PRESENT – Cllrs Marsh, Wanstall, Robbins, Kewley, Manion, Bond and Kevin Lynch, Parish Clerk. 26 members of the public.

2. To receive declarations of interest to matters included on the agenda 3. To resolve that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 29 July are a correct record. 4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). The Clerk then outlines on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Clir Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iiii) Council to write to the S of S to take for revocation (iiii) Council to write to the S of S to ask for revocation of firm House of Common Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State wall generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various inserse: (i) Highway safety. (iii) Athink tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation (ix) CPRE and a Judicial Review	1.	To receive apologies	Cllrs Dyer, Jull, Cronk, Kenton	
a. To resolve that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 29 July are a correct record. 4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk then outlined some options for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Permission Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Permission Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Permission Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to the S of S of S with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Parmission that the meeting was discussing: " the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "green wedge". (iii) Mischledn saturation		To receive declarations of		
3. To resolve that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 29 July are a correct record. 4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Communities and Local Government or revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Art Clerk then outlined statistics, only three requests for revocation (ii) Council to twrite to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Permission He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Clir Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (iii) Athink tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) Sholden saturation				
of the Parish Council meeting held on 29 July are a correct record. 4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). The Clerk then outlined some options for council down the development would cause. Clir Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (ii) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power (Section 100) only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Athink tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The 'green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			Drange de Clir Wangtall Congress de Clir Koudey, All Agreed	
meeting held on 29 July are a correct record. 4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). South Planning Act 1990: A. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council of the vice casking them to write to the S of S with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to sk for revocation (ii) Council to write to the S of S to sk for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to sk for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to sk for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ak for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vii)	3.		Proposed: Ciir Wanstali, Seconded: Ciir Kewley. Ali Agreed.	
a correct record. 4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990. Country				
4. Public Participation 5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Beginning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). The Clerk then outlined submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successfully lobbying the Secretary of State to revoke the development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (ii) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: " the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) Sholden saturation		•		
5. Churchfield Farm Planning Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). The Clerk then outlined some options for revocation (ii) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council to to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety, (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution, (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation	4.		Yes – Reserved for item 5	
Decision: To consider requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (ii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) Sholden saturation				
State for Flousing, Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Country Planning Act 1990. Country Planning Act 1990 Country Planning Act 1990 Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (iii) A think tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation		•	·	
Communities and Local Government to revoke planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Robbins agreed that there was very little or no chance of successfully lobbying the Secretary of State to revoke the planning permission. He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vii) Air quality/pollution. (viii) The "green wedge". (viiii) Sholden saturation		requesting the Secretary of		
Government to revoke planning permission for the land at Churchfield Farm. He highlighted various thoughts on how to do this. Clir Robbins agreed that there was very little or no chance of successfully lobbying the Secretary of State to revoke the planning permission. He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Clir Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
planning permission for Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Farm. He highlighted various thoughts on how to do this. Cllr Robbins agreed that there was very little or no chance of successfully lobbying the Secretary of State to revoke the planning permission. He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Churchfield Farm (Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Robbins agreed that there was very little or no chance of successfully lobbying the Secretary of State to revoke the planning permission. He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
successfully lobbying the Secretary of State to revoke the planning permission. He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (iii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
Country Planning Act 1990). planning permission. He added that the best way forward was to present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			,	
present a case on the environmental damage that the development would cause. Clir Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: " the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
development would cause. Cllr Marsh reported that, according to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation		Country Flamming Act 1000).		
to published statistics, only three requests for revocation (from planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
none had been successful. 3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv) Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
3. The Clerk then outlined some options for Council (i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			planning authorities) had been submitted since 2009/2010 and	
(i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			none had been successful.	
(i) Council to write to the S of S with new evidence asking for revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
revocation (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
 (ii) Council to write to Dover District Council with new evidence asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation 			`'	
asking them to write to the S of S to ask for revocation (iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
(iii) Council not to act upon Section 100 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
Country Planning Act 1990. The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
The Clerk reconfirmed to Council and the gallery the wording from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			•	
from House of Commons Briefing Paper "Revocation of planning permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
permission" that the meeting was discussing: "the Secretary of State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
State will generally use this power [Section 100] only if the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
original decision is judged to be grossly wrong, so that damage is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			ı ·	
is likely to be done to the wider public interest". 4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
4. Members of the public raised various issues: (i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
(i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			is incly to be dolle to the wider public litterest.	
(i) Highway safety. (ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			4. Members of the public raised various issues:	
(ii) Missing ecological report. (iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			·	
(iii) A think tank. (iv)Lack of support from DDC. (v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
(v) The "shared space" (including the Lord Homes intervention). (vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			(iii) A think tank.	
(vi) Air quality/pollution. (vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation				
(vii) The "green wedge". (viii) Sholden saturation			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
(viii) Sholden saturation			`	
(IX) CPRE and a Judicial Review				
			(IX) OFRE and a Judicial Review	
5. The Council and Clerk responded to the various issues			5. The Council and Clerk responded to the various issues	
raised. They referred back to the House of Commons Briefing				
Paper and also to two letters from the Planning Inspectorate				
(representing the S of S) written in response to representations				

Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of Sholden Parish Council held on Tuesday 10 September at 7.00pm in Sholden Scout HQ

	from Cllr Wanstall and a member of the public. The two letters answered the issues raised (the matter of the of the CPRE intervention had been dealt with sometime ago as had the Lord Homes intervention) and there did not seem to be any new evidence presented which would reach the threshold that the Inspector's decision was grossly wrong and would impact on the wider public interest. 6. After further discussion, Council agreed that members of the public should write to the Clerk, by 21 October, presenting their new evidence to support (as above) a decision that was grossly wrong and which impacted on the wider public interest. In doing so, the Clerk encouraged members of the public to acquaint themselves with the contents of the House of Commons Briefing Paper and the two Planning Inspectorate letters. These representations would be collated by the Clerk and their findings subject to further discussion at the Sholden Parish Council meeting on 28 October.	
6. To receive agenda items for the next Parish Council meeting to be held on 30 September 2019	None	
	The Meeting Closed at 7.55pm	