

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KIG JOINT PARISHES GROUP**

**Held on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2009 at 7.30pm.**

The meeting was chaired by Richard Jacques

Present: Representatives from the parishes of Detling, Thurnham, Broomfield and Kingwood, Sutton Valence, Langley, Bearsted, Boxley, Leeds, Harrietsham, Hollingbourne and Downswood.

**1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Lenham and Otham Parish Councils.

**2. KIG Update.**

Alison Broom from MBC attended the meeting to speak with the group about the KIG application.

She informed the meeting that the Inquiry was due to commence on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2009, and she spoke of the timetable for this, informing members that evidence by all Rule 6 parties needed to be submitted by 15<sup>th</sup> September 09, following this there would be a period of exchange of proofs of evidence and a rebuttal period.

She stated that it was anticipated that the Highways Agency part would be taken late into the Inquiry.

She informed the group that at present MBC and KCC were in the process of establishing a statement of common ground which sets out everything that is agreed. This would also allow for things to be dealt with such as S106 agreements and conditions.

This would ensure that the Borough Council was prepared just in case the Inquiry was allowed.

Mrs Broom informed members that on 3<sup>rd</sup> July the Appellant has submitted further information which may affect the timetable. The deadline for commenting on this information was 7<sup>th</sup> August 09.

She stated that the new information did not change the overall view of MBC; however they would change its view on the impact of the development. She warned that this may affect the start date of the Inquiry and the Joint Parish Group had the right to make a view on this.

She reported that discussions had been held with other interested parties and organisations, this included JPG, StopKIG, KCC, CPRE and MBC. She stated that MBC has tried to establish the strengths of the Rule 6 parties.

She reported that MBC and KCC had commissioned expert advice and advised that the JPG strength would be to focus on the local impact and the interpretation of the community impact.

Alison Broom stated that MBC were considering how MBC comes to a formal view should the additional information be accepted, whether this would be delegated officer responsibility or dealt with by the Planning Committee. She stated that she anticipated consideration in the early part of September.

Peter Waite asked if it was necessary for all objectors to reconfirm their original objections.

Alison Broom stated that all previous objections would be considered.

Alison Broom suggested that any further representations should be short and focused. She stated that MBC had publicised the resubmission by placing notices around the area.

Tom Hoy asked if there was a limit on the number of plans that could be submitted by the appellant.

Alison Broom stated that there was no limit.

Geoff Licence asked if MBC had considered writing to residents in the immediate area as they need to be aware of the additional details in order to make representations.

Alison Broom stated that this had been considered; she stated that the responsibility of placing notices and publicity was the responsibility of the Appellant; however MBC had decided to raise public awareness, but it needed to balance resources, time and strike a balance with being able to manage the number of responses and prepare for the Inquiry.

Alison Broom stated that Parishes could assist with this matter and make their electorate aware

Larry Mulheirn asked if the new proposals were an exact replacement or an alteration, and did they acknowledge the views made at the planning meeting.

Alison Broom stated that they did respond to issues to do with historic buildings and woodland and in some cases it did respond. She stated that MBC were considering whether to accept the changes and this application would then become the revised proposals.

David Burton suggested that MBC writes a letter for the parishes to circulate to their electorate in order to publicise the reconsultation.

Alison Broom stated that the Borough Council would consider this.

Patrick Walton spoke regarding the Section 106 Agreements and suggested that this should include a bus service to serve Maidstone, Bearsted and Hollingbourne via the KIG site.

Alison Broom stated that the document would need a green transport plan and therefore this would be included.

Gavin McLaggan asked if the Borough Council had a back up plan should the appellant fetch further information to the table during the Inquiry.

Alison Broom confirmed that this would depend on the information submitted.

Larry Mulheirn question where the JPG fitted into the Inquiry as he was not clear where the role of the JPG was with regards to the case it would put forward.

Alison Broom stated that no organisation has a specific role and it is reliant on an informal collaboration.

She stated that MBC would not fetch all parties under one umbrella as each party needed to remain independent.

In broad terms she stated that MBC would commission the technical information and she advised that the JPG should not present this as it could be cross examined at the Inquiry.

Richard Jacques stated that the JPG should present the local community issues and fetch the ground level issues to the Inquiry.

Alison Broom spoke regarding the importance of the summing up statement.

Hollingbourne Parish Council asked whether the archaeological aspects could stop the project.

Alison Broom stated that the appellant had not yet submitted the detail regarding archaeology and therefore she was unable to offer a view at present.

She stated that there was still a lot of information that had not been submitted by the appellant and this may be considered by MBC as a further reason for refusal.

Paul Young from Bearsted Parish Council spoke regarding the level of expertise expected by the Inspector.

Alison Broom stated that no qualifications were necessary to make representations to the Inspector.

It was confirmed that the JPG could be subject to cross examination by the QC for the appellant and possibly by MBC.

Section 106 agreements were discussed by the group.

The Chairman summed up the discussions and thanked Alison Broom for attending the meeting.

She then left the meeting at 8.45pm.

*A short comfort break took place.*

The Chairman spoke regarding the work undertaken by representatives of the group since the last JPG meeting. He reported on the meetings attended by himself, Peter Waite and Patrick Walton with Mark Watts and Hugh Robertson.

He stated that Luther Pendragon was in the process of drawing up proofs of evidence and determining the type of witnesses the group needed to call.

He stated that this information would be forwarded to all parties and reiterated that there was still a lot of work to be undertaken by the group.

Gavin McLaggan stated that the JPG had 11 witnesses to call under its umbrella, yet any number of people could attend as public witnesses on their own accord.

Richard Jacques spoke regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment which needed to be considered and responded to by 7<sup>th</sup> August 2009; he stated that these details were still incomplete at present; however they did need to be looked at by the group.

He suggested that it was undemocratic to expect people to respond to the details within the time scales.

In light of this he stated that Luther Pendragon had drafted a letter to the Planning Inspectorate stating that the process was undemocratic. He read out the letter to all present for formal approval. He stated that the response would determine the next steps taken by the group.

Gavin McLaggan stated that the new documents could not be looked at without reference to the original application.

Paul Young asked whether the JPG had a Planning Consultant in place to look at the planning detail.

Richard Jacques responded to this question.

Richard Jacques reiterated the role of the JPG as lay people; he stated that it was unacceptable and unreasonable for the Planning Inspectorate to expect people to digest the new planning details in an unreasonable time.

Representatives from Bearsted Parish Council questioned the benefit of lobbying. Richard Jacques and Gavin McLaggan spoke regarding this and the current role of Luther Pendragon. They confirmed that lobbying was not part of the current plans, lobbying would need to be undertaken at the end of the process after the recommendation is made by PINS.

Tom Hoy spoke regarding the events of the last meeting and he stated that in his view lobbying was important at the appropriate time.

Richard Jacques spoke regarding the document on Infrastructure Planning Route Maps and the influence that these plans could have on the KIG application.

This document was discussed by all present.

Larry Mulheirn suggested that the JPG should write to PINS to ask what rules would be followed with regards to KIG,

Richard Jacques stated that this would be an issue discussed at the meeting with Hugh Robertson planned for 17<sup>th</sup> July.

David Burton questioned how this document would affect the application.

Richard Jacques confirmed that a parliamentary debate would set changes and specifically legislate on rail interchanges.

Patrick Walton spoke regarding the JPG contract with Luther Pendragon; he stated that Bearsted PC had agreed to finance their share for three months work and although there was differing views on the Parish Council he stated that they would not inhibit the work of the JPG.

A discussion took place with regards to the structure and set up of the JPG.

It was agreed that the JPG should make contact with KALC Area Committee regarding KIG.

Larry Mulheirn proposed that the JPG should send the letters to PINS as discussed, and that members should take away the resubmitted documents and report upon these at the next meeting.

This was seconded by Gavin McLaggan and agreed by all.

Paul Young spoke regarding the Rule 6 submission by the JPG, he stated that this seemed very broad and made a lot of points. He asked if the JPG would consider submitting a new Rule 6 statement.

It was agreed that the current submission was satisfactory.

David Burton offered to circulate the new details to all interested parties.

**3. Date of Next Meeting.**

Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2009 at 7.30pm at Tudor Park Hotel.

Richard Jacques declared the meeting closed at 9.50pm.