

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STAPLEHURST PARISH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
held at South Hall, Staplehurst Village Centre on  
Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2018 at 7.00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Ashby, Buller, Silkin and Sharp who was in the chair. Ex Officio: Chairman Burnham and Vice-Chairman Riordan.

Deputy Clerk: Mrs DA Jenkins

**APOLOGIES:** Cllr Smith.

**APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES:** Minute Pages 1352P-1354P of 18<sup>th</sup> December 2017 were approved, signed by Councillor Sharp and made available at [http://www.staplehurstvillage.org.uk/minutes\\_of\\_the\\_last\\_meetings.aspx](http://www.staplehurstvillage.org.uk/minutes_of_the_last_meetings.aspx).

**URGENT ITEMS:** No items were requested.

**COUNCILLOR DECLARATIONS:**

1. Declarations of Lobbying – Councillors Ashby, Buller, Burnham and Sharp declared they had been lobbied about 17/506234 and 17/506369.
2. Declarations of Changes to the Register of Interests – none declared.
3. Declarations of Interest in Items on the Agenda – none declared.
4. Requests for Dispensation – none.

**FULL PLANNING APPLICATIONS:** (for recommendation)

17/506234 **Grasmere, Station Road TN12 0PZ** – Introduction of two new dormers and conversion of pitched roof to gable end on front elevation, removal of conservatory and conversion of garage to home office and fenestration alterations (revision of application 17/504878 Refused by MBC – omission of garden wall. SPC had recommended Approval (Min 1341P, 1351P)). After some discussion Councillors RESOLVED unanimously to recommend REFUSAL for the following reasons: the scale, height and proportion of the proposed development would be out of character with the neighbouring single storey properties; the orientation of the new dormer windows would be visually intrusive to the neighbouring property resulting in overlooking and causing a loss of privacy and the overshadowing and the loss of sunlight to the neighbouring property, contrary to policies DM1 and DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan and planning policy advice notes 4.38, 4.75 and 4.76 of the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009. Councillors also noted that the proposal would result in the loss of a small chalet bungalow, of which there are few, to the village housing stock.

17/506369 **Holman House, Station Road TN12 0QQ** – Conversion of existing commercial/residential building together with single storey side extension, single storey rear extensions with a terrace above, changes to fenestration and the addition of a second-floor extension to provide 7 residential apartments (see application 17/506369 to convert offices to residential dwelling Approved by MBC. SPC had recommended Approval (Min 1333P)). Following considerable discussion Councillors RESOLVED unanimously to recommend REFUSAL for the following reasons: the proposal was an over intensification of the site; the increase in the scale and height of the building due to the addition of a proposed second floor; insufficient parking spaces for the number of properties proposed; the increase in dwellings would result in an increase in traffic movements to the site; the lack of amenity space provided; the neighbouring residential property would suffer from an unacceptable loss of privacy in particular due to the proposal of two first floor terraces and the insertion

of new fenestration to the northern and eastern flanks; the loss of sunlight, the noise impact and the additional effect of six properties on a shared drainage system with the neighbouring property, contrary to policies DM1 and DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan, paragraphs 17, 66 and 123 of the NPPF and planning policy advice notes 4.75, 4.76 and 4.79 of the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009. Councillors requested that this application be referred to MBC Planning Committee.

**LAND AT FISHERS FARM** – Proposal to seek joint meeting with Redrow Homes and Bovis Homes to discuss the site layout (JB). Councillors RESOLVED that they should try again to initiate a meeting with Redrow Homes to discuss the plans for linking the site to the adjoining developers site.

**REPORTED DECISIONS:** (for noting)

- 17/503390     **River Farm, Chart Hill Road** – Erection of a controlled atmosphere stores, covered access way, dispatch and loading bay MBC WITHDRAWN. SPC had recommended Refusal (Min 1327P). NOTED by Councillors.
  
- 17/504433     **Perfect Place, Frittenden Road** – Change of use from gypsy caravan site to mixed use for residential gypsy caravan site and for the keeping of horses, including the stationing of 6 caravans, of which no more than 3 shall be static, the erection of 3 amenity buildings, 3 stable buildings, fencing and laying of hardstanding (part retrospective) MBC REFUSED. SPC had recommended Refusal (Min 1336P, 1344P). NOTED by Councillors.
  
- 17/504840     **Kings Head, High Street** – Listed Building Consent for removal of the existing post and installation of a new Oak post secured to the rafters of the pub roof to provide a safe and secure post to re-fix the swing sign to MBC GRANTED with 1 condition. SPC had recommended Approval (Min 1344P). NOTED by Councillors.
  
- 17/505020     **Lime Kiln Farm, Clapper Lane** – First floor extension above the single storey kitchen and utility area, alterations to the roof including raising the roof and changing the current roof to all flat roof, addition of French doors and window to the south west elevation and removal of small section of utility area MBC REFUSED. SPC had recommended Approval (Min 1344P). NOTED by Councillors.
  
- 17/505396     **Staplehurst Nurseries, Clapper Lane** – Advertisement Consent for 2 x non-illuminated timber mounted directional signs MBC REFUSED. SPC had recommended Approval (Min 1346P). NOTED by Councillors.

Chairman.....

**PUBLIC FORUM** – Before the meeting a resident commented on planning application 17/506234 Grasmere regarding the loss of privacy and sunlight on the neighbouring property. A resident also commented on planning application 17/506369 Holman House with regard to the detrimental affect the proposal would have on the neighbouring property. At the end of the meeting a resident commented on planning application 17/506369 raising concerns to the proposal setting a precedent.