

**MINUTES OF A FULL MEETING OF BRENCHLEY PARISH COUNCIL ON MONDAY 4th APRIL
2016 IN MATFIELD PAVILION AT 7.30pm**

Present

Chairman C Woodley presided, Cllrs M Mackenzie, N Woodward, A deGuingand, I McEwen, B Stanley, Mrs G Warner, Mrs N Marriott, Clerk M Powell. No members of the public.

No Item

1 To accept apologies for absence

Cllr P Randall for family commitments

2 To approve Minutes of the last meeting

2.1 Approve minutes of the planning meeting of 22nd March 2016

Resolved: - To accept the minutes presented as accurate. The Chairman then duly signed them.

3 To record declaration of Interests on any item on the Agenda

Members were reminded that if any have a *prejudicial* interest in an agenda item, this should be declared at the start of the meeting.

Personal interests could be declared at this point or, alternatively, could be declared at the time a specific item is being discussed if that member wishes to speak on the item in which s/he has a personal interest. In case of doubt about such an interest Councillors have been advised to contact the Monitoring Officer before the meeting.

4 To adjourn to allow public participation- questions and comments

None

5 Parish Plan (PP)

5.1 To hear reports

Cllr Woodward reported that the working groups were building questions for the survey, which was planned for testing via a pilot group hopefully in May. Cllr McEwen expressed caution that there are no leading questions, which could negate the value of the response. It was also evident that some questions proposed so far can cause confusion because of a lack of precision in their content. It was also of concern that the school did not prejudice questions regarding education but that they were truly from the working group.

The Chairman was of the opinion that questions needed to be independent and also not be multiple variations of the same question. The PC also must not write them but leave to the working groups. He asked what could be done to ensure the same individual did not complete multiple surveys. The answer was that for paper surveys the logistics team were looking at distribution and Cllr McEwen should be able to spot multiple online submissions from their sources.

Cllr Woodward also reported that he had started the application for a grant from Awards for All (A4A). In answer to a question as to what the money was for he replied principally for employing expertise from Planning for Real (P4R) long term to provide both scrutiny and to compile the end report. The PC was not funding this and external sources of money were required. However some money at present of around one man days worth of some £300 was needed for the reports so far, albeit not all in one go, and would the PC agree to this? Cllr Mrs Warner was unhappy that a limit should be set at the meeting but it was noted by others that the PC had already provisionally allocated some funds. It was also noted that a very detailed proposal to A4A was necessary to stand any chance of success. Mr Boot would have some experience in grant applications of this nature but the application would need to be made in the name of the PC. The policy group would discuss this in more detail.

Agreed: - to release up to £300 to pay Mr J Boot for his services.

5.2 Parish plan correspondence

An email from Mr J Punyer had been circulated to residents of Market Heath regarding possible future housing developments. Cllr Mrs Warner had read the email and expressed concerns that Cllr Woodward was acting independently expressing his own ambitions and not those of the PC and the PP. Cllr Mrs Marriott had written a reply to those emailed to allay some fears that the email may have caused stating that the PC had not promoted any site, did not endorse changes to the LBD nor had a policy in this regard. Cllr Mrs Warner was of the opinion that her reply was well drafted and it had reassured many, but some were left unconvinced with concerns that they were not being kept fully aware of these potential issues.

Cllr Woodward stated that the email contained many inaccuracies. He had neither a master vision nor was steering the working groups in any particular direction.

Most of the meetings referred to included statements derived from Mr Cunningham of Brenchley School that should the school develop, sites for consideration will likely require brownfield development and therefore Brenchley Garage and residents of Market Heath had been contacted. He was not as well known and as stated in the email, the PC's Cllr for planning. He had been approached by Rydon Homes who, having obtained his details from the web site as being involved with the PP, wished to make a presentation to the working group concerned. This was declined. Subsequently he agreed to meet with them if other independent residents were also invited. He invited members of the Planning working group to attend, none of whom accepted but he was accompanied by Mr J Barsley. Rydon were interested in some land in Matfield and they had now agreed to take an option on this from the owners.

In answer to a question from Cllr Mrs Marriot Cllr Woodward did agree that, with hindsight, it would have been preferable if he has asked Mr Punyer to allow him sight of the draft before circulation. Cllr Mackenzie felt it was wrong to place blame on Cllr Woodward for these inaccuracies and also felt that there was nothing sinister implied.

Cllr Mrs Marriott had had some replies to her email and some residents were concerned over the lack of transparency and sceptical of the planning process as a whole. She thought that placing of agendas with B&M news and on the website prior to meetings may help. The TWBC plan referred to is ongoing but would not be adopted until 2020 and until such time all planning applications would be judged on the rules in place at the time. However, there is likely to be challenges to some decisions as the current policy does not comply with the estimated housing need.

The Clerk reported that due to concerns by some Cllrs he had formally written to Cllr Woodward that from the content of the email he could be interpreted as promoting various sites for development and was working with TWBC to this end. Further that there was a suggestion that the Limits of Built Development could be extended. This appeared to be with the blessing of the PC. The Clerk had asked for reassurance that the PC was not being represented erroneously and that the PP working group was not being encouraged to reflect the Cllr's own thoughts. The Clerk had received a lengthy reply, which provided much information about the processes involved, and which stated that there were so many facets in the production of a PP that he could not influence them. His approach was in fact one of facilitating the PP and to formulate widespread understanding of what was possible so that the PP could make an informed assessment of future options. That the email concerned had ambiguity or inaccuracies was regrettable and misleading and that the final conclusions reached for inclusion in the PP would be gained by the results of the forthcoming survey.

6 To consider the following planning applications.

6.1 16/502253 Sunbury Foxhole Lane Matfield

Proposed ground and first floor side and rear extensions and internal alterations

Resolved: - To recommend approval

The Chairman declared an interest as the applicant was a near neighbour. Whilst he remained in the room he took no part in the discussion or vote.

7 To receive items for information

7.1 Decisions by TWBC

- 7.11 16/500611** The Star Inn Maidstone Road Matfield
Advertising consent for 1* fascia sign, 2 x externally illuminated fascia signs, 1x externally illuminated hanging sign, 2x hoarding signs, lighting and change of colour to exterior elevation and frontage
Recommendation- Approval Decision-Approval
- 7.12 16/500179** Town Farm Slaughterhouse
Conversion of traditional building to one bedroom dwelling and erection of single storey side extn. Renewal of 13/00230
Recommendation- Approval Decision-Approval

7.2 Appeal Decisions

7.21 Sissinghurst

A resident had forwarded the results of an appeal successfully upheld regarding a development in Sissinghurst of approximately 60 dwellings. The appeal succeeded primarily because the Borough's current Local Plan is non-compliant with estimated housing need and the developers were able to argue that the provision of housing overrode the harm to the landscape, the Borough's planning hierarchy and the fact that the site is outside the built limits. However, the site is also outside the AONB, separated from it by the village, so that there is no "Intervisible relationship" between the AONB and the site. The inspector said that, whilst sharing some of the characteristics of the AONB, this was not sufficient to afford the site the same level of protection enjoyed by the AONB.

8 Decisions Required

None

9. Correspondence

9.1 KCC Bus Consultation

A resident has asked that the PC is aware of a consultation regarding bus services. It is open for replies until 15th May and can be found at www.kent.gov.uk/busreview.

Noted: - That the consultation was regarding a reduction in subsidised bus services but that none of the routes were within our Parish. The Clerk was asked to communicate our thanks but that we had nothing to add.

9.2 Drains

A resident has advised the drains between the bottom of Blind Lane and the school are blocked. KCC has been advised. The Clerk was asked to enquire of KCC if they would supply a schedule of drain clearing within our Parish.

9.3 Air Ambulance application 15/510638

The air ambulance has made a planning application to move the base to Old Hay involving more staff and consolidation of flying bases from two sites and an increase in the number and size of helicopters. Whilst BPC has not been consulted a resident from Willow Lane on behalf of several has advised us of local concerns regarding noise and traffic. Agreed That whilst an increase in noise was inevitable the service the Air Ambulance was very valuable. The PC would make no further comment.

9.4 Unity Bank

Advice has been received that from 4th June we will incur a monthly fee of £6 and that interest will no longer be paid on this current account.
 Agreed: - That operation of the internet banking with Unity Trust was still very much worthwhile and no change was proposed.

10 Meetings attended and reports by Councillors

10.1 Teise Group

Cllr deGuingand had met with the Teise Catchment improvement group in March. They were involved with ideas to improve the flow in the Teise by removing four weirs.

11 To be advised of urgent Business as may be previously notified.

none

12 Accounts for payment

12.1	M Powell	Salary & Expenses	1033	TFR	£1418.43
12.2	HMRC	Tax & NI	1034	TFR	£402.35
12.3	E.On	Electricity	1035	TFR	£28.11
12.4	C A Forward	Repairs to allotment fence	1036	CHQ	£174.00
12.5	KALC	Chairman's conference	1037	CHQ	£72.00
12.6	KALC	Annual Subscription	1038	CHQ	£1046.50
12.7	KCC	Annual charge CHW	1039	TFR	£3500
12.8	KCC	Refund of grant to KHWP	1040	TFR	£2032.00
12.9	Managed Technology	Photocopier copies	1041	TFR	£65.09
12.10	Siemens	Photocopier lease	1042	TFR	£164.40

Resolved: - To accept the above invoices and to pay them. Cllrs Stanley and McEwen agreed to authorise the electronic transfers.

13 Date of next meeting

Tuesday 19th April at 7.30pm in Matfield Pavilion. This will be preceded by a meeting of the Finance Committee at 7.00pm