

From: Mike Taylor [<mailto:mike.truck@btconnect.com>]
Sent: Friday, **April 22, 2016** 17:01
To: 'Louise Reid' <Louise.Reid@tmbc.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Steve Humphrey' <Steve.Humphrey@tmbc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Isles Quarry East



Dear Louise,

Thanks for the detailed response. I can accept that Crest were merely coppicing along Thong Lane, but note that advising the community in advance could have saved a lot of anguish for residents, and also saved a lot of extra work for local members and your office. Whilst ex-townie residents do not always understand coppicing, my colleagues and I who have lived most of our lives in the country do, and could have allayed fears.

Regarding the earthworks to the east of the Hanson Office - I cannot accept your answer. If Crest wanted an area of "amenity grassland", all they had to do was cut the grass that was there, and perhaps cut back a few brambles and scrub that have developed through recent neglect. I can see no reason to strip the topsoil, unless arsenic free topsoil for IQW gardens is unavailable. What is happening there is excavation and I suspect that excavation will shortly be filled with a membrane and subbase to provide temporary parking or storage area. You insult my intelligence, and that of you and your officers, by suggesting you accept this is just a bit of gardening. We will be monitoring closely what happens in the next few days, and will take you to task if the explanation you have provided is wrong.

KCC did not say they had investigated and found no breach, they said the area under discussion was outside the amenity area of 94/155, and therefore a TMBC problem. I suggest you reread Jim Wooldridge's email forwarded to you all this morning.

Finally, I found the comments by both the MD of Crest and the manager I spoke to yesterday to be vague and deliberately evasive.

Can I also take this opportunity to remind you that a swift response to Parish queries is both courteous, and our right, and also saves frustration rising to unnecessary levels. I trust a swifter response from your officers will become the norm, or at the very least an acknowledgement and a promise of a fuller reply when available.

I have copied this to Steve as well in acknowledgement of his reply.

Regards
Mike

From: Louise Reid [<mailto:Louise.Reid@tmbsc.gov.uk>]

Sent: Friday, April 22, 2016 15:16

To: Mike Taylor <mike.truck@btconnect.com>

Subject: Isles Quarry East

Mike

I am writing in response to your emails regarding the tree works that have recently taken place adjacent to the old Hanson office. I apologise for the delay in responding.

To clarify, in terms of TM/11/1191/FL (Erection of 171 dwellings), the red line on the site location plan showing the application site area does not extend to the Hanson office or to the east of Quarry Hill Road/ Thong Lane. The Tree Protection Plan submitted in relation to TM/11/01191/FL does not include the trees in these areas either.

However, the details submitted pursuant to condition 27 of TM/11/01191/FL (ecological enhancement), under TM/14/02862/RD, includes the areas of land that you have referred to and in view of the wording of that condition the scheme of ecological enhancement includes that area. The details that have been submitted and approved under TM/14/02862/RD show an area of "amenity grassland" to be provided to the east of the Hanson office where some of the clearance works have recently taken place. Consequently it appears that the works are not inconsistent with that provision and not in direct conflict with the condition 27 of TM/11/01191/FL.

As you know, Glenda met with Crest this morning in relation to other matters, and was able to discuss this with them. Crest have advised that the trees by the recycling area have been coppiced. There is an oak tree that has uprooted as a result of the watercourse running under and this has been cut back, to encourage it to grow upwards. Rear of the Hanson office, bramble and scrub has been removed by the tree surgeons at the same time, most of which was below 1.2m. This has been done to encourage the woodland beyond to have more air and light. They have sought advice from an arboriculturalist and ecologist prior to carrying out works.

Whilst they implied that they have been advised to carry out annual coppicing, etc. to maintain the area, they have also let us know that they will not need to carry out any further in the near future.

It is noted that the suggestion in your email yesterday of a breach of TM/94/155 has been investigated by KCC and has found not to be the case.

We will continue to monitor the site and maintain the dialogue with Crest. I note that you have also been in direct contact with the MD of Crest and I have seen his comments which appear to be reasonable.

I trust that this is of assistance.

Regards,

Louise Reid
Head of Planning
Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council



Dear Louise

I have deliberately waited for further works to happen at IQE before responding.

Firstly I copy below a sentence from your main email:

quote " *Rear of the Hanson office, bramble and scrub has been removed by the tree surgeons at the same time, most of which was below 1.2m. This has been done to encourage the woodland beyond to have more air and light. They have sought advice from an arboriculturalist and ecologist prior to carrying out works.* "

Firstly, the picture I sent that triggered this response was clearly far more extensive than "bramble and scrub cutting", as noted then it was excavation, as clearly shown in the att pics IQE1 and IQE1a, which you have already had. Now it may well be that Crest did not require planning approval for the work. But if you compare the spoil heap in 1 and 1a. and compare it to the laid surface in IQE2, it is quite clear that the clean topsoil with grass has been removed and replaced with another material, heavy with stones, on top of a membrane. It is also relevant that neither IQE1 or 1a show any sign of your alleged "bramble and scrub" infestation. I suspect that the imported material is some form of low grade sub-base of hoggins, and is not a suitable base for the alleged "amenity grassland".

There are several points at issue here:

1. I was under the impression that any material removed from, or introduced to a site required a transfer note, and I would like sight of these. Or has this been used to replace arsenic contaminated garden imports?
2. By far the most important point at issue is the clear attempt by very senior planning officers to deliberately mislead us again. Now I expect Crest as a developer to be economical with the truth, but I do not expect that from Officers. I won't refer to Glenda, because I presume she is junior to you, but you are an officer of vast experience who should know that Crest are not telling the truth, and yet you have attempted to alleviate our fears by passing on false information without comment.
4. If the tree removal at the IQE recycling area was coppicing, why have Crest not carried out any tree maintenance work anywhere else on their land, save where it impacts their construction. It should not be the job of the Parish Council to clear fallen trees from Crest land.

3. quote " *The details that have been submitted and approved under TM/14/02862/RD show an area of "amenity grassland" to be provided to the east of the Hanson office where some of the clearance works have recently taken place. Consequently it appears that the works are not inconsistent with that provision and not in direct conflict with the condition 27 of TM/11/01191/FL.* ", This is another attempt to mislead us- replacing good topsoil and grass that contained a protected orchid species with rubble is not conducive to providing "amenity grassland", so it is clearly not consistent with TM/14/02862/RD. I also att a Google image of the grassland which rather gives the lie to the "scrub and Bramble" allegation. I cannot find anything in 14/02862 or 11/01191/27 which requires Crest to dig up an established area of amenity grassland.

I accept that planning is not black and white, that there is a huge grey area between right and wrong, but yet again TMBC Planning Officers have strayed off the grey area completely into supporting developers so wholeheartedly that planning rules are being deliberately flouted, and are doing so knowing that they will be supported by a similarly

flawed legal advice. If you can't handle the protection of a bit of grass, what hope do we have for Kent in general, our home.

You will notice that this time I have carefully refrained from accusing anyone of lying.

I am copying this reply to Adrian Stanfield, so that he can begin his proceedings without delay, to the Leader, CEO and Director of Planning. See you all at the Standards Hearing.

Regards

Mike Taylor

