



**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
TUESDAY 21ST JUNE 2016 IN THE JOHN BANKS HALL, GOUDHURST ROAD,
MARDEN COMMENCING AT 7.30PM**

- 038/16 **PRESENT:** Cllrs Adam (Chair), Boswell, Childs, Cowin, Mannington, Newton, Robertson, Turner. The Assistant Clerk together with 21 members of the public were also present.
- 039/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Cllrs Brown and Tippen. The Clerk and Borough Councillor McLoughlin also gave their apologies.
In the absence of Cllr Tippen, Cllr Adam took the chair.
- 040/16 **(a) DECLARATION OF INTEREST:** There were no declarations of interest
(b) COUNCILLORS REGISTER OF INTEREST: There were no registrations of interest.
(c) GRANTING OF DISPENSATION: There were no requests for granting of dispensation.
- 041/16 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
The Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 14th June 2016 were deferred until the meeting on 12th July 2016.
- 042/16 **IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS INVOLVING PUBLIC SPEAKING:**
All members of the public in attendance wished to comment on item 043/16(a)
- 043/16 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS WITHIN MARDEN PARISH**
(a) **16/504584/OUT – Land West of Maidstone Road, Church Farm**
Outline application for up to 150 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children’s play area, land for potential train station car parking for up to 50 spaces, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access point from Maidstone Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.
Prior to Cllrs making a recommendation the meeting was adjourned for members of the public to make comment. These can be seen at Appendix A of these Minutes.
The meeting was then reconvened for the Cllrs to discuss the application.
Items of concern raised by Cllrs included: The site allocations detailed in the Maidstone Borough Draft Local Plan which identified development in Marden have been met through various applications MA/13/0115; MA/13/0693; MA/13/1291; MA/13/1585 and MA/13/1928. Cllrs note that Maidstone Borough Council has used, in a decision on an application within the Parish (16/502527/OUT) quoting “the Council has achieved 5.12 years housing supply”, which would indicate that the Borough has an adequate supply of housing land for the next five years, therefore, the previous arguments for housing over-riding the harm to the countryside as covered by Policy ENV 28 no longer applies. As expressed in the NPPF and the principle of development is to be sustainable, Marden

Parish Council feel that this particular site, due to its location, physical constraint i.e the railway line, does not meet the criteria for sustainable development in terms of village cohesion.

The pedestrian and cycle access is inadequate due to the footway being far too narrow to be used safely. The argument that the footway could be widened and the carriageway narrowed would introduce as many problems for vehicles as it might solve for pedestrians.

There is no scope for the physical expansion of the Medical Centre and relocation of the amenity is undesirable due to its current, central, location within the Village.

Potential conflict between traffic coming from development and commuters accessing proposed car park.

On these grounds Marden Parish Cllrs unanimously recommend refusal.

(b) **16/504735/SUB – Land at Stanley Farm, Plain Road, Marden**

Submission of Details pursuant to Condition 17 – External Services & Fixtures. Phase 1A (Plots 26-59) and Phase 1B (Plots 65-85)

Whilst Cllrs appreciate the need for utility metering and they are not actually consulted, Cllrs find it disappointing that more sympathetic design and location, especially on the social housing could not be achieved, particularly with the advent of smart metering.

Cllrs also would wish to see the balustrade of the proposed Juliet Balconies as close to the windows as possible to avoid unsightly storage and overlooking.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.31 pm

Signed:.....

Date: 12th July 2016

Chairman

Marden Parish Council

Marden Parish Council
Extraordinary Full Council Meeting 21st June 2016

16/504584/OUT – Land West of Maidstone Road, Church Farm

Outline application for up to 150 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, land for potential train station car parking for up to 50 spaces, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access point from Maidstone Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.

Comments from the Members of the Public in attendance:

- Maidstone Borough Council has 510 more houses than needed – why are they proposing this application?
- Major worry is loss of value of current property – if value of property is reduced, will rateable value be reduced?
- Concerns of many patients as to practical considerations due to increase in patients will place a considerable strain on resources of Medical Centre. Concern regarding providing appropriate care, might end up with no service at all. Adverse reaction on present and future patients. This is unsustainable.
- Concerns about sewage. No legal mechanism for Planning Authority to refuse an application on sewage grounds. Southern Water can request the developer maintain the service not improve it?
- Projected number of pupils in the village – what is the projected figure? Would the school be able to cope?
- Underlying reason for dismay is not charm or otherwise of designs but is the fact that there is so many large applications in a small village. Marden is doing more than its share. Former Maidstone administration wanted 5 local villages turned into hubs (towns)
- Too many new houses in too short a time in a small village and cannot be sustained.
- Small field north of railway bridge over other side of the road that has applied previously for planning and been refused because the area is north of the railway. Why is this application going on?
- Potential overflow car park for station. Is this just for developer or is it opening the door to having another car park to the north of the railway line?
- Marden will need more houses over the years, the problem is the location within the countryside adjacent to industrial developments. Intensive development, physically removed from the built up area, seems to conflict with ENV28. Closer to PS5. Changes character and further developments will be based on new character. ENV28 is the primary issue. Future development should avoid coalescence.
- Development Plan 2000, anti-coalescence Policy
- Medical centre clearly issue with numbers.

Marden Parish Council
Extraordinary Full Council Meeting 21st June 2016

- Applicant made reference to 'suggested conditions attached' rather than Section 106
- Making railway bridge single lane and pavement too narrow
- Submission of MBC Draft Local Plan – how does timing of acceptance of Plan (when does it come into effect?) how does this fit with approval of Outline Planning Application and how will it feel with an appeal, should application be refused?
- Was this being put into the second five year period? Developers were reluctant to answer.
- Bus service to Marden is subsidised by KCC. Rail commuters are from south Maidstone area not Marden
- Population of Marden showed a decrease at last census and grown older. Example of employment in the village - 130 construction jobs of which only 30 places would be taken by Marden residents. Does this mean there will be more people coming into Marden? There are very important considerations – strongly urge MPC recommend MBC defer this application for further consideration until 5 year plan is adopted. Come close to local elections, lot to learn and unfair for people to make decisions.
- Sole entrance/exit to development very close to blind bend, this is very dangerous. Why do the developers not put in a roundabout as commuters drive very fast down that road on the way to and from the station? Someone is going to get killed.
- Concerns about commuters racing through residential area to 'proposed car park'
- Extension into open countryside no different from any of the other sites