



Edenbridge Town Council

Town Clerk: Christine Lane CertHE Local Policy



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

A meeting of the PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE will be held in Rickards Hall at 7.30pm on Monday 17 December 2018

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 Committee 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 26 November 2018

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE, FOR REPORT ONLY

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED

7. SDC PLANNING DECISIONS – for noting

8. PLANNING BUSINESS

8.1 SDC Development Control Committee meeting re the Swan Inn

8.2 Planning Appeal APP/G2245/W/18/3197312

8.3 SDC Consultation on amendments to The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy

8.4 Planning application for Covers Quarry, Westerham

9. TRANSPORT BUSINESS

9.1 Road issues

9.1.1 404/405 Bus consultation

9.1.2 Edenbridge and surrounding areas – school issues and school transport

9.1.3 Request for additional bollards in the High Street

9.1.4 Traffic Regulation Order 2013 Amendment 29

9.2 Rail issues

9.2.1 Sussex Community Rail Partnership Autumn Newsletter

9.2.2 Missing Link newsletter Winter 2018

9.3 Aviation issues

9.3.1 Gatwick draft Master Plan 2018 consultation – HWCAAG response

9.3.2 HWCAAG Royal Mail door to door leaflet drop

9.4 Highways report

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

REPORT PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION – 17 December 2018

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>

Variation of condition 7 (drainage) of 18/00233/FUL for demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of a supermarket, a comparison based variety store and small 'sandwich shop' unit with associated access, parking and landscaping, with amendment to wording to read 'The development should be carried out in accordance with the Drainage Statement (CTP Consulting Engineers, December 2018)'. To ensure the development is served by satisfactory arrangements for the disposal of surface water and to ensure that the development does not exacerbate the risk of on/off site flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. **Site Of Melbourne House Station Road Edenbridge KENT TN8 6HQ** Ref. No: 18/03748/CONVAR

7. SDC PLANNING DECISIONS – for noting

Development of 2 houses with patios, two new crossovers and extension of existing crossover. Demolition of side extension. **22 Skeynes Road Edenbridge KENT TN8 5HD** Ref. No: 18/02994/FUL

Granted

Formation of dropped kerb **53 Church Street Edenbridge KENT TN8 5BQ** Ref. No: 18/03167/LDCPR

Granted

Side door and Master Bedroom window opening on East Elevation along with is to be blocked up. Rear sliding doors and window to be replaced with central Bi-Folding doors. Garage to be converted into Bedroom by exchanging the garage door for a window and insulating the interior. Internal door added to allow access into the converted garage. Chimneys to be removed in their entirety. Internal walls to be lessened for better flow of movement in the property and an ensuite to be added to Master Bedroom. **Headley 85 Lingfield Road Edenbridge KENT TN8 5DY** Ref. No: 18/03052/LDCPR

Granted

4m lateral reduction of overhang of the Ash Tree (TPO). **30 Ridge Way Edenbridge KENT TN8 6AR** Ref. No: 18/03553/WTPO

Granted

Alterations to side and rear elevation to provide access to first floor. Installation of new balustrade to flat roof. **83A High Street Edenbridge KENT TN8 5AU** Ref. No: 18/02772/FUL

Withdrawn

8. PLANNING BUSINESS

8.1 SDC Development Control Committee meeting re the Swan Inn

Development of a 3 storey Residential building. **Swan Inn Swan Lane Edenbridge KENT TN8 6BA** Ref. No: 18/00690/FUL

The Town Council objected to this application on three occasions and it is due to be considered at the Development Control Committee meeting on 13 December 2018. Cllr J

Scholey is representing the Town Council, and the outcome should be available by the time of Monday's Planning & Transportation.

8.2 Planning Appeal APP/G2245/W/18/3197312

Prior notification for a change of use from agricultural use to dwellinghouse (C3) and associated operational development. This application is made under Class Q of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. **Crouch House Farm Crouch House Road Edenbridge KENT TN8 5LQ** Ref. No: 17/02202/PAC

The appeal made to the Secretary of State against SDC's refusal of planning permission for the above was allowed – papers attached.

8.3 SDC Consultation on amendments to The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy

“Sevenoaks District Council is seeking the views of a wide range of individuals and organisations on its draft amendments to The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy. The Council is required to review this policy on a regular basis and this draft replaces the previous one dated February 2016. The new draft is broadly similar to the old policy; however there are a number of proposed changes. These are itemised in the table included with the policy document available on the link within the survey.

<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/taxipolicyamendments>

Some of the changes are required due to government legislation, others are there because they are considered good practice and some have been introduced as a result of discussions with the trade and the public. This survey has specific questions in relation to the proposed changes and we are keen to hear the views of all consultees on the issues.

Consultation takes place from 19 November until 30 December.”

Do members wish to respond to the consultation?

8.4 Planning application for Covers Quarry, Westerham

At last month's meeting members resolved to support Westerham Town Council against the application to restore Covers Quarry, Westerham, Kent Ref. No. KCC/SE/0495/2018. A summary of the points forming the basis of their objection is attached for information.

9. TRANSPORT BUSINESS

9.1 Road issues

9.1.1 404/405 Bus consultation

KCC is holding a Public Consultation relating to a proposed change to bus service 404/405 which operates from Edenbridge – Ide Hill – Sevenoaks – Ivy Hatch – Shipbourne – Plaxtol. It can be found at <http://www.kent.gov.uk/404busserviceconsultation> and will run until 19 December – if progressed, changes would be implemented from April 2019.

The current and proposed timetables are attached. Although there is an increase in the number of services, the 16.40 from Edenbridge has been cut and, most importantly, the 18.00 from Sevenoaks, a service which enables students to take part in after-school activities.

Do members wish to respond to the consultation and object to cutting the last two services?

9.1.2 Edenbridge and surrounding areas – school issues and school transport

Below is an email from County Councillor Peter Lake to Tom Tugendhat MP, regarding the lack of proper bus provision for children who go to school in Sevenoaks.

‘I have won all my School Transport appeals this year but I have been completely frustrated, as you have, trying to get Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Families, and Mike Whiting, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to come to our rescue and to provide properly acceptable transport to

school for Edenbridge children going to Sevenoaks. (Roger Gough is the one to address as he has the schools' transport budget in his portfolio). Roger and I have met three times, passed numerous emails to each other, and dealt with various concerned parents, but I have got nowhere. When Sandy Bruce Lockhart closed the Secondary School in Edenbridge in 2001 he gave an undertaking that Edenbridge children would always be transported to the schools of their choice, to Oxted, East Grinstead or Sevenoaks.

At the end of the summer term the dedicated transport to Sevenoaks was removed, to be replaced by an existing commercial service, GoCoach 404, to Sevenoaks. The reason and excuse offered by Roger and Mike was that only 12 children had an entitled bus pass to Sevenoaks, KCC would save £37,000, and there were seats to spare on the commercial service. They were badly advised.

At the beginning of the September term the parents found that the 404, an urban bus, allowing 34 seated and 27 standing passengers, quickly became crowded to overflowing with children having to stand for over an hour both going to and from schools in Sevenoaks. A headcount on one day revealed 24 children standing on the bus. I myself counted 17 children getting on the bus at the first stop in Edenbridge. The parents complained bitterly as you know and many decided it was too dangerous to let their children stand, so they took them by car instead. So now Roger will tell you that it has settled down and the problem has gone away. It hasn't and the parents just cannot believe that we are treating their children in such a callous way.

I have repeatedly asked for a proper headcount, and although KCC recently admitted that 16 were entitled to a bus pass, this is nowhere near the true figure of children going to Sevenoaks. I have continued to press hard, and suddenly Roger, at long last, has come up with true figures for Knole Academy. There are actually 69 children going to Knole from Edenbridge and the surrounds, but there must be even more children going to Sevenoaks as the figure does not include Weald of Kent GS or Trinity School. We have a serious number of children trying to get to schools in Sevenoaks and the bus transport is obviously dangerous and inadequate. I say dangerous because I believe that the GoCoach bus is built for transporting urban passengers safely standing at low speeds through built up areas, not going across country at speeds well over 30mph. A rural bus is a Coach with seat belts as defined in the Dept of Transport regulations.

So, to sum up, I feel that we need proper adequate transport to take Edenbridge children to Sevenoaks and until recently we were getting it, but because KCC is withdrawing free transport to Sevenoaks (and East Grinstead) there is only Oxted remaining over the border in Surrey where they have to take the train to and from school. Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells Schools are not considered as appropriate schools for free transport.

I just have a feeling that KCC is taking the easy way out by transporting these children out of Kent rather than finding places for them in Kent schools. More importantly the parents have to pay exhorbinant train fares in years 12 and 13 (£93 a month) to continue their children's education in Oxted, so it is no wonder that children drop out. KCC does not keep proper track of progress of any children out of County so their parents have nowhere to turn for help and advice and as the head of Transport says "There is little support we can offer in respect of rail travel, the young persons bus pass and the 16+ travel cards are bus specific we have looked at the rail equivalent but this has proved cost prohibitive". So what do we do? I would be very grateful if you could take this matter up with Roger, and if necessary with Paul Carter, now that we know the true figures. I strongly believe the Department for Transport should tighten up the regulations otherwise children travelling on inadequate buses are at considerable risk.

I just do not think that Edenbridge parents and their children are getting a fair deal especially as KCC removed their secondary school through no fault of their own.'

A breakdown of the pupil numbers is available in the office.

Members have agreed to support Cllr Lake by writing to Tom Tugendhat MP – draft letter attached, covering this and the reductions to bus 404.

Are there any further actions members wish to take?

9.1.3 Request for additional bollards in the High Street

County Councillor Peter Lake has agreed to our request for funding to install bollards from beyond 44 High Street as far as the dropped kerb for the archway into the courtyard of 46 to 54 High Street, next to Contented Pets. The Admin Officer is to discuss their locations with a Kent Highways Officer next week.

9.1.4 Traffic Regulation Order 2013 Amendment 29

Members were consulted by SDC on a proposed traffic regulation order for Station Road – both sides, near the junction with Four Elms Road and Westways – new double yellow line restrictions (no waiting at any time), connected to proposed changes to an existing pedestrian crossing, and new filter lane for traffic turning right into Four Elms Road

SDC has advised that at its meeting in September the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board considered feedback received during the consultation, and decided to proceed with the proposals as published.

9.2 Rail issues

9.2.1 Sussex Community Rail Partnership Autumn Newsletter – is available at <http://www.sussexcrp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Autumn-2018.pdf>

9.2.2 Missing Link newsletter Winter 2018 – previously circulated to members

9.3 Aviation issues

9.3.1 Gatwick draft Master Plan 2018 consultation – HWCAAG response

The High Weald Councils Aviation Action Group's draft response to the above is attached.

9.3.2 HWCAAG Royal Mail door to door leaflet drop

HWCAAG are arranging for a door to door leaflet drop and the Chairman and Cllr C Pearman have agreed to a payment of £150 as a contribution towards the costs.

Do members agree retrospectively to this payment?

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?

Admin Officer
11 November 2018



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2018

by **M Seaton DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/W/18/3197312

Crouch House Farm, Crouch House Road, Edenbridge, TN8 5LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs I Henderson against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref SE/17/02202/PAC, dated 12 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a change of use from agricultural use to dwellinghouse (C3) and associated operational development.
-

Procedural Matter

1. During the course of the planning appeal, the Government published the final version of its revised National Planning Policy Framework on 24 July 2018. The revised Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they should be applied. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that whilst the Council has not responded, the appellant has made further submissions regarding the revised Framework.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and approval granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 for a change of use from agricultural use to dwellinghouse (C3) and associated operational development at Crouch House Farm, Crouch House Road, Edenbridge, TN8 5LQ, in accordance with the application Ref SE/17/02202/PAC, dated 12 July 2017, and subject to the conditions set out in the Annex.

Background and Main Issue

3. The National Planning Practice Guidance advises the starting premise for Class Q is that the permitted development right grants planning permission, subject to the prior approval requirements. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development in respect of transport, highways, and noise impacts of the development, and also the flooding and contamination risks on the site, and whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the

building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses). It is also necessary to assess whether prior approval would be required regarding the design or external appearance of the building.

4. In respect of whether the agricultural buildings are capable of conversion to dwellinghouses in accordance with the extent of works set out as permissible as defined in paragraph Q.1 of the GPDO, I note that the Council has concluded that the proposed development would not fall foul of any of the criteria set out within paragraph Q.1 of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO. On the basis of the information submitted with the application, and my observations during my site visit, I have no reason to dispute this conclusion.
5. Turning to the conditions for a determination of prior approval set out at paragraph Q.2 of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, there is no dispute between the Council and the appellant that impacts of noise, flooding and contamination risks on the site, practicality of the location or siting of the building, and the design and external appearance of the resultant building, would all be acceptable. Whilst I have had regard to the concerns raised by interested parties on issues related to noise and drainage, I have not been provided with any detailed submissions on these issues by the parties, and do not therefore have any basis from which to dispute the conclusions on the above conditions.
6. However, the Council has concluded that the transport and highway impacts of the development would be severe and would require prior approval. As a consequence, in this instance the main issue is whether prior approval is required in relation to the condition regarding transport and highways impacts, as set out in paragraph Q.2 of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO.

Reasons

7. The appeal relates to 2 agricultural buildings positioned within a wider complex of cottages and buildings, including a number of existing dwellings. The complex has been converted from former agricultural buildings for the purposes of residential and office occupation. The proposed development would create two dwellings within the existing buildings.
8. In response to the Council's reason for refusal relating to highway matters, the appellant has submitted a Highways Appeal Statement prepared by Mayer Brown in support of the proposed development, and dated 2 March 2018. The statement seeks to address outstanding matters raised by the Council related to the safety and use of the access, visibility onto Crouch House Road, and the width of the access road.
9. The Statement identifies that the access has historically been used in connection with green-keeping duties at the adjoining Kent and Surrey Golf and Country Club, and also with the agricultural use of the buildings the subject of this appeal and agricultural land. The existing residential properties close to the appeal site also use the access, and from my observations of the available car parking and access arrangements, it would appear that the dwelling known as The Lodge located at the junction between the access and Crouch House Road does as well.
10. I acknowledge that different types and sizes of vehicles have, and continue to use the existing access for deliveries and other purposes. However, there is no

evidence presented of recorded accidents at the junction over the last 15 years, or that the type of vehicles which would be generated by the proposed development would be a departure from those currently using the access. Furthermore, and as confirmed by Kent County Council and highlighted on submitted drawing number WSEDENBRIDGE.1/01 rev. A, and a 1:1250 Ordnance Survey Plan indicating the extent of highway boundaries, it has been demonstrated as possible to provide adequate visibility splays appropriate to the speed characteristics of Crouch House Road at this point, within existing highway land. Whilst I have had regard to the contrary assertions of interested parties on this matter, the maintenance of highway land including any owned by third parties to ensure the continuation of highway rights over the topsoil is a separate matter. In respect of visibility splays, the use of a condition to secure their provision and maintenance prior to occupation of the development is a reasonable and appropriate means of addressing this issue.

11. Turning to the level of use of the access, I have had regard to the appellant's calculations and have also noted the absence of any contrary technical assessment rebutting the trip analysis. Nevertheless, even if the resultant level of use was to exceed that as assessed, I am not persuaded that the level of traffic that would be generated by the proposed development, in addition to continued agricultural access and movements, would be so significant as to result in an unacceptable or severe impact on the use of the access or highway safety.
12. I accept that the overall width of the access road would not support two-way traffic, but there is no compelling evidence of existing conflict on the access leading to adverse highway conditions. In this respect, and with reference to the unchallenged technical conclusions related to the future level of use of the access, I do not regard that the level of use resulting from the proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on the safety of users of the access or highway conditions as a consequence of the width of the access. Whilst I have had regard to the suggestion of the use of a condition to secure the widening of the first 10 metres of the access from Crouch House Lane, on the basis of my conclusions I do not regard this as being necessary, or indeed deliverable with regards to the absence of any agreement of requisite landowners to such works. A condition in this respect has therefore not been imposed.
13. Given the submitted information, I have no reason to dispute the technical conclusions proposed by the appellant, and which I note have been accepted by Kent County Council as the Highway Authority. Therefore, the proposed development would not result in adverse transport and highways impacts. As a result, prior approval would not be required in respect of condition Q.2(a) of the Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO.

Other Matters

14. Interested parties have raised concerns over the nature of 'associated operational development' as described in the description of development, with concern over whether this may include gardens, garages and parking. In this respect, the location of curtilage associated with the proposed development is indicated on the Site Plan. Whilst there is no detail of proposed parking or garages, the prior approval procedure addresses the conversion of the buildings and works necessary for such a conversion rather than the need for,

or disposition of additional structures, which would fall under the auspices of general planning controls.

15. It has also been suggested by interested parties that the construction of an alternative access road across land beyond the appeal site and current access is required as a means of resolving the disputed highway issues. However, this is not a part of the appeal proposals, and as a consequence of my conclusions as set out above, this is not a matter to which I have attributed any significant weight in my decision-making.

Conditions

16. Paragraph W.(13) of the GPDO sets out that procedurally a local planning authority is entitled to grant prior approval subject to conditions, where they reasonably relate to the subject matter of the prior approval. In this instance, the Council has not suggested any conditions in the event that the appeal was to be allowed. However, on the basis of the evidence submitted, I conclude that conditions related to the provision of visibility splays and the investigation of the potential for ground contamination are necessary, the latter being a pre-commencement condition. In accordance with the requirements of Section 100ZA(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the appellant has confirmed written agreement to the imposition of the pre-commencement condition.
17. In granting approval the GPDO requires at Paragraph Q.2(3) that the development must be completed within a period of 3 years from the date that the prior approval is granted. A number of other conditions apply to such development, including paragraph W(12) of the GPDO which requires that the conversion is carried out in accordance with the details provided in the application.
18. The condition securing visibility splays would be necessary in the interests of highway safety, whilst the condition securing the investigation of the potential for contamination on the site, and any required remediation, would be necessary in the interest of ensuring the site is suitable for the proposed use.
19. I note that the Council referenced the possibility of a condition securing obscured and fixed glazing of high-level windows as a means of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers within the section related to the assessment of the noise impacts of development. However, I do not regard the nature or level of any noise generated from the proposed residential occupation of the dwellings to necessitate such a measure, and in respect of other matters of amenity including privacy, the nature of the windows would not warrant such measures.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR

Annex

Conditions

- 1) No development shall be commenced until a desk study has been undertaken and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority to investigate and produce an assessment of the risk of the potential for on-site contamination. If the desk study identifies potential contamination, a detailed site investigation shall be carried out in accordance with a written methodology, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If remediation measures are then considered necessary, a scheme for decontamination of the site shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in writing and the scheme implemented prior to the development of the site. Any changes to the agreed scheme must be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works being undertaken.
- 2) The first occupation of the dwellings hereby allowed shall not take place until the works to provide 2.0 metre x 43 metre visibility splays measured from an eye height of 1.05 metres, with an object height above 0.6 metres, and as shown on Drawing Number WSEDENBRIDGE.1/01 rev. A, have been completed in accordance with the details of the plan. The visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any fixed obstruction, and retained for their intended purpose at all times.

COVERS SAND PIT RESTORATION APPLICATION KCC/SE/0495/2018

Bullet points: basis for response.

Introduction

1. Response after consultation with Westerham community groups and neighbouring communities who would be affected by proposed restoration
2. Sensitive site: AONB, Green Belt, close to SSSI and Ancient Woodland, source of Darent
3. Westerham wishes to see the land restored in a way which causes least damage and disturbance to local communities
4. WTC and communities view is that the application:
 - a. fails to establish the **need** to import a minimum 800,000cu.mtrs of infill to this site to stabilise ground conditions, and potentially understates the volume of imported material by as much as 50%.
 - b. fails to fully consider all other options to minimise the environmental impact of any remedial works.
 - c. fails to accurately reflect the cumulative impact with other major development schemes currently in planning including a submitted application at Moorhouse tile works and the emerging local plans in Sevenoaks, Bromley and Tandridge districts.
 - d. fails to demonstrate that it will not harm areas of SSSI and the AONB landscape character and therefore fails policies in both NPPF and Local District Plans.

Planning considerations

1. Need for extensive restoration not demonstrated

Previous restoration plan deemed 'unfit' on questionable grounds (? Morants statements)

Previous plan still viable?

2. Obligation to consider alternative solutions

- a. Alternatives dismissed without adequate analysis (para 3.4 Non Technical summary)
- b. No carbon calculations against the options considered (recommended under BS 6031)

3. Environmental Impact Assessment

Response to scoping document from KCC (17 August) set out information required to satisfy requirements of a full EIA and the recommendations under the British Code of Practice BS6031:2009.

a. Transport and Access

- i. Challenge assertion of 'minimal adverse impact'
- ii. Proximity of haul road to Churchill School
- iii. Proximity of HGV traffic (Beggars Lane) to NE Westerham(Ash, Hartley etc Roads)
- iv. No assessment of impact on Brasted, Sundridge or Biggin Hill
- v. Impact of haul road on M25 (Highways England concern) at

Beggars Lane roundabout

vi. Disruption (danger?) at Croydon Road crossing

vii. Assumptions on:

1. Length of working days(11 hrs)
2. No of days per year able to work
3. Acceptability ratios of imported material underestimated, resulting in material extension of the project term

b. Interaction with other developments

EIA regulations (2017) require this. SDC required it (response to Scoping request) in relation to emerging Local Plan. Application states: 'only small scale developments'. Ignores Moorhouse, WWW (not yet withdrawn), other developments likely under emerging local plans.

c. Flood risk

- i. Darent River acknowledged by Environmental Agencies as flood risk area to east of site.
- ii. Dewatering proposals assume 'natural' infiltration
- iii. Environment Agency has not opined upon the proposals under requirements of the North Kent Rivers CFMP (2009) Policy Option 6 as it applies to the upper Darent river. Under this policy the Environment Agency is required to take actions with others to store water or manage run-off in locations that provide overall flood risk reduction or environmental benefits.

d. Air Quality

- i. Dust, vibration along haul road in proximity to school '
- ii. HGVs ascending steep Westerham Hill. No scope to allow an overtaking lane will increase journey times throughout each day not just at rush hours. As this plan is to run for at least six years from 2019 it impacts half of the term of the emerging SDC Local Plan and is therefore a material consideration in transport policies of reducing traffic congestion.
- iii. Ash, Hartley Roads affected by HGV movements
- iv. Potential impact on public health (school) claimed to be minimal?
- v. Assessment on air quality, particularly increased diesel particulants. Failure to meet SDC district policies on reducing pollution from traffic.

e. Landscape and visual impact

Site wholly within Kent Downs AONB: no full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provided.

Working the site 11 hours each day for six days a week with heavy machinery will have a noise impact on local residents. No assessment or mitigation measures have been proposed. The location on site of buildings, equipment and lighting has also not been provided other than to say that it will be of "minimal intrusion". Given the

extent of project activities and its longevity this needs greater specification to properly consider its impact on the AONB and local residents.

4. Engagement with local community (recommended by KCC, prior to preparation and completion of application)

No engagement has taken place.

Engineering considerations

WTC has engaged professional geo-technical consultancy. A full report will follow. Preliminary points are set out below

1. Purpose of the application? Several reasons emerge from the application documents.
 - a. To stabilize the north escarpment so as to safeguard the M25.
 - b. To restore the landscape to good quality permanent pasture.
 - c. To minimise the volume of construction waste imported.
 - d. To dewater the north lake after infilling and achieve sustainable drainage of the restored land.
2. None of the above objectives are achieved in the application for the following reasons:
 - a. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the fill material once placed provides sufficient passive resistance to stabilize the slope
 - b. Passive resistance requires compacted and graded materials.
 - c. End tipping into water precludes compaction.
 - d. No evidence of Highways England concerns over M25 slippage.
 - e. Tipped material displaces 300,000m³ of water and doubles size
 - f. Stabilisation quickly achievable by piling if "currently unstable."
 - g. Shallow translational slips are weathering, no M25 risk.
 - h. The bund embankments should run north/south. As designed provide no lateral support to the east/west running M25.
 - i. Requires substantial importation of material, no volumes identified for soil substitutes.
 - j. The material to be imported is construction site inert waste. It is variously and misleadingly described as:
 - i. Self compacting - there is no such thing.
 - ii. Suitable engineering material - no definition of properties.
 - iii. Waste
 - iv. Of a generally cohesive natureThe above is NOT engineered fill which is specifically classified e.g 2,7 or 6J and of defined chemical composition.
3. There is no prospect that the infill waste, end tipped into water will achieve bund slope angles of 1:2. 1:4/5 is more realistic.
 - a. The material content of the bunds is approximately 750,000 m³ at 1:2 slope.
 - b. The infill source for the cells created is unclear but inferred to be imported/part of the 800,000m³. Substantial further imported infill will be needed of similar volume.
 - c. The 1 km haul road requires a granular base to form the route, 400mm deep on good ground and 4.5 metres wide.

No importation volumes are disclosed for this material. Nor for its removal and reinstatement at the end of the requirement.

The primary difference between what is proposed for infill and what will work is that the applicant is paid to take waste but has to pay for defined engineering material.

4. The transport consequences of the above are substantial.
5. The dewatering proposal is vague in the extreme.
 - a. The north lake water level has not increased over the past three years as photographic evidence shows. This runs counter to suggestions that the lake is now clay lined and rising by 1.5 metres a year.
 - b. Infilling into water creates displacement, compaction and contamination issues.

THE PROPOSALS AS FAR AS CAN BE DETERMINED WOULD CREATE SLOPES LESS STABLE THAN THOSE THE APPLICANT IS ATTEMPTING TO PROTECT.
6. Lack of supporting data from applicant. There are many issues in this category:
 - a. Define engineering material using SHW definition.
 - b. Define what form does the "structural engineering to "stabilize the northern face" take.
 - c. What evidence exists to document the rise in water levels.
 - d. Additional compaction is proposed. Over what specification and without evidence of water level reduction it is impossible.
 - e. What is meant by "occasional treatment of material"
 - f. If screening and segregating is to be done on site the material cannot have consistent engineering properties and what happens to inferior materials.

Bus Service 404 and 405 Changes

Public Consultation

22 November to 19 December 2018



I wish to advise you of two separate consultations that will take place between 22nd November and 19th December relating to proposed bus service changes in Thanet and Sevenoaks.

The changes result from engagement with bus operators following previous proposals to make larger scale reductions to the bus subsidy budget that supports this activity. Whilst these plans were not progressed, KCC does still need to make some savings and asked operators to make proposals that will enable us to reduce spend, whilst being able to protect school services and ensure those communities currently served still have access to transport.

Two proposals; from Stagecoach (services 42/42A, 56 and 39/39A) in Thanet and from Go-coach (services 404 and 405) in Sevenoaks are being considered. These would save KCC approximately £410k per year (£360k from Thanet proposals and £50k from Sevenoaks proposals). This note focuses on proposals for services 404 and 405 in Sevenoaks from Go Coach which are summarised below.

Service No.	Operator	Route	Summary of proposed changes	Estimated saving
404/5	Go Coach	404 Edenbridge – Ide hill – Sevenoaks – Shipbourne – Plaxtol Monday to Friday 405 Sevenoaks – Otford – West Kingsdown Wednesday	Reduction in the overall number of journeys, removal of the Plaxtol to Borough Green section and the withdrawal of the Wednesday only 405 service. Service 222 will continue to offer a link to Borough Green and Tonbridge whilst service 429 provides West Kingsdown with a link to Dartford and Swanley. In addition, a new Taxi Bus service is being introduced as a Big Conversation pilot scheme and this will provide new journeys linking West Kingsdown, Fairseat, Otford, Stansted and East Hill with Sevenoaks.	£50,237

This consultation will run for four weeks from 22 November until 19 December 2018 (inclusive) and if progressed changes would be implemented in April 2019.

Full details of the proposals, current and proposed timetables and the consultation questionnaire are available at kent.gov.uk/404buserviceconsultation. Should you have any immediate questions then please email; public.transport@kent.gov.uk

Appendix A – Timetables

Current Timetables for 404

Edenbridge - Idle Hill - Sevenoaks - Ightham Mote - Shipbourne - Plaxtol													404	
Mondays to Fridays			NSD	SDO		SDO	NSD		SDO	NSD	NW	W		
Edenbridge Post Office			0725	0725							1640	1640		
Edenbridge, Farmstead Drive			0728	0728							1643	1643		
Marlpit Hill, Ridgeway Estate			0730	0730							1645			
Four Elms			0734	0734							1650			
Crockham Hill, Royal Oak												1649		
Westerham, Chartwell												1654		
Four Elms			0735	0735								1700		
Idle Hill, The Cock			0745	0745		1045		1355			1700	1710		
Bayleys Hill Crossroads			0751	0751		1051		1401			1706	1716		
Sevenoaks, Julians Close			0756	0756		1056		1406			1711	1721		
Sevenoaks Bus Station (arrive)			0801	0801		1101		1411			1716	1726		
Sevenoaks Bus Station (depart)			0801	0801		0919		1225	1415	1526	1549	1735		
Sevenoaks Railway Station			0805	0805		0923		1229	1419	1530	1553	1739		
Sevenoaks, Blair Drive				0807	0925		1231	1421		1555	1741	1741		
Sevenoaks, Bayham Road				0810	0927		1233	1423		1557	1743	1743		
Trinity School				0814										
Knole Academy				0833				1538						
Trinity School								1548						
Godden Green					0931		1237	1427	1555	1601	1747	1747		
Fawke Common					0933		1239	1429	1557	1603	1749	1749		
Bitchet Green					0935		1241	1431	1559	1605	1751	1751		
Stone Street					0937		1243	1433	1601	1607	1753	1753		
Ivy Hatch					0941		1247	1437	1605	1611	1757	1757		
Ightham Mote					0944		1250							
Shipbourne Church (arrive)					0952		1258	1442	1616	1616	1802	1802		
Shipbourne Church (depart)					0953		1300	1443	1617	1617	1802	1802		
Dunk's Green					0956		1303	1446	1620	1620	1805	1805		
Plaxtol					1000		1307	1450	1624	1624	1809	1809		

Bus Service 404 and 405 Changes Public Consultation: 22 November to 19 December 2018

NSD – Non-school days SDO – School days only NW – Not Wednesdays W – Wednesdays only

Plaxtol - Shipbourne - Ightam Mote - Sevenoaks - Ide Hill - Edenbridge									
	NSD	SDO		NSD	SDO		NSD	SDO	
Shipbourne Church	0740	0740	0953	1300	1443				1617
Dunk's Green	0743	0743	0956	1303	1446				1620
Plaxtol	0747	0747	1000	1307	1450				1624
Ightham Mote									1632
Ivy Hatch	0752	0752	1005	1312	1501				1635
Stone Street	0756	0756	1009	1316	1505				1639
Bitchet Green	0758	0758	1011	1318	1507				1641
Fawke Common	0801	0801	1013	1320	1509				1643
Godden Green	0804	0804	1015	1322	1511				1645
Knole Academy								1535	
Trinity School		0812						1545	
Knole Academy		0822							
Sevenoaks, Bayham Road	0808		1019	1326	1515	1547	1547	1649	
Sevenoaks Railway Station	0812	0830	1023	1330	1519	1551	1551	1653	1800
Sevenoaks Bus Station	0816	0834	1027	1334	1523	1555	1555	1657	1804
Sevenoaks, Julians Close			1032	1339		1600	1600		1809
Bayleys Hill Crossroads			1037	1344		1605	1605		1814
Ide Hill, The Cock			1043	1350		1611	1611		1820
Four Elms						1621	1621		1830
Marlpit Hill, Ridgeway Estate						1626	1626		1835
Edenbridge, Farmstead Drive						1628	1628		1837
Edenbridge Post Office						1631	1631		1840

NSD – Non-school days SDO – School days only

Proposed Timetables

The proposed 404 timetable offers a more simplified schedule.

Edenbridge - Ide Hill - Sevenoaks - Ightham Mote - Shipbourne - Plaxtol				Plaxtol - Shipbourne - Ightham Mote - Sevenoaks - Ide Hill - Edenbridge			
Mondays to Fridays	SDO	NSD		SDO		SDO	NSD
Edenbridge Post Office	0725	0725	935	1200	1455	0740	
Edenbridge, Fircroft Way	0728	0728	938	1203	1458	0743	
Marlpit Hill, Ridgeway Estate	0730	0730	942	1207	1502	747	
Four Elms	0735	0735	947	1212	1507	0747	1045 1340
Ide Hill, The Cock	0745	0745	957	1222	1517	0752	1049 1344
Bayleys Hill Crossroads	0751	0751	1003	1228	1523	0756	1053 1348
Sevenoaks Julians Close	0756	0756	1009	1234	1529	0758	1055 1350
Sevenoaks Bus Station	0801	0801	1015	1240	1535	0801	1058 1353
Sevenoaks Railway Station	0805	0805	1019	1314	1544	0804	1101 1356
Sevenoaks, Blair Drive	0807		1021	1316	Via	0812	
Sevenoaks, Bayham Road	0810		1024	1319	River	0822	1535
Trinity School	0814				head		1545
Knole Academy	0834				1552		1547
Trinity School					1602		
Godden Green		1028		1323	1609	0830	1110 1405 1551
Fawke Common		1030		1325	1611	0834	1114 1409 1555
Bitchet Green		1033		1328	1613	~	1189 1413 1600
Stone Street		1035		1330	1615	~	1129 1423 1605
Ivy Hatch		1039		1334	1619	~	1133 1427 1611
Ightham Mote		1043		1338		~	1143 1437 1621
Shipbourne Church					1630	~	1148 1442 1626
Dunk's Green					1633	~	1152 1446 1628
						~	1156 1450 1631

SDO – School Day only

NSD – Non-School days



Edenbridge Town Council

Town Clerk: Christine Lane CertHE Local Policy



Tom Tugendhat MBE MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

11 December 2018

Dear Tom,

School Transport and Revised Bus Service

Edenbridge Town Council supports the actions taken by County Councillor Peter Lake to address issues arising from the decision taken at the start of this academic year, by Kent County Council, to remove the dedicated bus service for Edenbridge children attending schools in Sevenoaks. His correspondence with you (copy attached) sets out the efforts he has made to try to improve the situation but, sadly, so far his actions have not resulted in an acceptable solution.

To exacerbate the situation further, Go-Coach are currently consulting on proposals to revise the timetable, which includes the removal of the 16.40 from Edenbridge and the 18.00 from Sevenoaks. This means children attending schools there will no longer be able to take part in after-schools clubs or participate in the Duke of Edenbridge scheme, as the last bus to Edenbridge will leave Sevenoaks at 15.35.

The Town Council hopes you will take both of these issues up on behalf of the children of Edenbridge, to ensure that they are able to travel safely to school and are not discriminated against by losing the opportunity to play a full part in school activities.

This Council requests you to take immediate action to lobby Kent County Council at the highest level to get the situation resolved, and lobby the Department for Transport to ensure that the regulations are tightened to prevent children travelling on inadequate buses at considerable risk.

It is vitally important the Edenbridge parents and their children get a fair deal.

Yours sincerely,

91. Cllr M McArthur,
Chairman Edenbridge Town Council

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

HIGH WEALD COUNCILS AVIATION ACTION GROUP (HWCAAG)

Gatwick Master Plan consultation

The High Weald Councils Aviation Action Group (HWCAAG) came into existence in September 2013 in response to the significant increase in both the noise and frequency of aircraft movements into Gatwick Airport and the possibility of a second runway at Gatwick. It comprises twenty-three Parish and Town Councils representing some 90,000 people from across the area to the East and South East of Gatwick. All 23 member councils have voted and formally adopted a policy that wishes to see maximum dispersal of flights across the radar manoeuvring area on all flights at Gatwick. Dispersal within NPRs for departures and a ban on night flights. This response has been discussed and approved by our member councils.

The most significant and troubling issue is that the masterplan takes no account of the need to balance growth with a commensurate reduction in environmental impact.

The effect of 60 ATMs/hr and the process of "peak spread" will be to reduce the ability of air traffic controllers allow aircraft to join the ILS closer to the airport, and a far greater number and in a more concentrated pattern will join between the 10 and 12 nm points on the ILS. It also increases the chances of spill over from the day schedule into the night period. This is not acceptable. We support sustainable growth at the airport. 45 ATMs an hour would allow for maximum dispersal, and growth based on year round use.

60 ATMs is a planned permanent change to the distribution of noise around the airport. A full airspace change should be required. For those under the path of 60 ATMs Gatwick must protect them from noise impact and compensate residents for the disruption and loss of amenity in a manner consistent with other transport infrastructure compensation.

The environmental impact has not been balanced with growth. Kent, where most councils we represent are based provides 7.4% of passengers, gets virtually no economic benefit from jobs at the airport and yet suffers 70% of all arrivals traffic with no compensation or mitigation of the effect. That is not a sustainable equation for us to be able to support future growth.

The further growth anticipated by the use of the emergency runway will only exacerbate these issues and make the issue of environmental noise impact, lack of adequate surface access, and air pollution even harder to solve. Use of the emergency runway creates additional safety concerns; not least if the main runway is out of action.

QUESTION 1

Given the above, to what extent, if at all, do you support or oppose the principle of growing Gatwick by making best use of the existing runways in line with Government policy? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Chapters 4 and 5 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

Strongly oppose

It is misleading to frame the question in terms of a single principle. There is nothing wrong with the principle in itself, we strongly oppose the proposal because it is not aligned to other equally important principles, also in government policy, such as that growth should be accompanied by a commensurate reduction in noise, and that there should be a reduction in those significantly affected. These have not been met and are not addressed in the masterplan. The increase in intensity of use to 60 ATMs an hour and for that peak capacity to be spread through the day will bring increased concentration of flights over an extended period making an already unsustainable situation worse for residents living in those areas affected.

QUESTION 2

Given the draft Master Plan looks out beyond 2030, to what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree that land that has been safeguarded since 2006 should continue to be safeguarded for the future construction of an additional main runway? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Section 5.4 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

Strongly disagree

We strongly oppose the use of this land for an additional runway. Now the UK has decided on a hub at Heathrow and spoke model for aviation it should be used for other purpose.

QUESTION 3

What more, if anything, do you believe should be done to maximise the employment and economic benefits resulting from Gatwick's continued growth? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Section 5.6 and Chapter 7 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

The Towns and Parishes HWCAAG represents provide a tiny percent of passengers and get negligible benefit from Gatwick as an employer. Yet they take the whole burden of noise from Westerly arrivals. With disbenefit being so much greater than the benefit of current or future growth we look to the airport to propose a scheme that adequately compensates residents for this planned change to the distribution of noise around the airport through growth.

QUESTION 4

What more, if anything, do you think should be done to minimise the noise impacts of Gatwick's continued growth? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Sections 4.5, 5.5, 6.4 and 6.5 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

Much more needs to be done to minimise the noise impacts. HWCAAG have proposed a multiple route PRNAV scheme to provide a fair and equitable distribution of the noise over the current swathe. The aim of that was to affect more people but to reduce the number significantly affected.

The proposal in the masterplan will result in fewer residents affected due to greater levels of concentration but those who are affected will be much more severely, leading to a substantial increase in those significantly affected.

This change combined with that made in 2013 constitutes a 35% increase in overflight. The true issue with the level of noise is masked by using an annual average metric. Gatwick should adhere to WHO organisation levels of noise and where it cannot meet those recommended levels then it should provide a noise protection scheme through noise insulation for homes, and compensation for loss of amenity.

We note that noise metrics are now likely to include an LDen measure but the increased use of the runway at peak times does not reflect the greater nuisance of aircraft noise in the evening and at night. The reduced redundancy and consequent lack of resilience in the proposed schedule makes evening and night noise more likely.

QUESTION 5

What more, if anything, do you think should be done to minimise the other environmental impacts of Gatwick's continued growth?

Before answering, you will find it useful to read Sections 4.5, 5.5 and Chapter 6 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

Climate scientists are currently warning of the very short window of opportunity to reduce carbon emissions and prevent permanent damage to the planet. The masterplan does not recognise the severity or the proximity of that threat. It only seeks to mitigate the symptoms of that change. That seems irresponsible. To be a responsible organisation not only Gatwick needs to be Carbon neutral, but also the services it facilitates. It needs to be playing a clearer role in helping the government meet its carbon targets.

QUESTION 6

Do you believe our approach to community engagement, as described in the draft Master Plan, should be improved, and if so, how? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Chapter 8 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

Yes. Gatwick's engagement strategy has been to set up new forums to engage with the public, but then fail to act on what they are told. A few years ago Gatwick published a document that described what it thought a good neighbour would do. Unfortunately, much like the Pharisee in the parable the airport continues to hear and see the impact without doing anything to mitigate or compensate those negatively affected. The communities are collateral damage in the requirement for growth with no appropriate provision for residents negatively impacted by aircraft noise.

QUESTION 7

If you make use of Gatwick, what areas of the passenger experience would you like to see improved?

No comment.

QUESTION 8

Are there any aspects of our Surface Access Strategy that you believe should be improved and, if so, what are they? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Section 4.4 in the full version of the draft Master Plan.

Surface access to Gatwick is poor. Whilst our communities are not directly affected many of our residents use the M23 and M25 and Southern rail routes to London for work and leisure on routes that are already at capacity. Growth at the airport is not sustainable without considerably better surface access. The M23, M25 and the Brighton main line are not suitable to carry the number of passengers that increased growth in the number of flights especially at peak times that the airport envisages.

Many of the infrastructure improvements that are listed in the masterplan are designed to deal with the recent increase in passenger numbers rather than future increases.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any other comments to make about the Gatwick Airport draft Master Plan?

Yes. See introduction.

QUESTION 10

Which, if any, of the following applies to you?

None.

29th November 2018

Contact: Mrs Louise Kleinschmidt, Salehurst Barn, Oak Lane, Blackham, Kent. TN3 9UB
Tel: 01892-740753
Email: louise.clerk@chiddingstone.org
Website: www.hwcaag.org

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 394517

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : OLD MARSH GREEN ROAD
Location : The problem is in the ditch
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 20-Nov-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 21-Nov-2018
Response Date : **Completion Target :** 31-Dec-2018

Enquiry Number : 394756

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : HIGH STREET
Location : Outside Costa Coffee 64 High Street Edenbridge TN8 5AJ
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 21-Nov-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 01-Dec-2018
Response Date : 22-Jan-2019 **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 394931

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Manhole/Drain Cover Problem
Site : MILL HILL
Location : Plotted on road at north end of hospital on Fix My Street
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 22-Nov-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 22-Nov-2018
Response Date : 22-Feb-2019 **Completion Target :** 20-Dec-2018

Enquiry Number : 11204326

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type :
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : MILL HILL
Location : Ditch adjacent Clare's
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 27-Nov-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 27-Nov-2018
Response Date : **Completion Target :** 31-Mar-2019

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 396371

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : MAIN ROAD
Location : Blocked drains (x2) on the left as you go up the hill.
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 30-Nov-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 03-Dec-2018
Response Date : 03-Mar-2019 **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 397980

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : HIGHFIELDS ROAD
Location : junction with Fairmead Road and Highfield Road
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 07-Dec-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 07-Dec-2018
Response Date : **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 398131

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Blocked Drain/Gully
Site : PENLEE CLOSE
Location : Part way up from the road entrance
Service : Drainage and Flooding
Recorded Date : 07-Dec-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 07-Dec-2018
Response Date : **Completion Target :**

Enquiry Number : 395775

Outstanding : Y **Enquiry Status :** Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Emergency Services
Subject : Operations & Others Emergency
Site : CROUCH HOUSE ROAD
Location : approx 150yds north of railway bridge
Service : Emergency Response
Recorded Date : 27-Nov-2018 **Last Logged Date :** 27-Nov-2018
Response Date : **Completion Target :**

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 395495

Outstanding :	Y	Enquiry Status :	Works being programmed
Customer Type :	Member of Public		
Subject :	Pothole On The Road		
Site :	PARK AVENUE		
Location :	Plotted in this area adjacent to number 11 on Fix My Street		
Service :	Potholes		
Recorded Date :	26-Nov-2018	Last Logged Date :	27-Nov-2018
Response Date :		Completion Target :	07-Dec-2018

Enquiry Number : 397731

Outstanding :	Y	Enquiry Status :	Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type :	Member of Public		
Subject :	Pothole On The Road		
Site :	CROUCH HOUSE ROAD		
Location :	Opposite side of the road from Oak Lea, against the kerb		
Service :	Potholes		
Recorded Date :	06-Dec-2018	Last Logged Date :	10-Dec-2018
Response Date :		Completion Target :	03-Jan-2019

Enquiry Number : 395686

Outstanding : Y	Enquiry Status : Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public	
Subject : Not Working	
Site : STATION ROAD	
Location : o/s 17 Garlands Court	
Service : Street Lighting	
Recorded Date : 27-Nov-2018	Last Logged Date : 05-Dec-2018
Response Date : 31-Dec-2018	Completion Target : 25-Dec-2018

Enquiry Number : 396734

Outstanding : Y	Enquiry Status : Enquiry under investigation
Customer Type : Member of Public	
Subject : Not Working	
Site : CROUCH HOUSE ROAD	
Location : As above	
Service : Street Lighting	
Recorded Date : 02-Dec-2018	Last Logged Date : 10-Dec-2018
Response Date :	Completion Target : 30-Dec-2018

Parish Fault Report : Edenbridge, Sevenoaks

Enquiry Number : 397780

Outstanding : Y
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : New Connection Enquiry
Site : MAIN ROAD
Location : The streetlight has been moved and now obstructs our property, we cannot open the gate! Please could someone contact me urgently on 07766743989
Service : Street Lighting
Recorded Date : 06-Dec-2018
Last Logged Date : 06-Dec-2018
Response Date :
Completion Target :

Enquiry Number : 397783

Outstanding : Y
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : New Connection Enquiry
Site : MAIN ROAD
Location : Bluebell terrace
Service : Street Lighting
Recorded Date : 06-Dec-2018
Last Logged Date : 06-Dec-2018
Response Date :
Completion Target :

Enquiry Number : 397632

Outstanding : Y
Customer Type : Member of Public
Subject : Fault
Site : FOUR ELMS ROAD
Location : At this particular junction
Service : Zebra Crossing Lights
Recorded Date : 06-Dec-2018
Last Logged Date : 06-Dec-2018
Response Date :
Completion Target : 03-Jan-2019
