

MINUTES

**UNDER THE CORONAVIRUS ACT [2020]
A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE COLLIER STREET PARISH COUNCIL
[PLANNING & FINANCE COMMITTEE]**

Took place on Monday 5th October 2020 commencing at 6.00pm

In attendance	Cllr Steve Sandys
Chairman Cllr David Goff	Cllr Dave Sealey
Vice Chair Cllr Andrew Papas	Parish Clerk – Alan Crocker
Cllr Steve Barham	Vicki, a representative of Bloomfield’s Chartered Town Planners
Cllr Deborah Papas	

DC.10.20.01. Apologies	No apologies received	
DC.10.20.02. Declarations of Interest	None declared	
DC.10.20.03 PLANNING	Cllr Dave Sealey chaired the Planning part of the meeting	
DC.10.20.03.01	20/503935/FULL	
	White Hart, Claygate, Marden, TN12 9PL	
	Demolition of the existing former public house and erection of 4 no. dwellinghouses, including associated landscaping and biodiversity enhancements.	

1. The agents acting for the owner agreed to meet with the parish council and members of the immediate community to discuss a way forward with this development that would be acceptable to all parties. This meeting was never offered by the agents.
2. MBC quote in the last application....'by virtue of the late submission of evidence relating to the viability of the public house and without it being independently assessed by a professional, it has not been demonstrated that the operation as a public house is not viable and that it is unlikely to become commercially viable'. Has this viability report now been independently assessed, and should this documentation not be part of this application?
3. We therefore fully support local comment that the applicant(s) have not tried to diversify their business before applying for demolition.
4. We also agree with local comment that the site itself is in a remote and rural location, sited away from any amenities within walking distance. It is another car-dependent sprawl in the countryside.
5. Although less cramped, the proposed development, by virtue of its scale, and prominent location would consolidate sporadic and urbanising development in the area, and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the countryside hereabouts. This would constitute poor design, contrary to the aims of policies SS1, SP17, DM1, DM5 and DM30 of the Maidstone Local Plan (2017); and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
6. The proposal by virtue of its location is far removed from any services, facilities and shops, where the local road network is of narrow unlit country lanes, would result in future occupants having to travel in private motor vehicles to villages or other settlements to access day to day

needs. This over reliance on private motor vehicles would be contrary to the aims of sustainable development as set out in policies SS1, SP17 and DM1 of the Maidstone Local Plan (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

7. Without a site-specific flood risk assessment, we would draw to the attention of the local planning authority the following observationsWe have asked the Middle Medway Flood Resilience Scheme for a formal qualification of the Fzone and they will be reverting to us. In the interim a quick check does confirm the site of the White Hart at the junction of Spenny Lane and the B2162 is within Flood Zone 1. We attach a snapshot below. [the system would not allow this snapshot to be included] We will therefore sent the case officer a separate email]

There is a "loophole" in the guidance for which this is a good example. All development in FZ3 needs to account for increased flood depths a result of climate change, but no such requirement exists for FZ1 and the EA are not consulted. The issue is for sites such as these which are located just outside FZ3 and so could be vulnerable to flooding in the future but aren't at present. So, a developer is quite within his rights to propose standard housing and be unaware that it could flood in the future, but it would not be picked up during the planning consultation. If they are able to, my advice would be to identify the climate change flood levels and design to these levels.

Will be sent to the case officer separately.

Source: Middle Medway Flood Resilience Scheme.

The meeting expressed real concerns with the maintenance of surface and foul water waste and wished to see a surface wate/foul water management plan. As there are no maintained ditches in the area, this would only add to the existing issues with surface water. There is no mention of where a tank would be situated on the site - and there is no infrastructure to support.

8. This would be contrary to the aims of policy DM1 of the Maidstone Local Plan (2017), the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), and the National Planning Practice Guidance.

9. The proposal would therefore result in the unjustified loss of a community facility, contrary to policies SP17, SP20, and DM17 of the Maidstone Local Plan (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

10. Why does the ecological survey not cover the entire area? It has therefore not been demonstrated, that protected species would not be adversely impacted upon. This would be contrary to the aims of policies DM1 and DM3 of the Maidstone Local Plan (2017); Paragraph 99 of Government Circular (ODPM 06/2005) Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations & Their Impact Within the Planning System; Natural England Standing Advice; and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application. In this instance: The application was considered to be fundamentally contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan and the NPPF, and these were not considered to be any solutions to resolve this conflict.

The meeting requires clarification of the following issues:

A. Confirmation that the applicant is not proposing any development detailed blue on the supporting plan.

B. Concerns over the management of the adjoining land. Will the owner retain ownership? Or what are the intentions regarding this portion of land?

C. There appears to be no access for this land to be maintained.

D. It appears that the residents would access the properties directly onto the street.

E. Issues with ownership of the land affronting the property - the agents agreed to seek clarification from the owner/ Kent Highways Definition Team.

F. Under Community Safety. Limited space on the B2162 for buses to pull in from the road.

G. Ownership of the drains to be ascertained.

POINTS OF CLARIFCATION POST-MEETING.

Agent Response

In respect of the land ownership queries raised I can confirm that the red/blue lines accurately represent the land within our client's ownership.

We are keen to work with the Parish Council to present a development which is beneficial for the community as a whole.

In the meeting it was clear that there were concerns in respect of the area where school children currently wait for the school bus. If we were to propose a layby for the school bus, would this help to address your concerns. No indication given of heating mechanism which if oil or gas would need storage provision.

DC.10.20.03.02	20/504139/FULL	9 October 2020
	Willows End Green Lane Collier Street Yalding Kent TN12 9RB	
	Retrospective planning application for the change of use of a stable block to a customer services building and shop, including associated external alterations	

The Parish Council voted 5 for -1 abstention to support this application.

DC.10.20.03.06
FINANCE

No payments to authorise

Minutes prepared by

ALAN CROCKER

Clerk to Collier Street Parish Council