

**MINUTES OF HORSMONDEN PARISH COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING MEETING HELD IN HORSMONDEN VILLAGE HALL, HORSMONDEN**  
**AT 7.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY 21ST MARCH 2017**

*Copyright Notice - Plans, drawing and material submitted to the Council are protected by the Copyright Acts (Section 47, 1988 Act). You may only use material that is downloaded or printed for consultation purposes; to compare current applications with previous schemes and to check whether developments have been completed in accordance with approved plans. Further copies must not be made without the prior permission of the copyright owner*

**Present:** Cllrs March, Holloway, Stevens, Isaacs, Russell, Davis, Jenkinson, and Richards

**In attendance** Lucy Noakes (Clerk) and 17 members of the public present.

**Declarations of Interest:** Declarations of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests in accordance with the Code of Conduct were invited. None were recorded

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr Larkin

**2. PUBLIC SESSION**

Nine members of the public had requested to speak about TW/17/00763/FULL – Land west of Maidstone Road, Horsmonden.

Mrs Kerrigan made the following points: the proposed development was outside the current curtilage for development; the size of the development was too large and too dense for the rural locality; the proposal would make the area lose its rural appearance and appeal ; the proposal offered no sheltered housing for the elderly; the ecological report suggested that there was not much wildlife present, however local residents know that this is not the case; a pumping station would be needed for drainage, however residents were concerned on how this would impact on a situation where drainage for some residents was already problematic; the development offers parking for only 28 cars, which is insufficient in an area where there is v little public transport; the development will cause more traffic and congestion on what is already a busy road through the village , used for heavy traffic. Mrs Kerrigan ended by requesting that parish councillors recommend rejection of the proposal.

Mr Currie also asked the council to recommend rejection and made the following points: this is a green field site with a lot of wildlife including slowworms, birds and rare species; the impact on local roads and infrastructure; the speed limit in this area was 30mph but the average speed is far more than this; the proposal suggests too many houses squashed into a small area; the proposal mentions a pumping station but this is not shown on the plans.

Mr Stubbings mentioned the density and setting of the proposal as being inappropriate on the historic edge of the limits to built development and felt that any development should reflect the area more appropriately by being low density like the surrounding houses on the road which are one house deep. Any development here should not incorporate any street lighting, in order to limit light pollution; landscaping would also be required to maintain privacy and rural views and this should not be left to a planning condition, which may not ever be carried out by developers. Mr Stubbings mentioned Neighbourhood planning which he felt could provide more sustainable development and help to provide adequate housing in the right place at the right time.

Mrs Rigby could not be present but asked the Clerk to read aloud her statement which asked the council to recommend refusal of the proposal and drew special attention to the potential destruction of habitat of the Hazel Dormouse. The ecological survey had found evidence of at least a breeding pair of Dormice. Mrs Rigby pointed out that it is against the law to disturb these protected species in any way and anyone doing so could face imprisonment or fine.

Mr Kerrigan also made the point that this proposal was outside the limits to built development, and as such he felt the only exception to building on this site should be for affordable housing. He pointed out that although the developers had allowed for some affordable housing in the development these were different sized units to the rest with substantially less bedrooms per unit. In affect this reduced the percentage of affordable housing from 35% to nearer 20% when calculated as the number of bedrooms provided rather than the number of dwellings. Mr Kerrigan reiterated that the village requires affordable housing for the young who wish to stay in the village and cannot afford the high house prices and sheltered housing for the elderly who wish to downsize .

Mrs Naude could not be present and had asked to the clerk to read a statement on her behalf. She asked the council to note her objection to the application. She believed the proposed properties did not reflect or complement the character of surrounding properties. She felt the entrance to the site would be overbearing and scale of the development would adversely affect the privacy of the grade 2 listed property opposite and other adjoining properties. Mrs Naude also made the point that the development was outside the limits to built development and would lead to the loss of valuable green space, eroding the rural setting and taking habitat from the wildlife. She felt that Highways safety would be compromised by the access road, increased traffic and parking and this would all have an impact on the right for a safe and quiet environment.

Mr Gordon also asked the clerk to read a statement on his behalf. He mentioned that he felt there was already an issue when trying to pull out of Kirkins Close because of parked cars close to the junction, which made the Maidstone Road

particularly difficult with large articulated vehicles often trying to navigate to in and out of parked cars. He believed the proposal would generate more traffic, in an area often used by pedestrians to access the sports grounds and tennis club etc. Mr Gordon felt that no more development should take place until the current traffic issue were resolved, as they would increase the risk of serious accidents occurring.

Mr Hart-Dyke agreed with all the points made by others. He particularly made the point that the development was too dense especially in comparison to the rest of the housing in that location, outside the limit to built development. He said it would spoil the rural quality of the area and he felt that quantity had overruled quality in this development. Mr Hart-Dyke was concerned about the development setting a dangerous precedent for the future. The development would run along the side of his property and bring light pollution and noise for him and others in the vicinity, also increasing cars and parking in the area.

Mrs Francis agreed with the others in that the development was too dense outside the limits of built development and was inappropriate. She mentioned that the village had already had several other developments built in recent years. She felt that the land report was flawed in its statement about drainage as was the ecological report which admitted that some of the area could not be surveyed. The pavement in this area was narrow and pedestrians passing often have to step off into the road. Mrs Francis agreed with the comments made by those who had spoken previously.

Mrs Reed had requested to speak in the public session as the applicant of TW/17/00441/FULL – 20 Hoath Meadow. She explained that she and her husband wished to extend the space in their family home as they now had three children and not enough rooms to sleep them all adequately. The extension would provide an adequate amount of space for them as a growing family and allow them to stay in the village. They had investigated the alternative of moving but unfortunately the house prices were prohibitive for them as a family and the extension of their current property seemed to be the best way to enable them to stay in Horsmonden and allow them to continue to be an active part of the community.

### 3. PLANNING

#### 3.1 Applications/Submissions:

The Council spent some time looking at the plans and discussing this application in some detail before reaching a decision.

<b>Planning Application No:</b>	TW/17/00763/FULL
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b><u>Development of 17 dwellings with associated infrastructure, landscaping and formation of a new highway</u></b>
<b>Location:</b>	Land West Of Maidstone Road Horsmonden Tonbridge Kent
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Recommended refusal
<b>Proposal:</b>	Cllr Isaacs, seconded Cllr Stevens, carried.
<b>Comments:</b>	Recommended refusal on the ground that this is over development of one of the last remaining sections of open countryside in the village.

<b>Planning Application No:</b>	TW/17/00441/FULL
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b><u>Demolition of rear conservatory and construction of a two storey rear and side extensions with alterations to front porch</u></b>
<b>Location:</b>	20 Hoath Meadow Back Lane Horsmonden Tonbridge Kent TN12 8LJ
<b>Recommendation:</b>	The Council wished to remain neutral
<b>Proposal:</b>	Cllr Russell, seconded Cllr Stevens, carried.
<b>Comments:</b>	The Council wishes to remain neutral as they feel they have insufficient information regarding the potential loss of light to the adjoining property.

<b>Planning Application No:</b>	TW/17/00623/FULL
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b><u>Proposed first floor rear extension and minor internal alterations</u></b>
<b>Location:</b>	8 Diamond Field Spelmonden Road Horsmonden Tonbridge TN12 8EG
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Recommended approval.
<b>Proposal:</b>	Cllr Stevens, seconded Cllr Holloway. Unanimous.
<b>Comments:</b>	Recommended approval. A suitable development for the rear of the property.

<b>Planning Application No:</b>	TW/17/00669/FULL
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b><u>Variation of Condition 2 (Plans) of 15/501918/FULL (Proposed conversion of redundant barn no.1 to a single residential dwelling and construction of detached garage) - Amendments to internal layout and internal works to accommodate the conversion, retention of weatherboarding to rear elevation, retention of the existing historic cart doors, retention of the existing historic threshing gate, new external doors and two new rooflights to the Western end, removal of raised concrete floor, revised rear elevation openings and creation of new first floor</u></b>

<b>Location:</b>	Barn 30M S Of Yew Tree Farmhouse Yew Tree Green Road Horsmonden Tonbridge TN12 8HP
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Recommended approval.
<b>Proposal:</b>	Cllr Isaacs, seconded Cllr Davis, Unanimous.
<b>Comments:</b>	Recommended approval. Reasonable alterations to a plan already approved by the council.

<b>Planning Application No:</b>	TW/17/00665/LBC
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b><u>Revised proposal for conversion of redundant barn no. 1 to a single residential dwelling and construction of detached garage</u></b>
<b>Location:</b>	Barn 30M S Of Yew Tree Farmhouse Yew Tree Green Road Horsmonden Tonbridge TN12 8HP
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Recommended approval
<b>Proposal:</b>	Cllr Stevens seconded Cllr Richards, unanimous.
<b>Comments:</b>	Recommended approval subject to the conservation architects comments.

### **3.2 Applications granted and refused.**

#### **Applications Granted**

TW/17/00193/FULL – Stiles Farmhouse, Maidstone Road.  
 TW/16/07666/FULL – Diamond Cottage, Spelmonden Road.  
 TW/16/07870/FULL – Mount Easy Farmhouse, School House Lane

#### **Applications refused.**

None

### **3.3 Other planning matters ( discussion only – no decisions)**

Cllr March pointed out that as from 1<sup>st</sup> April those owning neighbouring properties will not be informed of planning proposals by TWBC, however the yellow planning notices will still be put on the site and the consultation period commences from the time the notice goes up.

**There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.00pm**