**WATERINGBURY PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of Planning Committee meeting
Tuesday 6th October2020
 immediately after the Parish Council Meeting**

**Held via Zoom**

**Committee**

**Cllr M Wells (Chairman)**

**Cllr R Tripp**

**Cllr D Marks**

**Cllr F Fielding**

**Cllr L Simons**

**In attendance**

**Mrs S Cockburn – Clerk to the Council**

**Cllr Mrs S Hudson – Borough Councillor**

**Cllr Mrs S Barker – Chairman Kings Hill Parish council**

**Mrs C Byron – Rostrum Correspondent**

**3 Members of the Public**

**The Chairman announced the meeting would be recorded to assist the Clerk in taking the Minutes**

1. **Apologies for absence –** none
2. **Declarations of Interest/Dispensations –** none

 **3 Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting 1st September 2020
 to be approved for accuracy –** The minutes having been read were

 approved by Cllr Wells and seconded by Cllr Marks

1. **Planning Applications**

**TM/20/01861/FL**Construction of stables with associated training area, parking, dung an bedding area, also use of land for the keeping, breeding, training and care of horses including their grazing for personal recreation: and some commercial livery.

Land south of Teston Road

**1**

Cllr Marks said the issue with this is it seems to be incorrectly described as to the area it affects in terms of the parish area it is in and that it is really something that needs to be established as well.

Issues relating to traffic particularly on visibility at the junction, but it should ensure the description and location is accurate. The people who are most effected should have proper representation.

The Chairman said he was concerned when looking at the site plan the actual application described it as being in Kings Hill & East Malling, and it also showed on the site plan the boundary of the site was actually Ketridge Lane. If that is the case then either the site is in Wateringbury and we have not, as yet, been invited to give or views on that situation, as there is a boundary map dated 1st April 1999 which shows Ketridge Lane well inside Wateringbury. Either the architects have got it wrong as regards their boundary for the proposed site because this shows a bit of land between the boundary of Kings Hill and in fact East Malling it is well inside Wateringbury parish, as is Cattering Wood. On that alone we have cause to write to the Officer and get that checked before we make any decisions. We have already spoken to Teston who are as concerned about the traffic, as we are, coming out of Teston Road, and especially Ketridge Lane which has also been spoken in another planning application for 65 houses to be built by Tregothnan Estates using Ketridge Lane as an emergency access. There is a lot going on in that area and, as yet we are not getting answers and until we do he proposed we hold on to this.

Cllr Hudson stated in the past she had had cause to speak to the Clerk with regard to issues raised by residents of Teston Road and it had always been in Kings Hill parish. Whenever Cllr Hudson had spoken to Enforcement and Planning Officers they had always told her that particular area comes under Kings Hill parish and not Wateringbury parish.

The Chairman asked, have they changed the boundaries without telling us? Cllr Hudson said she had no idea but in the 18 months to 2 years she had had cause to speak to various officers in the Planning Department of TMBC it had always been referred to as Kings Hill parish and not Waterngbury which is why the Clearheart Lane development, which is literally the next door field, or a parcel of woodland comes under Kings Hill and not Wateringbury – it is on the boundary.

The Chairman said the boundary change was done in 1999 and looks like the new boundary had taken in part of the old airfield.

Cllr Hudson asked if the boundary also included Clearheart Lane and the ancient woodland owned by Tregothnan Estates.

The Chairman said Cattering Wood, Great Canon, Flite Wood and Hoath Wood down to Red Hill Farm and Ketridge Lane were well inside Wateringbury.

**2**

Cllr Marks said he could understand why part of the area was incorporated in Kings Hill when the natural boundary of where the airfield was. The plan he had seen did indicate it appears partly in Wateringbury. If it is not then we can have an opinion but we would not have a statutory right to a consultation. Council should write and establish exactly there the land is. It looks like it is going to affect Wateringbury and residents are actively complaining about it.

Cllr Sarah Barker said this was an interesting occurrence because List B showed it occurred in Wateringbury and Kings Hill Parish Council knew nothing about it until your Clerk contacted King Hill’s Clerk so there is some confusion and I would urge you to contact the Officer. We have been in contact with the Officer and were told it is in Kings Hill the same as Clearheart Lane development which is being proposed, and I think we need definite confirmation. Cllr Barker would raise this at a meeting tomorrow evening and during the day to see if we can get a hold of this and the boundary change in April 1999.

The Chairman asked Council to agree to contact the Officer as there is no point in TMBC giving us a boundary map if what it is saying isn’t true. If in turn what Cllr Hudson has said, fine, but why give us a map on boundary change they have carried out if it’s incorrect.

Cllr Hudson went on to say she has asked to call in this, and the 3 Mill Lane application.

The Chairman agreed to forward a copy of the 1999 boundary change map to Cllr Hudson and Cllr Barker

**TM/20/01992/8FL**

Garden shed 10x16ft, 2.4m high located at the end of garden behind hedge 120 feet from house and 1 metre from boundary

The White Cottage  171 Tonbridge Road Wateringbury

Comment:

The Parish Council is concerned that adjoining properties closest to the proposed building could be affected by uses not strictly compatible with its initial location and suggested use in the application. We would ask if the Officer could establish that the applicant may consider locating the new structure further away from the rear boundary, if possible, to address the concerns of the closest neighbouring properties in Allington Gardens.
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We would also ask if it would be possible to ensure by condition the use of the proposed building to avoid commercial or uses likely to cause environmental health concerns if permission is granted.

 **TM/20/01973/FL**

Proposed outbuilding – 3 Mill Lane

The Council’s original comment was no objection but there had since been objections from neighbours that questioned the boundary and the height of the proposed building being oppressive and up against Mill Lane. Cllr Marks said there was a lot of local knowledge the Parish Council were not aware of and if the boundary is incorrect then the application is invalid and should be resubmitted Cllr Marks said it was unfair to say the Parish Council allowed the application stating we are not a statutory authority. The Council would submit further comments to Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council.

Comment: Following our previous response to this application, we have had representations from neighbouring residents suggesting that the details forming the basis of the application are misleading or incorrect. As a result, we would ask the officer dealing to check this aspect of the application, if necessary, with any relevant respondent objector. Following this reassessment, the Parish Council may wish to reconsider its original response to the application so would appreciate further advice as to its status and accuracy

The meeting was closed at 8.35pm
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