

Draft Notes/minutes for SPC meeting December 10, 2007 incorporating Clerk's running order for December meeting

1. Apologies

Martin Miles (Chairman), Sue Lee, Curtis Galbraith (Clerk)
Lynette Sergeant took the chair as Vice Chairman, Libby Cohen took notes.

2. Minutes of the last Meeting

No minutes of the last month were available

3. Borough & County Councillors' Reports

No Borough Councillors were present

PC Tony Wiles, the community police officer, greeted everyone and informed them that thieves had been targeting Ightham Mote car park where visitors stowed their handbags and valuables in the boots of their cars. He warned that anyone putting items in their car boots should make sure that there was no-one observing them when they did so. It was mentioned that the same could apply to walkers parking on the common. PC Wiles suggested that they leave their bags at home, and carry necessary valuables with them. Libby Cohen suggested that a warning to that effect could be posted on the Shipbourne website.

4. Questions from public

Members of the Public: Mrs Lucy Bull, James Sheldrick's daughter .

5. Matters arising

None

6. Finance

Balances total at Statements 01.12.07:
Current £ 33.54, Deposit £ 14,081.12

No invoices presented for payment by 06.12.07 no cheques required

Church path - John Boyd – Curtis has spoken to John Boyd again (Weds 05/12) and the PCC has written to Marchants politely expressing their concern over the finished condition and durability of the path. John will copy letter to us. Suggest defer until January to await Marchants' response.

7. Roads / A227

Steve Davis confirmed that there would be a speedwatch presentation at the 14 Jan meeting.

8. Commons

Nothing to report

9. Planning - decisions, applications and enforcement

Steve Davis read the notes from the running order.

Decisions: - none advised @ 05.12.07

1. TM/07/03048/RD The Meadows, Hildenborough Road, Shipbourne, TN11 9QA

Proposal: *Amendments to approved landscaping scheme submitted pursuant to condition 6 of planning permission TM/00/02509/FL (Demolition of existing buildings and erection of new dwelling and detached garage) including minor changes to layout of parking and turning areas.*

View: - submitted immediately prior to Area 2 Planning Committee Meeting on 05.12.07:

With regard to the above application, Shipbourne Parish Council has a number of comments to make:

The council is disappointed that TMBC has written its Officer's Recommendation to Committee without sight of its view. You will know that the council has been awaiting answers to questions from TMBC. Additionally, a number of residents allege that even the latest plans submitted are still inaccurate in comparison with the

TMBC measured survey. Investigation is necessary as the proposals and work already carried out are not 'minor changes'.

It also appears that correspondence between the agent and TMBC is ongoing and there still appears to be a number of 'open issues'. The council would have preferred to have all information to hand before submitting a view.

Because of the time constraints and based on what is at present apparent the council wishes the following to be considered:

1. The council is aware that the area and layout of the hard parking and turning areas that have now been implemented are different from those given permission. However, if TMBC make it a condition that the area of planting at present laid as turf remains 'green' in perpetuity, as a lasting and binding condition, then the variation is acceptable.

2. The council however objects strongly to the proposed brick piers. They are overlarge in mass and height and along with the proposed gates are unsuitable for the surrounding open and rural street scene. Additionally SPC considers that the close boarded fencing is totally inappropriate and unsuitable for the site and should be replaced with a native mixed hedge or single species hedge such as hornbeam. (Hornbeam trees were traditionally and historically used as boundary treatments throughout Shipbourne - see page 8, Shipbourne Design Statement 'SDS'. This is a fast growing species that will give total privacy within a few years whilst adding to the surrounding rural landscape). (Also see SDS p29, Landscape, accepted as Supplementary Planning Guidance and upheld in the latest Core Policies).

3. The permission granted removed further development rights and specific mention was made of further construction. The patio of the original scheme is now a terrace built in excess of 1m above the original garden level. Additionally a substantial area, presumably surrounding a rotary washing line has been added. This is seen to be additional hard landscaping outside of the original plan. The council objects to this additional construction which is in place without permission.

4. Finally, whilst ownership of land is not a planning issue, the council objects to the hard landscaping that has restricted the width of the driveway. The Borough will be well aware of the safety issues that were a material consideration at the time of the application for an alternative entrance. Indeed, at that time, the applicant considered that this driveway entrance was 'unsafe'. The entrance is used by a number of other properties and the hard landscaping has made access by larger vehicles extremely difficult. The result is vehicles waiting on, or delaying whilst attempting to manoeuvre in from Hildenborough Road. Additionally the council objects as it considers that this hard landscaping is not in sympathy with the avenue of mature and protected chestnut trees that is a feature of this rural settlement.

As stated previously, the parish council would have preferred all of the information requested to have been made available for consideration in the usual way. The proposals are, and in general the work already carried out is not in line with the permission granted. The council objects as noted above and asks that TMBC reviews the proposals with reference not only to the Supplementary Planning Guidance of the SDS, which the Officer's report omits but additionally to the material considerations of the Saved Policies of the Local Plan, the Core Policies and the relevant policies of the Kent and Medway Structure Plans.

As circulated – decision deferred pending Area 2 Members site visit as agreed at TMBC Area 2 meeting 05/12.

James Sheldrick and Mark Beadle thought the PC should ask when the site meeting was so that a member of the PC had the option of attending who is fully aware of the planning history.

2. TM/07/03880/FL Puttenden Manor, Puttenden Road, Shipbourne, TN11 9QY

Proposal: Use (part retrospective) of land and buildings for the training of horses and the construction of an alternative means of access from Puttenden Road and the erection of 3x timber stables and feed store for keeping horses ancillary to the domestic use of Puttenden Manor.

View: Already submitted:

Shipbourne Parish Council – as before – objects to any commercial use of this site. The parish council sees in this application no major changes or differences material enough in this application to overcome previous objections or concerns. The council wishes TMBC to consider its previous view as attached and dated 20.08.07 as applicable to this current application."

Mrs Bull asked to explain her application to the Councillors and showed them some plans of the site. She pointed out on the plan that the site was only the area of the stables, yard and sand school and did not include the surrounding fields where her horses grazed. She thought all the concerns of the TMBC Committee had now been addressed, including those of light and noise.

C Cohen read from the clerk's notes that the view of the PC was the same as that previously submitted as they could see no material differences.

Mrs Bull said that previously the TM Planning Committee and the Parish Council has "got it wrong" and that the number of horses was "not a problem".

C Davis said that it was the number of horses that was the issue which Mrs Bull had now addressed and that her agents had gone some way to address the other issues.

C Cohen mentioned that according to the official rejection of the application the Committee had not objected on the basis of the number of horses, but in part, on the difficulty in enforcement of conditions. Mrs Bull was very annoyed and said that there were now horse passports which would overcome any objections but that "obviously nothing has come up on your radar". C Beadle pointed out that C Cohen was only repeating what the printed official objection had been.

The Councillors checked the clerk's notes to see if the response had indeed been sent and confirmed that it had. C Cohen said that the P Clerk had emailed the draft response around to PCouncillors for their comment. C Davis said that he definitely did not get an email. C Sheldrick then said he did not remember an email and C Beadle said that he may have had an email but that he did not remember seeing it.

C Cohen was very surprised, and asked whether they may have been abroad or away. No-one had been but in the absence of the PClerk it was not possible to check that the email had been sent or rejected.

Mrs Bull said that she was extremely annoyed that this had happened as she had not been given the opportunity of presenting her views before the response went in. C Cohen said that to her knowledge the application had come in late, was viewed online, and had to be responded to by 5 December. She explained that the PC is given very little time to respond to applications and C Sheldrick confirmed this. Mrs Bull said that it could have waited and that TMPlanning Department had recommended that the application was acceptable and that the PC should listen to them. C Cohen pointed out that the PC is never under an obligation to accept the recommendations of the Planning Department.

Mrs Bull said that she wanted the PC to re-examine the application and write to the BC with an amended response that they *only* object to the commercial aspect "if they must".

The Vice Chairman said that enough time had been spent on this matter and the meeting must move on.

3. TM/07/03884/FL Wellhampton House, Upper Green Road, Shipbourne, TN11 9QL

Proposal: *Replacement with study above and games room to rear.*

View: Already submitted:

With regard to the above application, Shipbourne Parish Council has "no objection" to the replacement garage.

However, it should like to draw your attention to the fact that this application does constitute loss of one garage and an increase in living space and the property has already been extended in recent years. The proposed works should be ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwelling.

Should permission be granted for this application SPC would like further conditions regarding good design and sustainability applied.

Core Policies, Quality of Life, 6.4.1 states that 'good design is a key element of sustainable development'. CP 6.4.4 quotes Kent Design stating that "good quality design also relates to sustainability and should have regard to CP1."

1. The design and construction should incorporate measures for minimal energy consumption, optimal use of renewable energy sources, and use of sustainable construction techniques. TMBC Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (September 2007) seeks to ensure that new development is achieved with the principles of sustainability.

2. The development should incorporate double glazing to windows, discretely sited solar panels (where not viewed from the highway), rainwater storage facilities and highest levels of insulation throughout the design and construction. Please see 'Kent Design' and Shipbourne Village Design Statement (2002), page 11, 'Sustainability' (both adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance).

3. *That all roofing tiles are natural slate, not reconstituted or concrete, windows should be timber framed with a painted finish, garage and entry doors also timber, painted finish: this property is in a conservation area, in an exposed position and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Please see CP24, Planning Policies and the Shipbourne Village Design Statement, Design & materials, page 28. CP24 states that 'development should accord with detailed advice contained in Kent Design and other Supplementary Planning Documents such as Village Design Statements and should wherever possible make a positive contribution to the enhancement of the appearance of the area.'*

4. TM/07/03944/FL Woodhall, Tonbridge Road, Shipbourne, TN11 9PA

Proposal: *Two storey and single storey extensions to replace existing conservatory*

View:

This property is a listed dwelling abutting the ANOB and the Shipbourne Conservation Area.

SPC objects to the proposed application for a two storey rear extension.

Reasons: the scale, bulk, mass and detailed design has an adverse impact on the on the character of the site. Policy 6/10.

The two storey extension is disproportionate in size to the original building and does not enhance the character and features of special architectural interest that contributed to its listing. Policy 4/1.

The proposals would adversely affect the setting of the listed building. It would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of a listed building and its setting.

Generally, the proposal does not demonstrate quality and good design. Apart from the unsympathetic windows of the ground floor extension, the unacceptable mass and bulk of the proposed first floor extension, and the clumsy roof design, the detailed design has tile hung facades for which there is no precedent.

TMBC Core Policies: Quality of Life, 6.4 states that 'good design is a key element of sustainable development, so the Council will promote a high standard of design.'

CP24 states that 'all development must be well designed and of a high quality in terms of detailing and use of appropriate materials, and must through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and the surroundings.'

Please see Shipbourne Design Statement, 'The importance of quality & good design', page 26 which states that 'the proposed design complements and suits the surroundings' and that the alterations should not 'mar the building and trivialize the original works'.

Woodhall Farmhouse was originally a small two storey cottage, with a smaller two storey extension under a separate pitched roof added at a later date. Its façade is symmetrical in design with timber sash windows (the design and access statement is lacking in description and councillor's memories have to be relied on regarding this).

The proposed extension is out of scale with this and does not enhance the original.

In addition the Design & Access Statement presented with this application does not give the required information: there is no planning history included (a two storey rear extension many years ago, a large garage several years ago and a conservatory/garden room) and there are no drawings or photographs showing the relationship to its surroundings (boundaries, highway, views, garage etc).

TMBC Core Policies: Quality of Life, 6.4 state that it requires a Design Statement to accompany proposals for development with accurate illustration of proposals and its relationship with its surroundings.

However, should permission be granted for this application SPC would like further conditions regarding good design and sustainability applied.

Core Policies, Quality of Life, 6.4.1 states that 'good design is a key element of sustainable development'. CP 6.4.4 quotes Kent Design stating that "good quality design also relates to sustainability and should have regard to CP1."

1. *The design and construction of the extension should incorporate measures for minimal energy consumption, optimal use of renewable energy sources, and use of sustainable construction techniques.*

TMBC Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (September 2007) seeks to ensure that new development is achieved with the principles of sustainability.

2. *The development should incorporate double glazing to windows, discretely sited solar panels (where not viewed from the highway or front of the property), rainwater storage facilities and highest levels of insulation throughout the design and construction.*

Please see 'Kent Design' and Shipbourne Village Design Statement (2002), page 11, 'Sustainability' (both adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance).

3. *That all roofing tiles are natural clay, not reconstituted or concrete, to match the original and, as the property is listed, preferably second-hand peg tiles. Windows should be timber framed with a painted finish, entry doors also timber, painted finish: this property is listed, abuts a conservation area and is sited in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*

Please see CP24, Planning Policies and the Shipbourne Village Design Statement, Design & materials, page 28. CP24 states that 'development should accord with detailed advice contained in Kent Design and other Supplementary Planning Documents such as Village Design Statements.'

Although SPC objects to this application it would have no objection in principle to the extension of the kitchen at ground level, nor to the replacement of the conservatory/garden room at ground level, if they were sympathetic in design to the original.

Steve Davis said that he did not recollect seeing this application but it was pointed out to him that it had been examined and discussed by everyone, including him, at the previous meeting.

5. TM/07/04012/RD Old Woodcocks, Reeds Lane, Shipbourne, TN11 9RR

Proposal: Details of landscaping, materials and drainage submitted pursuant to conditions 2, 3 and 4 of planning permission TM/05/02222/FL: Demolition of single storey outbuilding, construction of new garage/store, formation of new driveway and relocation of entrance gate.

View:

The parish council objects to the scheme for boundary treatment and landscaping.

1. *The applicant proposes planting more Lawson Cypress trees along the eastern boundary of the above property. However, these are non-native conifers that support no wildlife: they will adversely affect landscape character. In line with existing ecological policies SPC would prefer any infilling to be either beech or hornbeam hedging to match some of that existing.*

2. *The applicant proposes maintaining existing wooden fencing with a new grass verge laid on the western boundary of the new drive: although this fencing is existing it does not suit the rural character of the Shipbourne lanes and supports no wildlife. SPC suggests that beech or hornbeam hedging replaces the proposed grass verge in front of the retained wooden fencing in the interests of visual quality, the rural character of the site and its setting, and of wildlife habitats.*

3. *The applicant proposes planting new evergreen shrubs to the west of the entrance: however there is insufficient space for such a scheme and the proposed shrubs do not suit the rural character of the site or its setting. SPC suggests that the beech/hornbeam hedging suggested along the western boundary stops approximately 2 metres short of the end of the drive to allow a better vision splay.*

Please see CP24, Planning Policies and the Shipbourne Village Design Statement, Landscape, page 29. CP24 states that 'development should accord with detailed advice contained in Kent Design and other Supplementary Planning Documents such as Village Design Statements and should wherever possible make a positive contribution to the enhancement of the appearance of the area.'

SPC would like to examine the samples of proposed materials, and ask that the applicant supply specifications for them.

Reason: the Parish Council is concerned that the proposed bricks and roof tiles do not match that of the existing listed property: this is necessary in the interests of visual amenity. Any structure within the setting of a listed property is liable to the same high standards of design and materials as the dwelling.

Please see CP24, Planning Policies and the Shipbourne Village Design Statement, Design & materials, page 28. CP24 states that 'development should accord with detailed advice contained in Kent Design and other Supplementary Planning Documents such as Village Design Statements and should wherever possible make a positive contribution to the enhancement of the appearance of the area.'

Applications:

In order of receipt: Declarations of interest?

None declared

6. TM/07/03030/FL, Fairhill, Riding Lane, Hildenborough, TN11 9QL

Proposal: Erection of front and rear gates, relocation of driveway and erection of ha ha – amended plans received and additional enlargement plan.

The PC examined the plans and agreed that they appeared to be as previously submitted. Mrs Bull asked questions about the application and site. Mrs Bull discussed her planning proposal with some Councillors and wanted to know why her application with 15/16 conditions was not acceptable when some applications were successful that had 50 conditions. C Cohen said that this was not material. C Sheldrick said that it was of interest to him. The Vice Chairman said that they had already discussed Puttenden Manor and that the subject was closed. P Councillors had no objection to the Fairhill amended application.

No objection

7. TM/07/04263/LRD, Kentish Rifleman, Roughway, Tonbridge, TN11 9SN

Proposal: Details of levels changes, dormer windows, eaves, joinery, timber screen, staircase, works to bar and fireplace submitted pursuant to Condition 2(c) (d) (e) (g) (h) (i) (j) and (k) of Listed Building Consent TM07/01768/LB: Restoration of roof structures, general restoration and refurbishment throughout following fire, first floor extension to rear.

The PC examined the plans and could see no problems with the plans. No objection

8. TM/07/04257/LRD, Kentish Rifleman, Roughway, Tonbridge, TN11 9SN

Proposal: Details of roof materials and hanging tiles submitted pursuant to Condition 2 (a) and (f) of Listed Building Consent TM07/01768/LB: Restoration of roof structures, general restoration and refurbishment throughout following fire, first floor extension to rear.

The PC examined the plans and could see no problems with the materials. No objection

Enforcement and other planning issues

TMBC notifications of Planning Enforcement Investigations at:

1. Stone Cottage, Roughway TN11 9SH – Further to letter 19/11 informing of enquiry at above premises, letter received 03/12 states *"it has been determined that a breach of planning control has occurred at the site. The owner / occupier has been invited to submit a retrospective planning application to rectify the breach, on a without prejudice basis"*

2. The Stables, Back Lane, Shipbourne, - Further to letter 25/04 informing of enquiry at above premises, letter received 30/11 states *"it has been determined that a breach of planning control is currently occurring at the site. The owner / occupier has been requested to paint the garage door to rectify the breach by the end of January 2008"*

10. Rights of Way

No recent news

11. Village Hall

Nothing to report

12. Correspondence

Kent Downs AONB – Streetscape Design Handbook as circulated by email

James Sheldrick pointed out that the Kent Downs AONB - Streetscape Design Handbook - giving details of proposals for the A227 through the village was based on totally out of date facts. He suggested that the clerk respond to this effect.

13. Any Other Business

Libby Cohen agreed to request further quotes for the village hall sign.

14. Dates of future meetings

14th January 2008, 11th February, 10th March and 14th April

Before Mrs Bull left at the end of the meeting she extended a previous invitation for any members of the parish council to come and visit the site for themselves as C Davis had already done. C Sheldrick said that he already knew the site well.