

SCRAIP Report for Special PTD OSC - Cabinet Call-in from 4 February 2015



Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
PTD.150302.160.1	<p>1 <u>RESOLVED</u> that the Committee recommend Cabinet:</p> <p>a) Reconsider their decision on site H1 (25) Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham and reject the site, and for it to be taken back to Regulation 18 for deletion on the basis that it is a receptor site.</p> <p>b) If during their reconsideration Cabinet decide to keep site H1 (25) in the Local Plan that the Revised Criterion for Design and Layout and Ecology be included in the policy with the inclusion of the requirement that an independent organisation such as Natural England or Kent Wildlife Trust be commissioned from the design stage of any development on the site to report whether the design of the development will adequately protect the species that are on the site</p> <p>c) That Cabinet remove point (e) of their decision – <i>‘that development here would not command the consent of local people as reflected in the consultation response’</i> from site H1 (10) south of Sutton Road, Langley, from reasons for rejection.</p> <p>d) Reconsider their decision on site H1 (10) South of Sutton Road, Langley and put it forward for Regulation 19 consultation for approval.</p> <p>e) It was the Committee's view that as all four sites, H1 (7) Land North of Bicknor Wood, Otham, H1 (8) Land West of Church Road, Otham and H1 (9) Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road and H1 (10) South of Sutton Road come on to the Sutton Road that all comments</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development			Steve Clark; Rob Jarman; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	<p>regarding traffic management must be the same. The Committee therefore request Cabinet, either to give H1 (7), (8) and (9) the same wording as H1 10, i.e. point (c) <i>'there would be an unacceptable cumulative impact on traffic generation in the Sutton Road corridor'</i>. In which case that may require cabinet to further decide sites H1 (7), (8) and (9) should be rejected in the same way as H1 (10). Or alternatively they can remove point (c) from H1 (10) and instead, under criteria, insert the same wording used for H1 (7), (8) and (9) i.e. <i>'strategic road infrastructure to significantly relieve traffic congestion on Sutton Road and Willington Street'</i>. This may not necessarily mean the status of H1 (10) changing because there would still be three reasons for rejection of this site, (a), (d) and (e).</p> <p>f) Note the disappointment of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committees' that Cabinet have not given a reason for recommending site H1 (20) – Postley Road, Tovil go forward for Regulation 19 consultation and ask that Cabinet provide a reason why the Committee's recommendation was overturned and incorporate this reason in the Decision Notice.</p>				