



Edenbridge Town Council

Town Clerk: Christine Lane CertHE Local Policy



To: Cllrs J Barnett, R Bell, T Bryant, Mrs J Davison, R Davison (Vice Chairman), A Layland, M McArthur, S McGregor (Chairman), B Orridge, M Robson, J Scholey, B Todd

A meeting of the PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE will be held in Rickards Hall at 7.30pm on Monday 20 March 2017

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS OR PREDETERMINATION**, including interests not already registered

Members of the District Council wish to state that although they will be considering planning applications at this meeting they would be reconsidering them at the district level, taking into account all relevant evidence and representations there.
3. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**
The members of the Council will receive questions and statements from the public (this is the only opportunity for members of the public to make a contribution during the meeting) and from members with interests on items in the Agenda. Both members and public are limited to 3 minutes per person to speak.
4. **TO RECEIVE AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE HELD ON Monday 27 February 2017**
5. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE, FOR REPORT ONLY**
6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**
7. **SDC PLANNING DECISIONS**
8. **PLANNING BUSINESS**
9. **TRANSPORT BUSINESS**
 - 9.1 **Road issues**
 - 9.2 **Rail issues**
 - 9.2.1 **London and South Coast Rail Corridor Study**
 - 9.2.2 **9th Kent County Council Rail Summit**
 - 9.2.3 **Update from Cllr M Robson**
 - 9.3 **Aviation issues**
 - 9.3.1 **Update from Cllr C Pearman**
 - 9.3.2 **Consultation on design and use of Airspace**
 - 9.3.3 **Gatwick Obviously Not**
 - 9.4 **Highways report**
10. **PRESS RELEASE**

Council offices: Doggetts Barn, 72A High Street, Edenbridge, Kent TN8 5AR

Office hours: Monday – Friday 9.00am – 5.00pm **Tel:** (01732) 865368 **Fax:** (01732) 866749

Email: townclerk@edenbridgetowncouncil.gov.uk **Web:** www.edenbridgetowncouncil.gov.uk

5. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE, FOR REPORT ONLY** – none

6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**

The planning applications to be considered are listed below. Paper copies are available to view at Doggetts Barn or they can be accessed electronically via the District Council website on the following link <http://pa.sevenoaks.gov.uk/online-applications>

Workshop roof alteration and cladding. **Crown Oak Buildings Gabriels Farm Marsh Green Road Marsh Green Edenbridge KENT TN8 5PP** Ref. No: 17/00566/FUL

7. **SDC PLANNING DECISIONS**

Conversion of loft into a habitable space, including the addition of dormers to the front and rear. **1 South View Cottage Hilders Lane Edenbridge Kent TN8 6JX** Ref. No: 16/03452/HOUSE
Granted

Conversion of agricultural barn to single dwelling, the laying out of a private garden area, formation of driveway and 2 parking spaces, landscaping. **New Barns Farm Marsh Green Road Marsh Green Edenbridge KENT TN8 5QU** Ref. No: 16/03348/FUL
Granted

Erection of a single storey side extension. Removal of shed and car port. Internal alterations and alterations to fenestration. **4 Sandstone Cottages Marsh Green Road Marsh Green Edenbridge KENT TN8 5PX** Ref. No: 17/00028/HOUSE
Granted

Confirmation that works have lawfully commenced on approved application SE/07/03609/FUL. **Beechwood Four Elms Road Edenbridge Kent TN8 6AB** Ref. No: 17/00040/LDCEX
Granted

Details pursuant to condition 7 (sustainable homes) of planning permission SE/14/01027/FUL **19A Springfield Road Edenbridge Kent TN8 5HQ** Ref. No: 16/03930/DETAIL
Granted

Details pursuant to condition 4 (Code for Sustainable Homes) of SE/14/01462/FUL. **Totties Mill Hill Edenbridge KENT TN8 5DB** Ref. No: 17/00455/DETAIL
Granted

Works to 1 Pine tree. **1 Manor House Gardens Edenbridge Kent TN8 5EG** Ref. No: 7/00420/WTPO
Granted

Details pursuant in part to condition 17 (parking for site personnel, operatives and visitors) of planning permission SE/13/00134/FUL. **Land At Station Road & Fircroft Way Edenbridge TN8 6HQ** Ref. No: 17/00441/DETAIL
Granted

Details pursuant in part to condition 16 (construction vehicle loading, unloading, parking and turning) of planning permission SE/13/00134/FUL. **Land At Station Road & Fircroft Way Edenbridge TN8 6HQ** Ref. No: 17/00399/DETAIL
Granted

Details pursuant in part to condition 18 (guard against the deposit of mud, stones and similar substances) of planning permission SE/13/00134/FUL. **Land At Station Road & Fircroft Way Edenbridge TN8 6HQ** Ref. No: 17/00442/DETAIL
Granted

Variation of conditions 2,3,12,13,14,16,17 & 21 (pre-commencement conditions) of application SE/13/00134/FUL (Demolition of existing buildings and erection of food store, along with car parking, recycling centre, servicing arrangements, junction improvements, access and landscaping. Erection of petrol filling station.) to defer submission of certain matters until after demolition has occurred. **Land At Station Road & Fircroft Way Edenbridge TN8 6HQ Ref. No: 16/03986/CONVAR**
Draft Decision Only Issued

8. PLANNING BUSINESS – none

9. TRANSPORT BUSINESS

9.1 Road issues – none

9.2 Rail issues

9.2.1 London and South Coast Rail Corridor Study

The government has published the London and South Coast Rail Corridor Study, which can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/london-and-south-coast-rail-corridor-study> - it touches on several proposals for reinstating a rail link between Lewes and Uckfield.

The government has also published a letter from the Rail Minister to Louise Ellman MP, Chair of the Transport Select Committee, which sets out the government's response to the study and can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/london-and-south-coast-rail-corridor-study-government-response>

9.2.2 9th Kent County Council Rail Summit

An invitation to the 9th Kent County Council Rail Summit, being held on Monday 15 May 2017 at County Hall Maidstone, is attached. Please email sam.thomas@kent.gov.uk by Friday 7 April to confirm your attendance.

Do any members wish to attend?

9.2.3 Tonbridge – Redhill/Reigate Steering Group Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the meeting held on 31 January 2017 are attached.

9.2.4 Update from Cllr M Robson – none

9.3 Aviation issues

9.3.1 Update from Cllr C Pearman – a verbal update at the meeting

9.3.2 Consultation on design and use of Airspace

An email from the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign has been received regarding the Department for Transport consultation on Airspace – that is flight paths and aircraft noise – at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/reforming-policy-on-the-design-and-use-of-uk-airspace> Responses have to be submitted by 25 May, and a copy of the GACC draft response is attached. They would be grateful for any comments by Friday 17 March – although this date is before the meeting, they could be sent immediately after.

Are there any comments members wish to make?

9.3.3 Gatwick Obviously Not

An email has been received from the Chairman of Gatwick Obviously Not regarding the Night Flight Consultation and Fair and Equitable Dispersal 'FED'. He says that in their last newsletter they offered a specially-built stand-alone website 'no fly-by-night.com' as a conduit for responses to the DfT's consultation, and have been copied in to 657 responses. In addition, according to him, nothing has infuriated people more than the lack of effective FED over the arrivals swathe since the join-point to the final approach was duly widened last August.

9.4 Highways report – hard copy available with the plans

10. PRESS RELEASE

Are there any items on the agenda for which members would like to issue a press release?

9th Rail Summit – Invitation

Kent County Council

is pleased to invite you to the

9th Rail Summit

on Monday 15 May 2017

at 1800 in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Maidstone, ME14 1XQ

Light refreshments from 1730

Meeting concludes by 1930

This year we are pleased to welcome:

- David Statham from Southeastern – recent developments and plans for the current franchise
- Alex Hellier from Network Rail – options from the Kent Route Study for Control Period 6
- Andrew Brittain from the Department for Transport – plans for the new South Eastern franchise specification

Could you please respond to sam.thomas@kent.gov.uk

by Friday 7 April to confirm your attendance - thank you

Matthew Balfour
Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Kent County Council





Tonbridge – Redhill/Reigate Steering Group Meeting Minutes

31.January 2017

Edenbridge Town Council Offices

Present:

Geoff Brown – EDRTA	Helena Windsor – Surrey CC
John Reynolds – Tonbridge Rail Users	Kate Richards - Southern
Stephen Gasche – Kent CC	Bevan Hubery – Godstone PC
Tim Sparrow – Sussex CRP	Christine Lane – Edenbridge TC
Tim Barkley – Sussex CRP	Vera Lamont – Mayer Brown
John Phillips – Sussex CRP	Greg Fallon – Sussex CRP
Sharon Gray – Sussex CRP	

Apologies: Robin Grant

Previous Minutes: Agreed

Officers Report: Sharon reported on the past year's action plan and the new plan for 2017/18. A new art project for Tonbridge station. The latest station partnerships to be agreed are with County Care adopting four stations including Reigate.

Matters Arising:

Helena: Had received a tweet regarding access problems at Godstone, with a passenger being told to go to Redhill and then return. There is the same issue at Lingfield. There is a need to address access problems.

Bevan: sometimes there is nowhere to change to make a return.

Kate: Southern can provide assistance with a taxi which needs to be booked 48hrs in advance. Kate has installed notices requiring people to use the emergency button.

John P: Upper Wallingham has an increased number of passengers.

Greg: Cost of works should be covered by access for all funds.

Tim Barkley: To renew the existing line guides for 2018, support will be needed from partners.

Partners Update:

Tim S: ACoRP's funding and staffing have been increased, there is a new officer for south east – Paul Webster. Most CR's are very small with three bigger groups including SCRIP. The DfT is using SCRIP as an example of good practice. We need more County Council input. Our biggest partners are Gatwick Airport Ltd and B & H Buses.

Greg Fallon: Nothing to report

Tim B: Kirsten Firth has replaced Sam and a new Arun Valley Officer is being recruited, plus a new director Greg Fallon. Action plans should be ready to be approved by end of February.

Stephen Gasche: Is fighting for the existing funding to continue. Regarding the timetable consultation, the Sunday service should continue to Victoria not London Bridge, also highlighted is the need for Kent to Gatwick route. Currently working with Southeastern's franchise team and is highlighting the need for a Gatwick service. KCC has had a change of policy by supporting the transfer of Metro services and wishes to work with TFL. The 9th Kent Rail summit will be held on 15th May, 6pm at County Hall.

Tim S: Tim S: We are grateful for the input from KCC for the 2017/18 year. SCRP has also been included in the ESCC award by DfT in the current follow up of LSTF

John P: Can we get a decision on funding by the next meeting?

Helena: Residents are suffering due to Southern's problems. She is happy to fund a Parish Council notice board for the station.

Bevan: Maybe a community board would be better for provision of information to be funded by the Parish Council.

Update from Southern:

Kate: We are starting to see the benefit of longer trains and platforms on the Uckfield line which is back to a full timetable. The introduction of driver only trains has started the on board supervisors will wear the same uniforms as guards. OB's are still in control of on board safety and passenger assistance. Will still sell the full fare tickets on board.

Geoff: Are you still using Southeastern staff? No. Will they be able to sell full range of tickets?

Stephen: Only full fare tickets if all other facilities are working.

All ticket machines are to be replaced including the Tonbridge line.

Christine Lane: SCRP have raised the profile and look of stations. Graffiti clearing on Network Rail property is a problem as they will only look at a problem when they wish to.

John Coleman: A through service to Gatwick is needed. There is currently no service to the coast from Redhill. Increased stops for Eurostar at Ashford for travel to Gatwick is needed.

Geoff: Timetable consultation – priority is for the London service. It is impossible to reconcile all connections. Have passengers been advised on new door operating system?

Bevan: Has the dispute finished? It will be good to get the Redhill to Brighton service reinstated.

Vera Lamont: Is currently working on 22 Southern stations the majority of which have existing travel plans. Station audits/facilities have been completed. Buses from outlying areas to connect with trains are needed. The next stage is to gather information from stakeholders, they need to be completed by March.

Tim S: SCRP is the point of access for information gathering. Disappointed 2010 travel plans came to nothing as they did not suggest how to implement changes which was a big mistake.

AOB: None

Date of next meeting:

11 April at Edenbridge Town Council offices

Campaign Office

01293 863 369

Stan Hill

www.gacc.org.uk

Charlwood

gacc@btconnect.com

Surrey RH6 OEP

DATE

DRAFT February 27

RESPONSE TO The UK Airspace Consultation 2017

Introduction

1. The consultation asks us to describe who we are and who we represent. GACC is the main environmental organisation concerned with Gatwick, and the only voluntary group that covers the whole area around the airport. Founded in 1968, we have as members many hundreds of individuals, over 50 District and Parish Councils, and over 40 community groups. These groups vary from three county branches of the CPRE, each with over 2,000 members, through over a dozen local aviation protest groups which have sprung up in the past four years in opposition to new flight paths, to many village amenity societies for whom aircraft noise is only one of their concerns. All our members pay us an annual subscription, demonstrating positive support. We also have several hundred supporters on our email list.
2. Our membership covers an area about 20 miles radius around Gatwick, from Guildford to Crowborough, from Tonbridge to Petworth. Over the years we have established a reputation for accuracy and responsibility which has earned us the support of all local Members of Parliament. Recently we have led the successful campaign against a second runway.
3. This response has been discussed and approved by our committee. [It has also been circulated in draft to all our members, and their comments invited and taken into account.]
4. We answer below the questions as posed in the consultation.

Q. 1 Changes to Airspace

Please provide your views on:

- a. the proposed call-in function for the Secretary of State in tier 1 airspace changes and the process which is proposed, including the criteria for the call-in and the details provided in the draft guidance.
 - b. the proposal that tier 2 airspace changes [that is permanent changes to vectoring] should be subject to a suitable change process overseen by the CAA, including the draft guidance and any evidence on costs and benefits.
5. We agree that the Secretary of State (SoS) should have a call-in power, as with important planning applications.
 6. The proposed criteria are, however, too restrictive. It is suggested that a flight path change could only be decided by the SoS if: "It could lead to a change in noise distribution resulting in a

10,000 net increase in the number of people subjected to a noise level of at least 54 dB LAeq 16hr11 as well as having an identified adverse impact on health and quality of life.” The three major changes in flight paths at Gatwick in the past four years have been the ADNID trial, the concentration of approach routes to the east of the airport, and the concentration of departure routes. All of these changes have created massive protests with thousands of complainants, articles in the national press and involvement of local Members of Parliament. Yet none of these new routes would fall within the proposed criteria.

7. Basing the criteria on the 54 leq contour would be unsatisfactory because this metric does not take ambient noise levels into account. And it fails to take account of the increased level of annoyance caused when a new flight path is over areas which have not been previously overflown. Moreover, it would be near impossible to identify a specific impact on health linked to a specific route.

8. Tier 1 Changes – defined as “changes to the permanent structure of UK airspace” – which were not called in, and all Tier 2 changes, would be decided by the CAA. The CAA is described as independent but unfortunately that is not how it is perceived by the public. Despite efforts to give it an environmental role, it is still perceived by many of those aggrieved by new flight paths as mainly concerned to seek the advancement of airlines and airports. That remains so despite the appointment of a chairwoman and a number of Board members from outside the aviation industry. Giving it power to take decisions on all new flight paths not called-in would mean it being perceived as dictatorial. Local MPs would become impotent.

9. It is therefore unfortunate that ICCAN has not been given the power to take final decisions on new flight paths, and unfortunate that it is to be made, in effect a subsidiary of the CAA.

10. Decisions on new flight paths may affect an individual's health, and they may knock £100,000 or more off the value of a house. It is difficult to think of any other public body which is given such dictatorial power.

c. the proposal that tier 3 airspace changes should be subject to a suitable policy on transparency, engagement and consideration of mitigations as set out by the Civil Aviation Authority.

11. These are changes to operations – for example significant shifts in the distribution of flights on particular routes – over which there is at present no control. We agree with the recommendation in the consultation but with the addition that there should be a trigger point at which review by ICCAN is required. The trigger might be a doubling of traffic within two years on a particular route, or a rise to more than a given percentage of the movements at the relevant airport. To give an example, at Gatwick there is a departure route called WIZAD. At present it is unused except in emergencies. If a decision were to be taken to use it regularly it would have an adverse effect on the town of Horsham. If in any year its use increased, to say, more 5% of the total number of departures, it should be subject to review.

d. the airspace change compensation proposals.

12. Many of our members who are affected by new flight paths dislike us discussing compensation because it sounds like accepting defeat: they want their previous peace and quiet restored. But when flight path changes become irrevocable, compensation is essential.

13. We consider that the compensation proposals are risable. The proposal for increased noise insulation would only apply very close to the airport and would provide no benefit for people who wish to open their windows or go out-of-doors. The proposal to encourage air space change sponsors to offer compensation voluntarily is a negation of responsibility.

14. Changes in flight paths can knock £100,000 off the value of a house, partly because of the increased noise actually heard, and partly because the publication of a line on a map can deter

potential purchasers. That may well occur at up to 10 or 15 miles from the airport.

15. In the case of a new motorway or any new road, a new airport runway or taxiway or terminal, the Land Compensation Act provides full compensation for any loss of property value plus 10%. That is applicable at any distance from the new development, and is not linked to the installation of double glazing, nor the sale of the property.

16. We strongly feel that the Act should be amended to provide the same compensation for those affected by a 'new motorway in the sky'. By this we mean any new departure or arrival route operated by PBN. Compensation for a new motorway is paid by the Highways Agency: compensation for new flight paths would be paid by the airport concerned. That would of course be reflected in air fares. Economic theory says that those who benefit should compensate those who suffer. So does natural justice. Air fares are already artificially low as a result of airlines paying no fuel tax and no VAT.

Q. 2 Assessing Noise in Airspace Decisions

Please provide your views on:

a. the proposal for assessing the impacts of noise, including on health and quality of life.

Please provide any comments on the proposed metrics and process, including details provided in the draft guidance.

17. We are disappointed that the consultation paper states that there is no intention to amend the Government guidance which states that noise should be given priority up to 4,000 feet, and noise and climate change equal priority up to 7,000 feet. While we do recognise the importance of climate change, many of our members are severely disturbed by the noise of aircraft between 4,000 and 7,000 feet. This is particularly true where ambient noise levels are low. We welcome the statement in the Guidance that consideration should be given to limiting the number of aircraft on any one route between 4,000 and 7,000 feet.

18. We are shocked by the proposed addition to the policy of sharing the benefits of noise reduction between the aviation industry and communities by the addition of the words "in support of sustainable development." The original words meant that the policy envisaged that technical progress meant more aircraft and less noise. The addition of 'sustainable development' is fairly meaningless but can only be assumed to mean that noise reduction becomes subservient to the expansion of air travel.

19. We welcome the publication of CAP 1498, as predicted in the consultation. This provides a useful discussion on how to define 'over-flight' which corresponds with what some environmental groups call 'noise shadow'.

Flight paths

20. In the past four years the introduction of concentrated flight paths based on satellite navigation has caused great distress around Gatwick, and so we are pleased that the consultation paper suggests that the Government policy of promoting concentrated flight paths is to be amended to: "Decisions on how aircraft noise is best distributed should be informed by local circumstances and consideration of different options. Consideration should include the pros and cons of concentrating traffic on single routes, which normally reduce the number of people overflown, versus the use of multiple routes which can provide relief or respite from noise."

21. Many of our members would dearly love to see a return to the random distribution of flight paths as pertained before the introduction of satellite navigation, but we recognise that satellite navigation is here to stay. Multiple PBN routes should ideally be used to create dispersal. If used to provide respite, this should be based on a daily schedule – for example, route 1 on Mondays, route 2 on Tuesdays, and route 3 on Wednesdays – with the schedule published well in advance so that people can organise their lives.

Metrics

22. It is good that the 57 leq measure of noise is to be replaced by a variety of other metrics. It was widely believed by environmental groups that 57 Leq led the Government to underestimate the number of people affected by aircraft noise. That is confirmed by the new survey, SoNA, which found that over the past thirty years sensitivity to aircraft noise has increased, with the same percentage of people being highly annoyed at 54 Leq as at 57 Leq thirty years ago.

23. But the 54 leq contour still only measures the area within which a majority of the community (as measured at Heathrow) are seriously annoyed by aircraft noise. We therefore welcome the additional measure of 51 Leq as the 'Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level' for daytime noise; and 45 Leq for the night.

24. Nevertheless, as the consultation paper says, many people find the concept of average noise difficult to understand. We therefore welcome the decision to introduce additional contours based on the number of aircraft: N65 in daytime and N60 at night. But we are concerned that these contours will still not adequately show the extent of the disturbance caused by aircraft noise.

25. The main problem with all these new metrics is that none of them take ambient noise into account. (See *Ambient Noise* www.gacc.org.uk/research-studies). They fail to take into account the fact that the same level of aircraft noise causes far greater disturbance and annoyance in a quiet rural area than above a busy city centre. As the Rural White Paper 2000 said: *There will always be sources of noise in the countryside, and many of these - such as noise from harvesting and livestock - are themselves representative of activities which have long been central to the rural way of life. But protecting the countryside from further intrusion of noise is not a luxury. It is about preserving and promoting a feature that is genuinely valued by residents and visitors alike.*

26. Gatwick is surrounded on three sides by Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty where peace and quiet are even more highly valued and the intrusion of aircraft noise even more resented.

27. The fact that a high proportion of the public interviewed for the SoNA survey lived near Heathrow means that the survey result may underestimate the impact at Gatwick. We understand that the reason the SoNA survey did not include ambient noise was the difficulty of obtaining appropriate figures for the levels of ambient noise at the locations where the interviews took place. That does not appear an insuperable problem, and we hope that further work can be done on this issue.

28. We note that a further analysis of the SoNA survey relating to night time disturbance is to be published soon.

b. the proposal to require options analysis in airspace change processes, as appropriate, including details provided in the draft guidance.

29. We are in favour of a more formal options analysis to aid decision making on new flight paths, or on dispersal versus respite or versus concentration. Indeed not to provide such an analysis might well open any decision to judicial review. But there are two dangers.

30. The first is that the publication of rejected options may cause a certain amount of blight. A house purchaser choosing between two otherwise desirable properties would tend to avoid the one that had a potential flight path overhead – even if that option had been rejected. The second, and more important, is that the choice of options would tend to set community against community. Any consultation on options should make it clear that it is not a public opinion poll based on the number of votes.

Q. 3 Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise

Please provide your views on:

a. the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise's (ICCAN's) proposed functions.

b. the analysis and options for the structure and governance of ICCAN given in Chapter 6, and the lead option that the Government has set out to ensure ICCAN's credibility.

31. ICCAN would have no power to reduce noise. We therefore can summon up little enthusiasm for it.

32. It is also disappointing that it is not proposed that ICCAN should act as an Ombudsman. Many people who have complained about aircraft noise have found unsatisfactory the system whereby their complaints are dealt with by the airport, and then the buck is passed between the Department, CAA, NATs and the offending airline. A single point for complaints, an aircraft noise ombudsman with power to order improvement or compensation, would have been welcome.

33. It is proposed that ICCAN should:

- advise on changes in air space. If its advice was not accepted, ICCAN would soon become distrusted.
- promulgate best practice. This role could equally well be fulfilled by the CAA. Providing information to the public on noise would be of no value. It is a mistaken belief in the aviation industry that if only the public understood noise and how it is measured they would be content. People who hear noise understand it perfectly well, and know that they don't like it.
- commission research. This would be welcome if given a sufficient budget: merely taking over part of the CAA budget would be of little benefit.
- undertake monitoring and quality assurance in order to increase trust by local communities. This would only work if ICCAN could demonstrate its independence by taking action to negate plans put forward by airports; but this is what it would have no power to do.

1. The lack of trust between Gatwick Airport and local communities has grown up over many years: in 2010 we were told there would be no runway, and a year later plans for a runway are produced; consultation on the 2012 master plan concealed mention of increased noise; consultations on airspace changes have been conducted without maps so that the public could not understand what was proposed; changes in arrival routes were made in secret and then denied; the ADNID flight path trial was launched without warning on an inaccurate excuse – the list of instances where the public feel they have been misled is endless. We doubt if ICCAN could compel Gatwick to behave in a more respectable way.

2. Making ICCAN in effect a semi-detached subsidiary of the CAA would further reduce confidence in its independence.

Q. 4 Ongoing Noise Management

Please provide your views on:

- a. the proposal that the competent authority to assure application of the balanced approach should be as set out in Chapter 7 on Ongoing Noise Management and further information at Annex F.**
- b. the proposal that responsibility for noise controls (other than noise-related operating restrictions) at the designated airports should be as set out in Chapter 7 on Ongoing Noise Management.**

3. The suggestion that controls on noise might be imposed by local councils as planning conditions might work at Stansted which has a major planning application coming up. But it may not be applicable at Heathrow where the forthcoming application for a third runway will be the subject of a Development Control Order. At Gatwick it would not work because, apart from a new hangar, as far as we know there is no big planning application in prospect.

4. Even if there were a major planning application we are not optimistic that the proposed system would work: the last big planning application at Gatwick was in 2009 for a large extension to the North Terminal. GACC urged that "conditions should be imposed to ensure no increase in noise, no increase in pollution, a higher proportion of use of public transport ..." Crawley Borough Council declined to impose any such conditions. Indeed there are legal restrictions on the use of planning conditions: paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework states "Planning conditions

should only be imposed where they are: ... relevant to the development to be permitted ...”

5. If controls on noise and night flights were to be passed to local councils (not in relation to planning permissions) we would request that they should be implemented jointly by all the District/Borough councils around the airport. Crawley is the planning authority for Gatwick but the other five councils which about the airport suffer most of the noise.

6. We would strongly oppose a policy of transferring some noise controls to the airports, including control over the NPRs and night flights. We believe that it would be wrong in principle to put such controls into the hands of a commercial business. Our experience over many years has shown that Gatwick will always put profit first. As has been said, it is unwise to put the fox in charge of the hen-house.

7. The consultation paper also hints that the Gatwick Noise Management Board (NMB) might be involved in setting controls on noise, eg noise limits or night flight quotas. So far that body has only dealt with arrivals and it has yet to be seen how effective it is in forcing the airport to take action which could be against its commercial interest. The requirement for a 75% majority means that it would be unlikely to take any action which was opposed by the airport and the airlines. If the NMB were to take on wider legal responsibilities, it would need a revised constitution to ensure that it represented all communities around the airport.

c. the proposal that designated airports should publish details of aircraft tracks and performance. Please include any comments on the kind of information to be published and any evidence on the costs or benefits.

8. We are content with the Caspar system in operation at Gatwick. The procedure for submitting complaints through the Caspar system is, however, unnecessarily complex and appears designed to discourage complaints.

9. We strongly oppose the suggestion that airports should be given ‘ownership’ of NPRs. These limits on flight paths have been in existence for fifty years. People have bought their houses and based their lives on the fact that the NPRs are fixed. Moving them would create great injustice and should not be put into the power of a commercial business.

d. whether industry is sufficiently incentivised to adopt current best practice in noise management, taking into account Chapter 7 on Ongoing Noise Management, and the role of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise in driving up standards in noise management across the aviation sector.

No. We see no effective incentive to reduce noise. ICCAN will be well-meaning but without power. Over the past forty years we have found that the Department for Transport takes seriously its responsibility to protect the public. At times we may have criticised it for being too close to the aviation industry. But Ministers are democratically responsible. We consider it would be a retrograde step for the Department hand over responsibility to commercial airports – which have a legal responsibility to maximise profits.

Q. 5 Guidance

Please provide any comments on the draft Air Navigation Guidance: guidance on airspace & noise management and environmental objectives published alongside this consultation.

10. The Objectives should include the improvement of the environment and the reduction of noise. Delete the weasel word 'mitigation'.

11. All our comments on the main consultation should be taken as applying also to the Guidance.

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 269972

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Works being programmed
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Ditch Problems
Site : MARSH GREEN ROAD
Location : Culvert under the road Gabriels Manor
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 07-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 09-Mar-2017
Response Date : 31-Jul-2017 **Completion Target :** 05-Apr-2017

Enquiry Number : 51952998

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : FOUR ELMS ROAD
Location : outside elms house
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 08-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 08-Mar-2017
Response Date : 08-Apr-2017 **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 11203237

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type :
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : MAIN ROAD
Location :
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 10-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 10-Mar-2017
Response Date : 10-Apr-2017 **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 270978

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : CROUCH HOUSE ROAD
Location : Drain directly in front of Springfield Cottage
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 12-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 13-Mar-2017
Response Date : 13-Apr-2017 **Completion Target :**

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 51953105

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Multiple Potholes
Site : MONT ST AIGNAN WAY
Location : Received vi fixmystreet.com - location given by custoemr as 'Two potholes in the centre of the road at the turning for Waitrose.'
Service : Potholes
Recorded Date : 10-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 13-Mar-2017
Response Date : **Completion Target :** 07-Apr-2017

Enquiry Number : 51953106

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Pothole On The Road
Site : LINGFIELD ROAD
Location : Received via FIXMYSTREET.COM - only location given by custoemr as 'Pothole at the side by The Pound green'
Service : Potholes
Recorded Date : 10-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 13-Mar-2017
Response Date : **Completion Target :** 07-Apr-2017

Enquiry Number : 10007033

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Dip/Depression
Site : SWAN LANE
Location : Please see letter in links
Service : Road/Carriageway
Recorded Date : 24-Feb-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 24-Feb-2017
Response Date : **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 269969

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Works being programmed
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Dip/Depression
Site : MARSH GREEN ROAD
Location : NEAR THE DRIVEWAY TO Gabriels Manor MARSH GREEN ROAD
Service : Road/Carriageway
Recorded Date : 07-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 10-Mar-2017
Response Date : 07-Apr-2017 **Completion Target :** 31-Mar-2017

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 271083

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Temp Signs Need Collecting
Site : HEVER LANE
Location : Outside the Old Dairy
Service : Roadworks
Recorded Date : 13-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 13-Mar-2017
Response Date : 13-Apr-2017 **Completion Target :** 10-Apr-2017

Enquiry Number : 271021

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Not Working
Site : PARK VIEW CLOSE
Location : The street lights throughout Stangrove Park are not working and haven't been since at least Friday night. The path and park is a busy route to the Stangrove Estate and the lack of lighting could be dangerous at night for many reasons. I live at 32
Service : Street Lighting
Recorded Date : 12-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 12-Mar-2017
Response Date : **Completion Target :** 09-Apr-2017

Enquiry Number : 11807250

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Error, Please contact WAMS Support
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Application For New Crossing
Site : SPRINGFIELD ROAD
Location : 45 Springfield Road, Edenbridge, Kent TN8 5HH
Service : Vehicle Crossing
Recorded Date : 01-Mar-2017 **Last Logged Date :** 01-Mar-2017
Response Date : 05-Apr-2017 **Completion Target :** 29-Mar-2017
