

**MINUTES of the Meeting of the PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, held via ZOOM on Monday 01 February 2021 at 7.30 pm**

---

Present: Cllrs J Aldridge, A Baker, A. Damodaran, A Layland, N Lloyd, Cllr M McArthur (Vice Chair), S McGregor, V Jennings, S Taylor, B Todd (Chairman).

In attendance: Town Clerk, Administration and Planning Assistant, and the RFO. Thirteen members of the public and no members of the press.

*Meeting commenced at 19:38*

Cllr Todd was unable to connect to the Zoom meeting and joined the meeting via a telephone link to observe only. Cllr McArthur as Vice-Chair, Chaired the meeting.

**1. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received, noted and accepted from Cllr Read and Cllr Scholey.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS OR PREDETERMINATION**

None

*19:39 Meeting was adjourned for agenda item 3.*

**3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

Sevenoaks District Council (SDC) Leader, Cllr Peter Fleming, spoke on agenda item 6.1. He said that SDC had been looking for many years how to solve the parking issues on the Stangrove Park Estate. To fund this there needed to be a provision of additional housing; this would increase the parking provision and improve the environmental aspect. The plans also included to rebuild the estate shop. He said that this application had been many years in the making; that SDC had listened to residents and there had been a survey conducted in 2019 which included the need for more car spaces.

A resident gave representation regarding agenda item 6.1. She said that residents had liaised with SDC since 2018 and had spoken to members of Edenbridge Town Council in 2019. Less than half of the residents on the estate had been sent consultation letters for this application, and that only a handful of site notices had been displayed, although the development would affect all who lived there. The resident stated that the overdevelopment of recreational areas would mean the loss of a vital community asset. The resident quoted Paragraph 97 of the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) stating that the planting of wildflowers and grass could not compensate for the loss of the open spaces; and the SDC's Open Spaces Study (June 2018) in which it stated that there was a deficit of open spaces in the district for children and young people, and that recreational space here was already below the recommendations outlined in the study. She went on to say there were inconsistencies in the cost schedule; it claimed that this development would bring a £495,000 profit to SDC, but that the planning and access document stated it was self-funding. The shop on the estate was running at a loss and received minimum footfall. The plans were not architecturally in keeping with the estate, and that it would infringe on neighbouring properties. The car park audit offered 1.5 parking spaces per 3-bedroomed house, when firsthand evidence suggested that a minimum of two should be provided. She added that the loss of open space in the application was contrary to NPPF, and that SDC had not provided enough justification to demonstrate why an exception should be made.

Another resident added that SDC had said that it would further consult with residents, but they had not; and they were surprised that SDC had decided to pursue this application in the middle of a pandemic. Issue with site 6 in the plans were also raised with the proposed houses and encroachment on the green space.

A resident spoke re item 10, on behalf of a group of residents about the portable Speed Indicator Device (SID) planned for Edenbridge. He said that a petition had gained more than 1,000 signatures regarding the safety issues at the Marlpytt Hill end of Main Road. Representations were now being prepared to be heard at the SDC Joint Transportation Board meeting on 9 March 2021. The resident felt that they had proved the Marlpytt Hill area of Edenbridge was an accident blackspot, stating that on CrashMap, a purple box represented six clustered accidents on the Hillcrest Road/Hilders Lane junction; this did not include the latest accidents there, one of which had required the Air Ambulance. Whilst the resident agreed that a SID was always a welcome addition to the entire town in terms of combatting speeding, the group felt that the omission of a SID at this junction was a vital opportunity missed. It could have provided an interim solution until more permanent speed mitigation measures were put in place. In summary, he asked that Fairmead Road at least be considered for a SID.

A third resident spoke for agenda item 6.1. He said that they wished to provide feedback to SDC and Edenbridge Town Council stating that Greshams Way had been missed off the site plans and that plans to remove the tree line would be of great concern. They stated also that flooding would be problem, and that site 10 was currently waterlogged.

*19:57 Meeting was reconvened; one member of the public left the meeting.*

#### **4. TO RECEIVE, ADOPT AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 11 JANUARY 2021**

**Resolved:** that the minutes of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on 11 January 2021 be duly signed by the Committee Chairman as a true and accurate record of the meeting; pages 9472 to 9473.

#### **5. MATTERS NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE**

None.

#### **6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**

**6.1 Ref. No:** [20/03786/FUL](#)

**Site:** **Land At Cedar Drive, Chestnut Close, Park Avenue, Park View Close  
Edenbridge Kent**

**Description:** Creation of seven off-street car parks; the erection of 13 dwellings; an extended replacement to the existing shop and associated landscaping improvements.

**Recommendation:** *Members objected to this application:*

- *Members were concerned at the encroachment of green spaces, which should be kept to a minimum. Green spaces are valuable to the residents of the Stangrove Park estate and should be protected. The playground should be in a wider green space, but it is too close to site 6 on the plan.*

- *There is no provision in the application for the drainage of surface water. Kent County Council had suggested that there should be a surface water policy. An example of surface water problems is Site 10 on the plan has been waterlogged following recent rainfall (January 2021).*
- *The shop design and materials are out of keeping with the area. The height of the building will mean accommodation above the shop would overlook properties.*
- *There is no provision in the application for electric charging ports*

*Members believed this application to be in breach of Regulations SE1, EN1 and EN2.*

- 6.2 Ref No:** [20/03792/FUL](#)  
**Site:** Last Chance Animal Sanctuary Hartfield Road Edenbridge KENT TN8 5NH  
**Description:** Proposed new build reception/office to replace an existing office; removal of 5 storage buildings on site.

**Recommendation:** *Members supported this application.*

*20:15 Eight members of the public had left the meeting.*

- 6.3 Ref No:** [21/00067/CONVAR](#)  
**Site:** Elderslie Hilders Lane Edenbridge KENT TN8 6LGD  
**Description:** Variation of condition 2 (plans) and 3 (materials) of application 19/02937/HOUSE to Single-storey extension to rear elevation with roof replacement and single storey front extension infill. Erection of a front dormer. Landscaping works to facilitate decking.

**Recommendation:** *Members supported this application*

- 6.4 Ref No:** [21/00118/HOUSE](#)  
**Site:** 21 Westways Edenbridge KENT TN8 6AA  
**Description:** Erection of a porch extension with a wildflower green-roof, side extension above existing single-storey extension and remove and replace existing rear conservatory with a single-storey extension.

**Recommendation:** *Members objected to this application:*

- *The porch was in front of the building. All others are inside the line. Therefore in breach of Residential Extension Guidelines.*
- *The building materials, the cladding and the wildflower roof were not in keeping with the street scene.*

- 6.5 Ref No:** [21/00162/HOUSE](#)  
**Site:** Firs Lodge Main Road Edenbridge KENT TN8 6HU

**Description:** Erection of detached outbuilding.

**Recommendation:** *Members supported this application*

**6.6 Ref No:** [21/00160/HOUSE](#)  
**Site:** 18 Elm Cottages Hilders Lane Edenbridge KENT TN8 6LB

**Description:** Single Storey Side Extension.

**Recommendation:** *Members supported this application*

**6.7 Ref No:** [21/00050/MMA](#)  
**Site:** Formerly The Star Inn 130 High Street Edenbridge KENT TN8 5AY  
**Description:** Amendment to 19/02360/FUL.

**Recommendation:** *Members supported this application*

## INFORMATION

**6.8 Ref No:** [SE/21/00156/NMA](#)  
**Site:** Royal British Legion Croft Hall 13 High Street Edenbridge KENT TN8 5AB

**Description:** Non material amendment to 19/02471/FUL.

**6.9 Ref No:** [20/03117/LBCALT](#) (Amended Consultation)  
**Site:** Firs Lodge Main Road Edenbridge  
**Description:** Overhauling and painting of existing windows and repair and replacement of the roof.

Items 6.8 and 6.9 were noted.

## 7. SDC PLANNING DECISIONS

Received and noted – items 7.1 to 7.8.

## 8. PLANNING BUSINESS

None

## 9. SPEED INDICATOR DEVICES (SID)

Following the Committee's meeting 2 November, seven sites had been put forward for the portable Speed Indicator scheme. Kent County Council (KCC) Highways had assessed these sites and supported only three of the sites, but with the option of two-way at two of the locations this would provide a total of five sites. Kent Highways allows up to a maximum of six sites per scheme and had said that it was satisfied that these five sites were sufficient for this scheme. Cllr Todd referred to the meeting report which had provided Kent Highways feedback on each site. The sites which they would support for the scheme were:

- 1) Mill Hill near Portland Vets – a single post could be used for both directions
- 2) Crouch House Road, sited away from the post box toward Orchard Drive – suitable for use in one direction
- 3) Swan Lane near Swan Ridge - single post can be used for both directions

Members noted that the site at Main Road between Brownings and Swan Lane, had since been considered unsuitable by Kent Highways as there was already a fixed flashing speed sign near Fairfield Road, and the north end of Main Road was currently part of a safety review being carried out by Kent Highways.

Members acknowledged residents' concerns and request for safety improvements at the north end of Main Road (B2026). The question over the type of fixed speed sign at Main Road would hopefully be part of the Kent Highways review. It was noted that residents had previously supported the need for a fixed flashing sign. Members agreed that a fixed SID would be more appropriate than the existing type of flashing sign. Members also expressed that the north end of Main Road was currently the priority site for a road safety review (as included in the Highways Improvement Plan). It was difficult for the Town Council to discuss further with Kent Highways until they had carried out its speed surveys, but it did remain in touch with Highways. The portable SID was not able to replace the fixed sign near Fairmead Road, Main Road, as the scheme was allow the device to be moved around several approved locations. If this site was included, it would mean that there would be periods Main Road would be without a device; neither could it be displayed simultaneously with the existing fixed sign. Members agreed Main Road remained the priority area for road safety improvements, but there were other locations that merited the portable SID suitable for this scheme. Members,

**Resolved:** to proceed with the three assessed locations: Mill Hill near Portland Vets; Crouch House Road near Orchard Drive; Swan Lane near Swan Ridge. This would provide five sites.

Members noted that the Joint Transportation Board meeting was 9 March; and asked for a report to be made to the Committee at its next meeting (26 April).

*20:42 Three members of the public had left the meeting.*

#### **10. TO RECEIVE A REQUEST FROM A RESIDENT TO CONSIDER IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE MAIN ROAD JUNCTION OF SWAN LANE**

Cllr Todd referred report noting a resident's concerns and request for road safety improvements. The original locations for the portable SID had including a site nearby but had since been withdrawn by Kent Highways. The Town Clerk had written to Kent Highways to ask if would consider the section of Main Road near Swan Lane as part of the north end review for Main Review, but without jeopardising the current speed surveys. A reply had not yet been received.

Member considered the resident's request, and

**Resolved:** to ask Kent Highways to extend the safety review for Main Road to include the section near Swan Lane. To consider the further requests for a speed limit review and double yellow lines at the next Highways Improvement Plan (HIP) review.

#### **11. TRANSPORT BUSINESS**

##### **11.1 Road Information**

Noted.

##### **11.2 Rail Information**

Noted.

##### **11.3 Aviation Information**

Noted - Cllr Baker was now a member of the Gatwick Area Community Trust (GACT). Cllr McArthur had attended Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign; and was attending Communities Against Gatwick Noise Emissions (CAGNE) AGM on 5th February.

##### **11.4 Highways Information**

Noted.

#### **12. CONSULTATIONS**

##### **12.1 Kent Police – Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras installation programme in Edenbridge.**

Members had received a presentation prior to the meeting from Guy Fletcher, ANPR Manager for Kent and Essex Serious Crime Directorate. The presentation had outlined

Edenbridge was currently one of the gateways between county borders where there was no camera coverage; this made it a target for vehicles avoiding ANPR cameras. The advantages for ANPR cameras are that they recognise and log known vehicles to the police, and the local police would also be able to access information in the event of local policing issues. Members unanimously supported the proposal, and

**Resolved:** for initially two ANPR cameras to be sited in Edenbridge.

#### **12.2 ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY FOR KENT 2020 – 2026**

See <https://kccconsultations.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/visionzero/consultationHome>

Opened 26 January 2021 closes 15 March 2021

Noted; Members were asked to respond individually.

#### **13. PRESS RELEASE**

None.

#### **14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 22 February 2021**

*The meeting closed at 20:50.*