

CRANBROOK & SISSINGHURST PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
HELD ON THE 19th SEPTEMBER 2017

Declaration of Interests, Dispensations, Predetermination or Lobbying:

Members are required to declare any interests, dispensations, predetermination or lobbying on items on this agenda. Members are reminded that changes to the Register of Interests should be notified to the Clerk.

Present: Cllr. Bunyan (in the Chair), Cllrs. Cook, Fermor, Fletcher (in part) Kemp (in part) Veitch & Warne.

Apologies: Cllr. Smith.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

17/02840/LBC & 17/02839/FULL

Steddenden Barn, Hazelden Farm, Marden Road, Cranbrook, Kent, TN17 2LP
Listed Building Consent – Garden room extension

The Parish Council recommends APPROVAL, subject to consideration of triple glazing and improvement to the proposed insulation, particularly in the roof. Proposed by Cllr. Bunyan seconded by Cllr. Warne and agreed.

17/020807/FULL

Saxon House, Dorothy Avenue, Cranbrook, Kent, TN17 3AY

Proposed first floor extension and internal alterations; Proposed conversion of garage to create a study

The Parish Council recommends APPROVAL. Proposed by Cllr. Fermor seconded by Cllr. Cook and agreed.

16/502860/OUT

Land at Brick Kiln Farm, Cranbrook

Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 180 dwellings (including up to 35% affordable housing) with means of access to be determined at this stage together with structural woodland planting and landscaping, informal public open space, community orchard, children's play area, attenuation basin, vehicular access point from Hartley Road and associated ancillary development.

The Parish Council recommends REFUSAL and strongly objects to the current application. Cllr. Cook will formulate a response to fully represent the views of the Committee. This was proposed by Cllr. Fermor seconded by Cllr. Bunyan and agreed. A copy of the response will be filed with these Minutes.

17/02912/LBC

Costa Coffee, High Street, Cranbrook, Kent, TN17 3EJ

Listed Building Consent – Internal alterations to create 2 No. flats (works commenced)

The Parish Council recommends APPROVAL, subject to the views of the Conservation Architect. Proposed by Cllr. Warne seconded by Cllr. Bunyan and agreed.

17/02793/LBC

Vestry Hall, Stone Street, Cranbrook, Kent, TN17 3HA

Listed Building Consent – To attach a community defibrillator to the external wall of the carriage entrance on the ground floor; to replace like for like external double side doors on first floor elevation facing church

The Parish Council SUPPORTS the application, subject to the views of the Conservation Architect. Proposed by Cllr. Cook seconded by Cllr. Fermor and agreed.

17/02512/FULL & 17/02513/LBC

Goddards Green Barn, Angley Road, Cranbrook, Kent, TN17 3LR

Remove existing detached storage buildings and replace with a single dwelling house with associated parking, garaging and amenity garden; Remove attached mono-pitched garage and replace with an attached 3. No bay timber frame garage.

The Parish Council recommends APPROVAL in principle, subject to the following considerations – as the property overlooks a neighbouring property, the parish council would urge consideration of moving the bathrooms to the north facing side of the building. Also since none of the main rooms will benefit from solar gain, perhaps a reconfiguration of the ground floor rooms could be considered and the committee were not happy to see no working chimney/woodburner. Passivhaus guidelines should be considered. Proposed by Cllr. Bunyan seconded by Cllr. Warne and agreed.

17/02949/LBC

1 Wilsley Farm Cottages, Angley Road, Cranbrook, Kent, TN17 2LE

Listed Building Consent – Replacement boiler and flue.

The Parish Council recommends APPROVAL, subject to the views of the Conservation Architect. Proposed by Cllr. Cook seconded by Cllr. Veitch and agreed.

APPEALS:

Cllr. Bunyan had noted some thoughts on the appeals process, these were handed out to the committee for consideration. A list of travel modes had been compiled and shared with the committee.

Cllr. Bunyan declared an interest as the applicant in the following appeal and left the room whilst it was being discussed.

17/01203/FULL

Goblins Glade, Spongs Lane, Sissinghurst

Erection of 1 No. 2-bedroom dwelling and garage.

The Parish Council had recommended the original application and it was agreed that a written letter of support from Cllr. Veitch and the planning committee will be formulated and sent to the Planning Inspectorate. Proposed by Cllr. Cook seconded by Cllr. Veitch and agreed.

17/00824.FULL

The Cobs, Hartley Road, Cranbrook

Erection of a chalet bungalow

The Parish Council recommended approval in principle of the original application. A further letter of support from Cllr. Veitch and the planning committee will be formulated and sent to the Planning Inspectorate. Proposed by Cllr. Cook and seconded by Cllr. Fermor and agreed.

TRAINING:

Cllr. Fermor would present an application at the next meeting.

DECISIONS:

Cllr. Bunyan read out the decisions received from the Borough Council.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:

Cllr. Bunyan had reflected on Cllr. Fletchers concerns over lack of workshop/office space for business with this Parish. Breach Farm now Park Farm was highlighted as a possible location for workshops/offices as this is based on a main road and can allow lorries to enter/exit the site safely and with ease.

The Parish Council recommends **REFUSAL** of the proposal on the following and fundamental grounds:

1) This is NOT a masterplan for development of the “Land Adjacent to the Crane Valley” defined and covered by Policy AL/CR 4.

This proposal covers only part of site identified for building, the other part of which is Corn Hall Farm, to whose land access will be via the plot covered here. It is not sensible to try to form an opinion of the suitability, the commercial-residential balance of building, the sizes of the planned units of accommodation, and how these might relate to the perceived priorities of the community, for the whole site when only part is covered by this proposal. We remarked on this on a previous application and are surprised to see no advance on the previous position. After some eighteen months, it is surely reasonable to expect some progress to have been made towards resolving a fundamental aporia. We see no evidence to give us confidence that this will be a coherent development.

2) There has not, in our view, been the cooperation required in Policy AL/CR 4 with “the Parish Council and Local Community” – including both the site’s neighbours and the developers of Corn Hall Farm. This is true over a wide range of issues, some of which appear below, and particularly over the question of satisfactory access.

We make no comment on and have no knowledge of how far they may have cooperated with the Borough Council and/or its Officers. Much of what is said under heading 1) also applies to the apparent lack of any move to produce a cooperative plan with Corn Hall Farm’s developers. This is sharpened by the question of joint access to the sites, given that, considered as access merely to the Brick Kiln site, the solution proposed is unsatisfactory in our view, and in that of a majority of the site’s immediate neighbours. Until the two developers work together on a single plan for the development, can show substantive consultation with the local community, more particularly the neighbours, the Parish Council and more particularly those involved in producing the Neighbourhood Plan, it is unlikely that any proposal put forward will be satisfactory under the various heads of Policy AL/CR 4. In particular, the conditions of the first sentence of the paragraph beginning ‘A masterplan shall be prepared...’

3) We do not believe that there is sufficient detail on ‘Matters Reserved’ to allow us to form a judgment in favour of the proposal.

Even granted the ‘Reserved’ nature of ‘Matters Reserved’, we are not happy to see, for example, the requirement for commercial property narrowed down to ‘small scale convenience retail (A1) floorspace’ at this stage in the process. Work on the Neighbourhood Plan suggests that there is at present little appetite for more retail space in the parish, while office space and workshops are undersupplied. This is building for the 21st century with new and emerging patterns of retail and employment – an unloved, boarded-up graffitied failed ‘convenience store’ will not be an asset to the residents of the new project in 2030. There are already too many of these around the country on earlier developments. We hope to see evidence that thought has been given to the sustainability of any retail space (while recognizing that any workshop provision might well involve retail facilities).

We would hope to see more detailed breakdown of house type, bedroom numbers, proportions of each, as well as provision of key worker housing, affordable housing, any provision for self-build, rented or part-owned properties. Here again, the fact that this proposal; covers only part of the allocated site is unsatisfactory. ‘Reserved’ these matters may be at this stage, but they have a tendency to become ‘hard to reverse’ before detailed proposals are submitted. This reduces ‘consultation’ to a mockery.

We are not satisfied that a sufficient answer is given to the hydrological issues raised by the site, not merely in relation to flooding on site, but also the implications for run off to the

Crane Valley. In particular, we are interested to note that an area previously seen as too boggy for building is now included in the areas to be covered with housing.

We do not feel that there is enough evidence *for* or rationale behind the proposed Development Character Areas for us to pass a judgment in favour of them. We would like more reassurance that 'understanding the unique landscape' means something definable, as also that the type of buildings may have a real relation to local styles and truly 'respect the character and pattern of settlements within the AONB', and not be an 'it could be anywhere from Gateshead to Ashford' set of designs from a general pre-existing pattern book.

The dispersed green spaces seem to us to lack clear meaning or purpose. Any proposal to be given sensible consideration needs to have a clear and explicit rationale, and this looks more like scatter than a plan with a single focus.

We are also fairly mystified by the new "Tanner Lane" which goes nowhere and seems to lack any clear purpose. Is it envisaged that it would be extended beyond the site under consideration? There is a lack of clarity here.

The Parish Council is producing a document, which will also be included in NDP, to show their desire for all new homes to achieve standards of building and insulation etc., that far outstrip current Building Regulations. We would want the developer/s to design and build to this standard.

We note that the most recent Housing Needs Survey which shows a great need for 1 and 2 bedroomed homes which are likely to appeal to first time buyers who generally find buying in this area beyond their means. We see no evidence of an attempt to respond to this.

It is also noted that, to date, the developer has not consulted with the police on 'secure by design'. We would expect that to be included in the application.

These last few paragraphs give voice to merely a sample of our concerns. Others are likely to arise when 'Matters Reserved' come up for fuller discussion.

When we have been supplied with the material to allow us to form a judgment on the desirability of the plans for the whole site, we will pass such a judgment. Until then, we can only express disappointment that so little progress has been made – or presumably required by the officers - on substantive issues raised in our earlier response. It is sad to have to repeat what we have said before, but until we are heard repeated it will be.