

**MINUTES OF HORSMONDEN PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**  
**HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL at 7.30 P.M. ON MONDAY 8<sup>TH</sup> JUNE**  
**2015**

**Present:** Cllr March (Chair)  
Councillors Isaacs, Stevens, Russell, Hughes, Stanton and Davis .

**In attendance:** Lucy Noakes (Clerk)  
80 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 declared.

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

**2. PUBLIC SESSION:** (***Members of the public have the right to speak for up to three minutes at the Chairpersons discretion on issues concerning the Parish providing the Clerk has prior notification.***)

Cllr March explained how the meeting would run and set out the rules of the meeting. She explained that she would have 'called in' the Planning application TW/15/503392/FULL at Pullen's Farm , in her capacity as Borough Councillor, had it not already been called in by the Head of Planning at TWBC. The fact that the application had been 'called in' meant that the planning decision would be made at Committee level at TWBC rather than by an individual planning Officer.

Mr Huby was the first person to speak and he felt there had been a lack of proper consultation about such a major planning application and confusion over the dates for comments to be sent to TWBC. He also pointed out that AONB guidance states that development within such an area should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. He did not feel that the current application constituted exceptional circumstances and should therefore be declined.

Mrs Overton said that she felt that Friday's engagement with local people had been nonexistent in this case. She voiced concerns over the potential problems of flies no vermin as well as smell, which she felt would be detrimental to the local area. Mrs Overton mentioned long standing grievances suffered by residents at Frittenden owing to a chicken farm in the vicinity. She also mentioned incineration and the possible future expansion of operations at the site if planning permissions were granted. Mrs Overton felt this was all detrimental to the local area and would generate very little economic value for the area, as the labour force was v low. She felt that the land was prime farm land ideal for hops and fruit and that the application would be better suited to a brown field site.

Mr Overton then addressed the meeting. He felt that the Environmental Impact Assessment ( EIA) produced in the application was more hypothetical than based on evidence. The lorry deliveries mentioned, did not include those already operating at the site. Mr Overton pointed out the construction period of 6-9 months which he felt would cause disturbance locally. He said that there were problems associated with smell at sites where Fridays were already in operation, and where the manure is spread, and that Fridays had not adequately responded to these problems. Mr Overton spoke about air quality, as the EIA had focussed on keeping within minimum EU air qualities. He reminded people that Horsmonden's air quality is a long way above the EU minimum, but this could be easily reduced if the plans went. He felt the plans would alter the character of the area.

Mr Hore focussed on the disposal of waste from the site. Whilst it appeared that waste was to be carefully managed on site, he was concerned about the waste which was removed from the site as this could result in spillages on roads and would be likely to be spread on farmer's fields. He pointed out that the spreading of manure on fields was not a small problem and in other areas locally it has caused residents huge amounts of distress because of the large amounts of ammonia in the air, making some people feel nauseas and disorientated. Mr Hore is not aware that these issues have been solved in other areas.

Mr John was concerned about the size of the proposals and the fact that there had been no engagement or consultation of local residents, prior to the application. He did not feel that such a largely industrial use of the site could be compatible with neighbouring use of land. He was worried about the risk of vermin and smell, as well as possible disturbance to the watercourse locally, some of which had already been modified to prevent properties up stream from flooding. He did not feel that the applicant's business plans constituted the exceptional need required to build in such an area and asked the PC and TWBC to use planning legislation to prevent the application from being approved.

Mrs Brick agreed with the points already mentioned. She was especially concerned about the management of the manure, which she did not feel had been fully taken into account. Mrs Brick pointed out that nitrogen and phosphorus can lead to nutrient pollution especially in water courses where it encourages excessive algae growth which eliminates oxygen and harms wildlife and fish. Mrs Brick also said that manure can also contain harmful pathogens, antibiotics and metals, which when released into the atmosphere can be potentially damaging. She was concerned about the spreading of manure on fields which she felt could contain salmonella and antibiotic resistance.

Mr Lemerle agreed with a lot of the points already made but wanted to expand on his highways concerns. He said that the local roads were not designed for HGV use and although residents had to cater for existing farm use, the proposal was bound to lead to an increase. He felt there was little mentioned in the plans about the Highways impact and that the information provided was optimistic and implied that vehicles going to and from the site would use the A21, whilst in reality there would be little to enforce this once the farm was built. Mr Lemerle pointed out that the new access had been cut through ancient woodland and was wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass, despite the fact that Fridays had said there would only be one vehicle movement a day from the site. The access would mean travelling around an extremely sharp bend on the Lamberhurst Road, which was notorious for near misses with large vehicles who would regularly swing out at the back end when negotiating the bend, narrowly avoiding cars on the other side of the road.

Mr Edmonds-Bell mentioned lack of consultation and time to review the documentation and comment. He felt that much more work was needed to properly assess the risks involved. He believed that the only beneficiaries of the application would be Fridays themselves as the planned farm only created 4 part time jobs. He felt that the application in no way met the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, as it did not enhance or conserve the area. Instead he thought it constituted a detrimental and permanent change to the landscape. Mr Edmonds-Bell mentioned how he had heard that chicken farms had blighted local communities and left residents unhappy. He was concerned that if granted permission, Fridays would then extend the site. Mr Edmonds-Bell was also concerned about the potential increase in flood risk owing to run off.

Mr Morton confirmed that he was in agreement with the points and concerns already raised and objected strongly to the planning application on this basis.

Mrs Kerrigan strongly objected to the proposal and wished to see the protection of the AONB. She stated that this was not farming in the usual sense, it was egg production on an industrial scale and was against the principles of the NPPF paragraph 5 which outlined that AONB should be preserved for wildlife, and could only be built upon in exceptional circumstances. Fridays' only evidence of need was based on an apparent 'egg production shortage', which was speculative and of no benefit to Horsmonden as a community. Mrs Kerrigan went on to say that she believed only Friday's would benefit from the project, as there was not even any guarantee that the 6 part time jobs mentioned would go to Horsmonden residents. Mrs Kerrigan said that she believed the parish Council had refused planning permission for projects much smaller than this one, and hoped therefore that they would be able to do the same for this one.

Mrs Ackenhead wished to point out that she had not seen any proposals for filters on the outlets from the sheds or incinerator. She had not read any evidence to suggest that the paddocks would be rested in order to allow renewal of the land, hence she believed that this would lead to run off and an alteration of the landscape surrounding the sheds. She believed that Fridays needed to implement swales and reed beds to protect the landscape, but had not seen any evidence to suggest that these were part of the planning.

Mr Harvey was representing the applicant. He said that in the time available to speak, he felt there was little chance of being able to answer all of the points raised, but offered to be available to answer questions outside the Village Hall after the meeting. He also wished to arrange a day when residents would potentially visit one of Friday's farms to see how they were run.

He mentioned the timetable for comments with TWBC and said that the applicant would not object if TWBC wished to take into account any points or objections submitted by residents after the closing date for comments had passed.

He felt that one of the main points raised was odour and wished to emphasise that the proposal was for modern sheds which were mechanically ventilated, and not like the old style chicken houses used previously at sites. Technology would keep the manure dry and therefore manage the odour more efficiently than at some other sites. The manure would also be removed weekly and go to local farms, with whom Fridays would have a contract. Fridays had a responsibility with regards to how the manure was used by farmers and this was managed carefully.

The public session ended as no one else had requested to speak. It was proposed by Cllr March at this point that point 5.Planning in the agenda be brought forward for discussion by the council , unanimous.

## 5. PLANNING

### 5.1 Planning Applications

Cllr March explained that this application had been advertised in the Kent Messenger on 22<sup>nd</sup> May, as a major application with potential environmental impact. TWBC were still waiting to hear back from Highways department and from their independent Environmental Impact assessor. She also explained that the Parish Council were not able to contact individual parishioners about plans in their area. The process was that notices are put up on the site and those in the immediate vicinity are notified by TWBC planning. As a Parish Council we are invited to give our comments as consultees in all applications in the parish

The Councillors then went on to discuss in some details the points raised by parishioners in the public session, before reaching a decision on their recommendation:

Planning Application No:	TW/15/503392/FULL
Proposal:	<b><u>Erection of a new free range poultry house together with associated access road and planting of around 9870 trees and shrubs.</u></b>
Location:	Land At Pullen's Farm Lamberhurst Road Horsmonden Tonbridge Kent
Recommendation:	Refusal
Proposed:	Cllr Davis, seconded Cllr Stanton. Carried.
Comments:	Recommended refusal on the following grounds: - The Highways aspects. Lorries would have to negotiate a 90 degree bend to get in and out of the site. There would be no controls over where lorries would go once permission was granted. - Environmental impact on woodland - Size of the proposed building - Run off from the exposed land - Lack of opportunity for employment - The economic benefits do not outweigh the environmental impact on an AONB - There is no comparable use of land in the area

Planning	
----------	--

Application No:	TW/15/501440/FULL
Proposal:	<b><u>Conversion of two office buildings to 9 apartments with associated internal alterations and changes to fenestration</u></b>
Location:	Orchard Business Park Furnace Lane Horsmonden Tonbridge Kent
Recommendation:	Approval.
Proposed:	Cllr Hughes, seconded Cllr Stanton. Unanimous
Comments:	Suitable use of a site. However, the Parish council feel that parking is inadequate and could spread out onto Furnace Lane. The PC would therefore like to see an increase of parking spaces.

March then proposed that the council discuss item 8.3 Music Festival as Sara Foster was waiting to feedback on this, unanimous.

### 8.3 **Music Festival 12<sup>th</sup> -14<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

Sara Foster had been speaking to the Clerk about liability for the events. On Friday evening it was the PC's event, therefore covered by their liability, Saturday afternoon school fete was covered by their liability insurance as it was the school's event. On Saturday evening back to the PC's insurance for the musical event. The Sunday morning was the churches event and covered by their liability insurance, however in the afternoon the vintage cars were not covered by this, or by the PC's insurance (as not their event as such.) Last year the vintage cars had been a NSPCC event. Sara had asked Tennyson insurance for a quotation and they had come back to say that they would cover the wheel weekends event for a premium of £400, but this was an annual premium.

It was noted that the cars were not really part of the Music festival event organised by the PC and the PC were therefore happy for the music festival group to cover them. It was proposed by Cllr Hughes that Cllr Cleek and Cllr March authorise any amount up to £200 in respect of a premium to cover the insurance with Horsmonden Summer festival group as the insurers.

It was also noted that the marquee would now be coming down on Sunday at about 5pm. This would save the security guard from covering Sunday as arranged. Instead it had been proposed at the music festival group meeting, that the money pay for stewards on the Saturday, as volunteers had been slow forthcoming for this. The Parish Council were agreeable to this.

It was proposed from the Chair that the meeting resume its normal order as on the agenda, after this item, but leaving the non urgent planning until the end of the meeting. Unanimous.

### 3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

#### **Minutes of the Annual Parish Council Meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> May 2015 and Planning Meeting 20<sup>th</sup> May 2015.**

The Minutes of the Annual Parish Council Meeting 11<sup>th</sup> May were presented to the Council as read and proposed for acceptance by the Chair. Unanimous.

The Minutes of the planning committee meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> May were presented as read and proposed for acceptance by the Chair. Carried.

### 4. **MATTERS ARISING. (No decisions taken)**

#### **Water bills**

**Cllr Russell** had continued to read the water meter at the public toilets.

He said he would read again before the festival weekend and report at the July meeting.

#### **Conservation Area Map**

**Cllr Davis** reported that he had spoken with Mark Stevenson at TWBC regarding this matter and would meet the following Wednesday to discuss final layout and construction.

#### **Buses to Paddockwood.**

Nothing more to report at present.

#### **Public Rights of Way**

The *Clerk* was still waiting to hear back from KCC on this matter

### **The Institute**

Cllr Isaacs had now received the engineers report. The engineer was trying to local at suitable type of bolt to hold the plaque in place. *Clerk* to report back in July as to whom the council could ask to tender on this project.

Cllrs had met with Chris Reed regarding the plans for the forecourt, and they were happy with these. *Cllr Stevens* would liaise with Pam Pemberton about the clock tower lighting, after the festival.

### **Street Cruiser**

This was now arranged and finalised to come four times during the summer time, with the driver and Sophie Dezechache on board.

### **Christmas Lighting**

*Robin Morton* is pursuing funding options with local families who may be able to offer some support. *Cllr Davis* was to purchase another set of lights for the green after the music festival.

## **6. PARISH COUNCIL FINANCE**

### **6.1 Parish Council Accounts to 7th June 2015**

The Clerk presented the accounts including cheques drawn, up to 7th June, as shown below, to those present. Cllr Russell proposed acceptance of the accounts, seconded by Cllr Stevens, Unanimous.

#### **Horsmonden Parish Council Accounts as at 7th June 2015**

	<b>Balances</b>
Current account b/fwd 11.05.2015	£ 60,974.36
Deposit account b/fwd 11.05.2015	£ 60,004.37
Interest received (Deposit Account)	

<b>Item</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Receipts</b>	<b>Payments</b>
Zurich Municipal - PC insurance	401613		£ 3,156.14
LPM Bohemia, the Tent co. Ltd - marquee hire	401614		£ 2,121.38
Golden Hill Nurseries - trees for VG	401615		£ 830.00
Mrs L D Noakes - May salary	S/O		£ 880.70
HM Revenue and Customs - Tax and NI L Noakes	401616		£ 69.17
Mr C J Couchman - clock and play area	401617		£ 103.85
Mrs L Noakes - refund of recorded delivery charges	401618		£ 6.45
The Marketing Solution - signs for APM	401619		£ 41.98
Communicorp - clerks and councils direct	401620		£ 12.00
Specialist Hygiene services Ltd- toilet cleaning May	401621		£ 187.20
SSE Contracting Ltd - May street lighting maintenance	410622		£ 71.26
SE Medical Limited - medical cover for festival	410623		£ 475.00
Young People bus services - youth bus hire	401624		£ 280.00
Kent County council - April Legal fees	401625		£ 21.60
Kent County council - Internal audit year end fee	401626		£ 165.00
Horsmonden Village Hall - parish office rent	401627		£ 900.00
Viking Direct - stationery	401628		£ 28.52
oyez - legal lease form -parish office	401629		£ 22.36
Cheque payments for casino night - music festival		£ 890.00	
Cheque payments for casino night - music festival		£ 420.00	
interest paid on current account		£ 8.36	

£ 52,920.11

Current Account as at 07.06.15  
Deposit Account as at 07.06.15

£ 60,004.37

£ 112,924.48

**TOTAL BANK:**

**7. HIGHWAYS AND GROUNDS MAINTENANCE**

**7.1 Highways issues – footpaths, trees, roads, signs, verges, and markings**

Cllr Stevens had met with the drainage engineer and shown him the problems at Hayman's Hill and Yew Tree green Road.

Cllr Stevens reported the following:

- There are several trees which seem to be supported by ivy in the hedgerow of Brooklands. Clerk to write to the owner and ask them to review the hedge. Offer advice from the tree warden if they would like it.
- Ask Emma Pavitt to review the white lines in the village as many are worn and faded.
- Dead branch over road at Hayman's Hill (clerk has already reported this)
- Lots of debris still next to the road where a tree came down near to Wrangling Cottage, Furnace Lane. This needs removing.

The Clerk reported that Dukes had now obtained a soil sample and she would report on this next time. Dukes would try and obtain a quote for adding the necessary minerals, together with a timescale.

**8. ADMINISTRATION**

**8.1 The Institute –plans for the front of the building, engineers report for plaque.**

Cllr Isaacs had obtained the engineers report, but the engineer was still trying to find a supplier for the correct type of bolts to hold the plaque in place. Clerk to commence drafting tender comments and finding details of possible builders.

**8.2 Village Vision (including quotations for Shelters)**

The public had requested a 5m diameter wooden hexagonal shelter at the Annual parish Meeting. The Clerk would obtain three quotations for this and bring to the next meeting. Cllrs to look at where the shelter can be sited.

**8.3 Music Festival 12<sup>th</sup> -14<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

Covered previously

**8.4 Emergency Planning**

The group hoped to circulate a revised version of the letter which would go out to Parishioners, shortly.

**8.5 Love Where We Live Awards.**

It had been suggested that Pauline Bell be nominated for Individual Hero Award, however the council felt that as David Bell also did so much, it would be nice to nominate them as a couple for the award.

John Couchman to be nominated for Life Time Achievement Award and the Cycle Horsmonden group to be nominated for Best Group. This was proposed by Cllr Stevens, seconded by Cllr Russell and voted for unanimously.

**9. CORRESPONDENCE/UPDATES**

### 9.1 **Chairman's update (no decisions)**

Nothing to be reported this time.

### 9.2 **Meetings attended (updates and feedback from meetings attended and held by council members –no decisions)**

It was reported that Cllrs March and Hughes were to attend the Horsefair meeting at Tunbridge Wells the following day.

### 5.1 **Planning**

Cllr March proposed that the Council resume the rest of the planning agenda if time still allowed, with the exception of applications TW/15/503684/FULL and TW/15/503271/FULL , as the council did not yet need to send its comments in to TWBC regarding these two applications and they could therefore be discussed at the next planning meeting. Unanimous.

Planning Application No:	TW/15/503506/FULL
Proposal:	<b>Demolish separate bungalow, demolish house conservatory and replace with a two storey side extension. New front porch and alterations to existing bay detail and fenestration</b>
Location:	Grovehurst Farmhouse Grovehurst Lane Horsmonden Tonbridge Kent TN12 8BQ
Recommendation:	Approval
Proposed:	Cllr Stevens, seconded Cllr Isaacs, unanimous
Comments:	Recommended approval on the grounds that it is an acceptable extension

Planning Application No:	TW/13/00759/FUL
Proposal:	<b>Erection of single storey dwelling house, external walled courtyard, swimming pool</b>
Location:	Land junction of Ruck Lane, Spelmonden Road Ruck Lane, Horsmonden.
Recommendation:	Refusal
Proposed:	Cllr Hughes, seconded Cllr Isaacs. Carried.
Comments:	The circumstances have not changed since the parish council discussed the application previously.

### 5.2 **Report of Permissions Granted and Refused**

None to report at this meeting.

### 5.3 **Appeal lodged – TW/14/502127 – Lawful development certificate (existing): siting of mobile home for residential purposes. Enforcement Appeal ref: APP/M2270/C/15/3007522. Bassett's Farm and Land Maidstone Road, Horsmonden.**

The Council looked at the Appeal. The following statement was proposed by Cllr Hughes and seconded by Cllr Davis, unanimous: The Council has reviewed their previous decision and stand by everything they said.

### 5.4 **Other Planning matters can be raised, but no decisions.**

No discussions.

**The meeting ended at 10.07pm**