prevented from travelling on a typical family celebration day and national bank holiday. Due to the extent of private roads, not only would this mean residents having to park some impractical distance away from their home to safeguard their accessibility and freedom, the impact on other areas would be significant and displace other residents. The cumulative effect is likely to be significant harm to highway safety, which is the test in Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- There is reference within the submission that the emerging local plan should be disregarded on the basis it is not yet adopted. However, the creation and submission of the local plan has engaged with the local population who have been able to comment and provide their

views with a view to shaping the plan for the future. Whilst the plan is now for review with the allocated planning inspectors, it is deemed to be a material planning consideration now as it is a proposal for how the future should be shaped; to pay no regard at this interim stage would be contrary to the intentions of the local plan.

- The parish council remains concerned that the applicant's advisers suggest expired consents for the previously consented business uses should be a material consideration. Kings Hill is significantly more developed than it was at the time such consents were granted and it is requested that the conditions of today afford greater weight than expired consents of the past.
- The Parish Council notes, and questions, why there is no secondary emergency access proposed for site 5.2. Although adjacent to site 5.3, the two sites do not appear linked and hence site 5.2 appears to be a significant risk. Due to the shape of the site, the far reaches of the site are some distance from the site entrance; the parish council are concerned over the safety of those residents who would occupy this site and the impact any serious incident in this location would have on the nearby busy dual carriageway of the A228, the major access and egress to Kings Hill.
- We understand that a new access is to be provided off the A228 in proximity to the junction with the railway station, to serve the proposed Broadwater Farm development. The Parish Council are concerned that the residents of Broadwater Farm development will want or need to use facilities at Kings Hill and vice versa. We are expecting to see a road link between these two developments to avoid adding to the traffic on the A228 itself and the issues of further clogging up the main Tower View entrance/exit. However, there appears to be no provision for this.
- The parish council has challenged the travel plan for phase 3 due to the stated low numbers of traffic movement and low threshold of improvement target. We are concerned this low bench mark is not applied to this current application.

**PHE18/387. TM/18/03033/OAEA – Development Site between 23 Kings Hill Avenue and 8 Abbey Wood Road, Kings Hill**

Outline Application: Redevelopment to provide up to 70 Class C3 residential units, together with landscaping, open space and other associated works. All matters reserved for future approval except for access (Site 5.6)

Kings Hill Parish Council object to this planning application for the following reasons:-

**Clerk**

- Concerns are maintained over the further loss of land allocated for employment. Whilst the marketing of this site is noted, this appears to be only of very large office spaces, even if the building is subdivided for more than one occupier. We are aware of the popularity of Churchill Square and the new building (Building 80) constructed in 2017 which we understand is fully let. This provides

small suites for small and/or start up businesses for which there appears to be significant demand. With today's business practise typically requiring smaller office spaces on shorter leases for flexibility, we therefore question whether the marketing of such large units sufficiently demonstrates that there is no demand for commercial use of this land, or just no demand for the large units that were marketed.

- There are significant concerns over the additional traffic that this site together with the other applications cumulatively will generate where accessed through Kings Hill. Even as phase three now begins to be built out and these proposed new sites, there are of course still only two means of access and egress for the ever increasing number of residents. Whilst the A228 is dual carriageway between the main entrance/exit Tower View and either the A20 or M20 which is where the majority of traffic travels to and from, there are quite often significant difficulties in residents trying to leave Kings Hill in the mornings. The single carriageway A228 south towards Mereworth and Tonbridge and beyond is heavily used but often backs up. The traffic frequently blocks the exit out of Kings Hill, giving rise to prolonged traffic queues and all the cumulative wasted time as people seek to leave Kings Hill on a daily basis for employment off Kings Hill, or pursuit of leisure activities. We attach photos for the mornings of 12th September 2018, 18th October 2018, 19th December 2018 and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Such is the issue the Parish Council have for some time been seeking amelioration arrangements through contact with our county councillor and KCC highways. These issues currently exist and were highlighted to us by residents at our recent public meeting as well as being referred to in some of their objections; phase 3 is already expected to add to the problems and we raise concerns over any further development eventually leading to further gridlock.

Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 states

"Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks would be severe".

It is felt, and the attached pictures show, that the cumulative impact of more houses will have a severe impact on the surrounding road network. The existing number of houses already creates gridlock. This is a material planning consideration that will create major highway issues due to increased traffic generation and vehicular access.

Kings Hill Parish Council and Mereworth Parish Council have employed a consultant to undertake a highway appraisal in respect of the local plan. The comments within the report are pertinent to this application in respect of any further housing numbers and their effect on the road network (the full report is also attached).

- o The Local Plan's assessment fails to recognise that the width of A228 Malling Road in the vicinity of its junction with Kent Street is unable to cope with the existing traffic flows on the route and the additional traffic that will be generated by the proposals for additional

housing will exacerbate congestion and poor highway safety.

- o There is no feasible or realistic solution to widen or improve A228 Malling Road to accommodate the additional traffic that will be generated.
  - o The significant impact from the proposed developments in terms of capacity and congestion and highway safety cannot be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
  - o The proposals have therefore been prepared by a strategy that fails to meet the infrastructure requirements and cannot therefore satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement for soundness, as required by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. The NPPF states that "Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed", there appears to be minimal if any mitigation for transport.
- We note the proposal to provide further traffic lights to the Tower View/Ashton Road roundabout, however these are shown as being installed on the Tower View exit arm. Rather than assisting residents leaving Kings Hill, this is likely to further restrict egress. What is required instead is a means of leaving the exit clear so that exit off of Kings Hill is as unhindered as possible.
  - Similar queuing occurs at the Tower View/Kings Hill Avenue roundabout in the mornings where the incoming business traffic has priority. There are often a number of cars queuing on the Tower View arm heading north to exit Kings Hill and on the exit arm of the new unnamed road through phase 3, similarly queueing to exit Kings Hill. Phase three has yet to be built out and occupied and hence this situation can only get worse, without calculating the additional effect of these latest proposals. The parish council feel there already a need for traffic light signalling to balance priorities and improve traffic flow in and out of Kings Hill.
  - We note from the traffic assessment that it is deemed from data collection and software modelling that there will be minimal queueing as a result of this new application. This appears incongruous with residents current experience and we raise concerns that there appear to be little, if any proposals for mitigation. The parish council is aware that this roundabout is to be the subject of a traffic assessment review during the build out of phase three, but already raises concerns that this may conclude a similar result that no mitigation is required, despite residents existing concerns and issues.
  - One of the greatest concerns is the lack of accessibility of GP doctor appointments. Kings Hill parish council have been working with the West Malling Group Practise to try to improve accessibility and availability for residents, following concerns raised. The situation is already considered to be seriously oversubscribed; indeed the practise is no longer accepting direct applications for new patients. As stated above, this situation is already occurring, before the 635

homes from phase three are built and occupied. The documents highlight that there are only 10 FTE GP's for the 20,616 residents registered with West Malling Group Practice, although West Malling Group Practice have informed us that the current number is actually 6 FTE. It states Watringbury have 11 doctors for 7,716 people and 9 doctors at Thornhill Medical practise for 14,113 patients. Despite such limited provision already for the residents of Kings Hill, the documents suggest there will only be a moderate adverse impact on the medical service and make no clear offer of mitigation. The West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group have stated the mitigation required which the parish council wholeheartedly support, if TMBC are minded to grant consent. The parish council are keen to see the majority of this contribution being for the West Malling Group Practice to improve the current poor ratio and also allow residents from the new areas to register and therefore have a doctors surgery within walking distance.

Paragraph 8(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 refers to

*"to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support health, social and cultural well being"*

This application is not socially sustainable for the low number of doctors per resident as detailed above. This is before the number of houses proposed for the local plan and this application.

The parish council and residents alike are concerned over the impact on the local infrastructure. Kings Hill has been designed to be attractive to young families and has proved very successful and popular in this respect. However, although there is reference to pre school provision within the documents, the parish council is aware of the severe over subscription of pre-schools and the pre school attached to the community centre is full and has a waiting list of 95 for 2019. The parish council seeks a contribution be provided for pre school, if TMBC are minded to grant consent.

Although there is a large number of secondary schools within an hour's travel radius of Kings Hill most are oversubscribed and all require bus or private travel. The implication of this is increased traffic movements and expensive travel costs. This is a deficiency in a social facility and a contribution should be made towards a new local secondary school which would allow for sustainable travel and to meet the future needs of ongoing developments.

- There is reference within the submission that the emerging local plan should be disregarded on the basis it is not yet adopted. However, the creation and submission of the local plan has engaged with the local population who have been able to comment and provide their views with a view to shaping the plan for the future. Whilst the plan is now for review with the allocated planning inspectors, it is deemed to be a material planning consideration now as it is a proposal for

how the future should be shaped; to pay no regard at this interim stage would be contrary to the intentions of the local plan.

- The parish council remains concerned that the applicant's advisers suggest expired consents for the previously consented business uses should be a material consideration. Kings Hill is significantly more developed than it was at the time such consents were granted and it is requested that the conditions of today afford greater weight than expired consents of the past.
- Residents have raised concerns regarding the fact that there is no pedestrian crossing on Kings Hill Avenue and now this is proposed land for residential residents will need to cross this road to reach the schools on Kings Hill. Kings Hill Parish Council strongly lobby for a pedestrian crossing on Kings Hill Avenue if the land is being used for residential use.
- Residents have raised concerns regarding infilling ruining the character of Kings Hill. The material planning considerations of layout and density apply in this case as it is not in character with the surrounding area.
- The means of access and particularly egress is going to add to the congestion of the single carriageway A228 heading towards Mereworth for which we have already demonstrated regular congestion including the Ashton Way roundabout. We are in total support of Kent County Council's comments with regard to the unsuitability of the access and egress arrangements of this site.
- The parish council has challenged the travel plan for phase 3 due to the stated low numbers of traffic movement and low threshold of improvement target. We are concerned this low bench mark is not applied to this current application.

*Cllr Bridger left the meeting at 21.31 and re-entered at 21.33*

**Planning Applications – to consider applications and agree responses**

**PHE18/388. TM/19/00183/PDV14J – 30 Kings Hill Avenue**

Installation of 608 Solar PV Modules mounted to the metal pitched roof areas on the easterly and westerly elevations.

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/389. TM/19/00007/FL – 3 Sunrise Way, Kings Hill**

Convert garage into a playroom

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council cannot support a family home left with just one off-road parking space particularly bearing in mind the known congestion in this area. **Clerk**

**PHE18/390. TM/19/00151/FL – 92 Lapins Lane, Kings Hill**

Addition of a porch to the front elevation

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/391. TM/19/00185/FL – 12 Blenheim Road, Kings Hill**

Construction of a two storey side extension

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/392. TM/19/00258/FL – 3 Garden Way, Kings Hill**

Retrospective: Single storey rear extension, installation of ground floor WC and new window to side elevation

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/393. TM/19/00314/FL – 34 Mitchell Road, Kings Hill**

First floor rear extension and new concertina doors to rear elevation

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/394. TM/19/00393/TPOC – 14A Meteor Road, Kings Hill**

Lime Tree on boundary of 16 Meteor Road – fell and replace with Ash Tree

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/395. To consider planning applications received after agenda has been submitted.**

**PHE18/396. TM/19/000279/FL – 6 Alfa Close, Kings Hill**

Change of use of amenity land to private garden and repositioning of existing 6ft high timber fence.

It was **RESOLVED** that Kings Hill Parish Council has No Objections to this **Clerk** planning application.

**PHE18/397. To discuss an email and letter regarding the Highways Technical Appraisal.**

It was **RESOLVED** to write to the Programme Officer to request to be included in any further discussions as Kings Hill Parish Council have an interest and would like to be consulted. **Clerk**

**To report Planning decisions:**

**PHE18/398. TM/18/02820/FL – 37 Porter Avenue, Kings Hill – Proposed two storey extensions.**

**Approved.**

Kings Hill Parish Council had no objections.

**PHE18/399. TM/18/02256/FL – 42 Braeburn Way, Kings Hill – Demolition of existing garden/boundary wall and construction of new wall.**

**Approved.**

Kings Hill Parish Council had no objections but raised concerns regarding health & safety and visibility.

**PHE18/400. TM/01609/RM – Areas 10, 11 and 15 Kings Hill Phase 3 – Reserved Matters Application (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for Areas 10, 11 and 15 for the erection of 166 dwellings (including 112 affordable housing units) with associated parking, access, open space and landscaping pursuant to Condition 1 and details pursuant to Conditions 12 (highways), 19 (parking), 20 (levels), 23 (landscape strategy), 24 (landscaping scheme – partial discharge), 37 (foul drainage) and 38 (surface**

water drainage) of Outline Planning Permission **TM/13/01535/OAEA** (Residential development for 635 dwellings and associated community facilities).

**Approved.**

Kings Hill Parish Council object on the following issues:

- Inadequate overall parking; although it is reported as meeting or just exceeding the requirements set out in the parking standards, KHPC is aware of the ongoing issue of parking throughout Kings Hill. Where inadequate provision is made, the result is excessive and obstructive parking on roads, causing highway issues. Other recent developments such as Areas 1 & Areas 63 have made greater provision above the minimum standard than is offered up in this application.
- Issues of overspill parking; a large proportion of the units proposed are one or two bedroom and hence only one parking space provided to meet the minimum parking standard. From experience most Kings Hill households have more than one car due to limited alternative transport options – these cars need to park somewhere and will end up over spilling to adjacent areas including the more major circulation/distributor roads.
- Tandem parking; the parking standards state that where more than one space is provided they should be independently accessible as “Tandem parking arrangements are often under-utilised. Given the proposed parking is only just above the minimum required, concerns are raised that a number are proposed in tandem agreement.
- Courtyard parking; a significant number of allocated spaces are proposed in these arrangements. The police have raised concerns over surveillance of these areas and from the experience they are under-utilised.
- Shared surfaces; the proposals are for no pavement areas; instead the proposals are typically for a shared surface of generally 4.8m width or less. Safety concerns have been raised elsewhere in Kings Hill where these shared surfaces have been provided. The situation is exacerbated in these proposals by long single access point cul de sacs and the homes being built close to the back edge of the shared surface. Whilst the swept plan demonstrates sufficient width for emergency vehicles and refuse carts, removal/delivery vehicles can be longer. The swept plan assumes there will be no vehicles parked in the road which from experience is unlikely; just one parked car can cause an issue and with no additional separate pavement space, there is limited alternative manoeuvring space.
- On street parking undersized; table B8 of the vehicle parking standards states the size for parallel on street parking is 6m by 2.5m; the proposal offers spaces only 2m wide. With the average car being 1.8m wide excluding mirrors and the need for some clearance and manoeuvring, it is likely that the parked cars will encroach onto part of the shared surface carriageway, which is designed at the minimum 4.8m width or less. Concern is raised that this exacerbates the issue of vehicular and safe pedestrian access for residents and commercial/emergency vehicles
- There appears to be no provision for any DDA/accessible spaces or

future proofing for charging of electrical vehicles, which may prove difficult to install retrospectively with such a high proportion of off plot parking.

- Density and over intensification; it is noted that this area was designated for higher density. However, the number of homes proposed on the parcels of land within phase 3 where planning consent has already been granted together with this application account for a greater percentage of the total 635 homes than the percentage of land used. As the outline planning consent for phase 3 is for a maximum of 635 homes, this allows for density of this application to be reduced which will enable greater provision for additional parking, roadways and footpaths.
- The gardens in many instances are very small with very modest front garden area. Although provision has been made for refuse and recycling storage; the allowance for only two bins and one box will be insufficient from next year when TMBC introduce their new refuse and recycling scheme with a greater number of receptacles – there is concern as to where these will be stored; potentially to the front of homes or in landscaped areas, etc.
- Kings Hill Parish Council highlights concerns that a greater proportion of the homes should be affordable ownership or rent in lieu of social rent.

**PHE18/401. TM/18/03022/FL** – 23 Tiffen Way, Kings Hill – Proposed loft conversion with dormer window to the rear elevation and 3 No Rooflights to front elevation to facilitate a loft conversion.

**Approved.**

Kings Hill Parish Council had no objections.

**PHE18/402. TM/18/03013/FL** – 24 Garden Way, Kings Hill – Single storey rear extension.

**Approved.**

Kings Hill Parish Council had no objections.

**PHE18/403. TM/18/03028/FL** – 20 Woodford Grove, Kings Hill – Proposed ground floor extension to the rear of existing house.

**Approved.**

Kings Hill Parish Council had no objections.

## **Environment**

**To discuss issues and exceptions on open spaces, allotments and playgrounds.**

**PHE18/404.** To receive update on the allotment site.

An update was received and it was noted that there is currently 6 people on the waiting list.

**PHE18/405.** To report that the deputy clerk is investigating grant funding for the purchase and installation of a communal shed.

It was reported that Cllr Balfour has been approached regarding a member's fund application. An application form has been completed.

**PHE18/406.** To note that a procedure, training policy and risk assessment for the parish council mower are being worked on and will be brought to the next Planning, Highways & Environment Committee.

This was **noted**.

- PHE18/407.** To report that the works to the Anson Avenue Play Area will be undertaken in April 2019  
This was **noted**. It was also **RESOLVED** to write to the Lords Walk Residents Association to explain that it is the intention to review the Anson Avenue Play Area again in the future.
- PHE18/408.** It was **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Order 3(v) and continue the meeting for a further 15 minutes.
- PHE18/409. To discuss joining the Great British Spring Clean and agree actions.** It was **RESOLVED** to defer this item to the next Full Council Meeting to be held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019. **Full Council**
- PHE18/410. To discuss the response from Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council in relation to the travel plan for phase 3 and agree actions.** It was **RESOLVED** to defer this item to the next Planning, Highways & Environment Committee Meeting to be held on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019. **PHE**
- PHE18/411. To report investigations regarding funding options for the "keep clear" signage on the Tower View/ Ashton Way roundabout.** It was reported that funding was agreed and then withdrawn by Kent County Council due to the planning obligation that has to be undertaken by the developer in relation to this roundabout. It was **RESOLVED** to arrange a meeting with the Kent County Council Highway Engineer in April. **Clerk**
- PHE18/412. To report that there have been no further volunteers for the Speedwatch campaign as a result of the recent recruitment drive.** This was **noted**.
- PHE18/413. To receive Parish Portal Fault Report.** This was **noted**.
- PHE18/414. To discuss email from a resident regarding crossing issues on Kings Hill and agree actions.** The email was discussed and a response was **AGREED**. **Clerk**
- PHE18/415. To discuss the Newquay Town Council National Parking Enforcement Survey and agree actions.** It was **RESOLVED** that Cllr Bridger would complete the questionnaire.
- PHE18/416. To report external meetings with representatives of the Planning, Highways & Environment Committee**  
22/01/2019 – Mereworth Parish Council meeting. Cllrs Barker and Colman attended.
- PHE18/417.** 20/01/2019 – Buses for Tonbridge Schools Meeting. Cllr Barker attended.
- PHE18/418.** 03/03/2019 – Buses for Tonbridge School Meeting. Cllr Barker attended.
- PHE18/419.** 05/03/2019 – JPCTCG Meeting. Cllr Barker attended.
- PHE18/420. To report Correspondence and matters for information**  
09/01/2019 – Email from resident regarding traffic on Kings Hill.
- PHE18/421.** 10/01/2019 – Email from TMBC regarding Minutes for Joint Transportation Board, Monday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018
- PHE18/422.** 11/01/2019 – Email from KCC regarding Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30; Mineral Sites Plan and Early Partial Review.

- PHE18/423.** 11/01/2019 – Minutes for Joint Transportation Board, Monday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018.
- PHE18/424.** 21/01/2019 – Weekly lists of planning enforcement cases 19/03
- PHE18/425.** 21/01/2019 – List B 19/03
- PHE18/426.** 28/01/2019 – Weekly lists of planning enforcement cases 19/04
- PHE18/427.** 28/01/2019 – List B 19/04
- PHE18/428.** 07/02/2019 – Email from Ryarsh Protection Group regarding Resident Update – KCC Mineral Sites Plan Consultation.
- PHE18/429.** 11/02/2019 – Weekly Lists of planning enforcement cases 19/06
- PHE18/430.** 11/02/2019 – List B 19/06
- PHE18/431.** 18/02/2019 – List B 19/07
- PHE18/432.** 19/02/2019 – Agenda for Area 2 Planning Committee, Wednesday. 27<sup>th</sup> February 2019 7.30PM
- PHE18/433.** 20/02/2019 – Weekly Lists of planning enforcement cases 19/07
- PHE18/434.** 20/02/2019 – Email from Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council regarding Local Plan submission.
- PHE18/435.** 25/02/2019 – Email from SGN regarding Consultation Meeting for SGN Closure in Summer 2019 – Follow up
- PHE18/436.** 25/02/2019 – Weekly lists of planning enforcement cases 19/08
- PHE18/437.** **Date of Next meeting** – 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019
- PHE18/438.** **Questions from Committee Members and future agenda items. There were none.**

The meeting was closed at 22.18 pm

Signed.....

Date.....