

HUNTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 14TH DECEMBER 2020 AT 7:30PM USING ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING

PRESENT: Cllr D Heaton in the Chair, Cllrs A Trought, T Stanbridge, R Lee, G Thomas and J Goddard and Mrs S Goodwin, Clerk.

IN ATTENDANCE: No members of the public were in attendance.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr H Ward.

2. FILMING AND RECORDING

There were no members of the public present to record the meeting.

3. COUNCILLOR DECLARATIONS

3.1 Declaration of Interests

Cllr Heaton declared an interest in Item 5.1, and will abstain from voting, as his wife has previously done some work for the applicant, who is a neighbour.

3.2 Dispensations

There were no requests for dispensations.

4. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 15TH SEPTEMBER 2020

The minutes of the meeting had been previously distributed and were agreed to be an accurate record. The Chairman will sign the official copy of the minutes at the next Planning Committee meeting held in person.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following applications were considered, and recommendations made:

5.1 Lantern Cottage, Barn Hill - 20/505445/FULL

Demolition of existing pergola, erection of a single storey flat roof side extension and installation of 3 no. rooflights to north elevation. Erection of a new pergola and conversion of outbuilding to outdoor kitchen, including internal alterations and associated hard and soft landscaping alterations.

Parish Council recommendation: No objection.

5.2 Gudgeon Farm House, West Street - 20/504996/FULL

Erection of pitched roof to existing side extension, alterations to windows and doors and placement of render and cladding.

Parish Council recommendation: No objection.

6. REPORTED PLANNING DECISIONS

The following decision, made by Maidstone Borough Council, was **Noted**:

6.1 Plots 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 Land at Lughorse Lane - 20/502744/FULL

To fence and gate agricultural field including Plots 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 and track for safe agricultural use, grazing livestock and to prevent trespassing.

Parish Council recommendation: No objection.

Maidstone Borough Council decision: Permitted.

7. MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: REGULATION 18 PREFERRED APPROACHES CONSULTATION

The following comments were raised by the parish councillors:

- There is no planned development for Hunton but there is an issue with Coxheath. Three developments are proposed, all to the north of Heath Road between Dean Street and Gallants Lane, which would form a ribbon development, extending Coxheath further into the countryside. The Dingley Dell site on the south side of Heath Road was rejected in the MBC Call For Sites exercise.
- The Leeds/Langley bypass is discussed in the consultation but not progressed. The bypass would result in more traffic in the Hunton area if it were built. KALC Maidstone Area sent a briefing note through about the consultation, which notes that MBC relies on houses being built to fund the Leeds/Langley bypass, but there is no surety that the bypass will go ahead.
- MBC is using the current housing algorithm provided by central government to calculate housing need, which results in a requirement for 1,214 houses a year, an increase from the 882 houses required in the 2017 Local Plan. The algorithm proposed in a new White Paper would take the number up to 1,532 houses per annum.
- There is inadequate detailed discussion of the infrastructure required to meet the housing need, either with KCC for highways and education or the local health authorities for doctors' surgeries. The Integrated Transport Plan may look good on paper, but nothing has taken place physically. Modal shift has not been successful. Cycle routes have not materialised - Maidstone is not suited for cycling anyway due to its topography and cars are required in rural areas. Infrastructure is always a secondary consideration in planning which no one in central or local government addresses. Planning applications are approved where there is a lack of infrastructure and lip service is paid to the objections of local people. Quality of life is gradually being eroded when these developments are approved.
- A local example of infrastructure issues is the development which has taken place in Yalding. Houses have been built near the school on Vicarage Road, which is often blocked. A development of 35 houses was built at Blunden Lane. Now there is a proposed development for 100 houses on Kenward Road, but Yalding bridge is an issue as it jams up every morning. The bus company has indicated that it may stop the bus service in the morning because of the delays caused by traffic at the bridge. Yalding is also losing its Post Office and only has one shop.
- There is mention of Maidstone competing with Ebbsfleet and Ashford for employment, which would mean building even more houses. Maidstone does not need more employment. Many houses have been built in the borough already and there is no noticeable requirement for additional employment as people are coming in with jobs, as a job is required to obtain a mortgage and therefore buy a house.
- MBC is not communicating adequately with neighbouring boroughs about the Local Plan. There is no duty to cooperate, so development on the edges of the borough with Tunbridge Wells, Swale, Ashford and Tonbridge & Malling is inconsistent.

Members **Agreed** that the Clerk and Cllr Thomas should respond to the consultation, to object to: the proposed developments in Coxheath and Yalding; lack of consideration of infrastructure; lack of discussion with neighbouring boroughs; and employment.

ACTION: CLERK/CLLR THOMAS

There being no further planning matters to be discussed, the meeting closed at 8:20pm.