



Wednesday the 13<sup>th</sup> December 2017 at 7.00pm

---

## Update Report for the Committee

The following notes and attached papers will be referred to at the meeting and will provide updated information to the Committee to reflect changes in circumstances and officer advice since the reports on the agenda were prepared

3. **Minutes** – To approve the Minutes of the Meeting of this Committee held on the 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017
4. Requests for Deferral/Withdrawal

### Part I – Monitoring/Information Items

None for this Meeting

### Part II – For Decision

5. TPO/17/00011 – Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No. 11, 2017 - Land South of Shorts Wood, Tenterden Road, Biddenden

The Biddenden Ward Member – Cllr Neil Bell wishes to express his support for the TPO despite the registered objection.

6. Schedule of Applications
  - (a) **16/01271/AS - Courtlands, Church Hill, Bethersden, Kent TN26 3AQ - Demolition of existing buildings and residential development comprising 17 houses and 20 space public car park**

The applicant has written to confirm that they are happy to enter into a Section 106 Agreement as set out in Table 1 in the committee report.

Historic England has commented to reiterate their concerns with the scheme as set out in the report.

One of the Ward Members, Councillor Pickering has written to state:

“I must apologize for not being here this evening, I am attending the Bethersden Parish Council meeting.

I am writing to support the statement of the Bethersden Parish Council Planning Committee Chairman in his written statement. Primarily that there is no objection to this application, though there are serious concerns regarding the latest submission. This revolves around the 'racetrack' form of access.

He also refers to the original application which is the preferred application with the current housing mix included.”

Bethersden Parish Council - has stated that they do not object to the principle but it is the design and layout which is of concern. They have asked that the following statement be tabled:

“STATEMENT TO ASHFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
13th Dec 2017

Please my accept apologies for not being able to attend the meeting-

I should like the following comments to be considered during the evaluation of the application-

The principle of development of this site is not opposed by the Parish Council.

As noted in the Agenda Report the overall site area is 1.56 ha but the Parish Councils preference is to limit the development to about 50% of this area say .75ha (or 1.8 acres)

At the preferred density of 20 to the hectare or 8 to the acre this could deliver 15 new dwellings with a mix of 2bed,3bed,4bed,and 5 bed properties of which 5 or 6 could be affordable and geared to occupation by local people with an identified need.

The proposal before you provides 17 new dwellings of an acceptable mix and provides 6 dwellings designated affordable. However the layout proposed includes a “racetrack” form of access road which results in an urban form of development containing over 50% of the site area.

Paragraph 45 of the Report (page 1.24) wrongly reports that the Parish has defined open space as including private garden areas. The term open space has always been interpreted as being areas that contribute to the open public appearance of the development in the context of the wider landscape.

Defined private gardens enclosed by perimeter housing clearly are not perceived in this way. Private gardens that back onto public open space however can successfully contribute to a more open rural appearance and provide a seamless visual boundary with the wider open vista beyond.

The principle of the first layout submitted in August 2016 did achieve this objective and is far preferable to the one that is currently proposed - See Below



If the Borough is minded to support development of this site the Parish Council would prefer the layout to be amended in line with the original application but contain the current housing mix.

**(Officer comment:** The emerging Bethersden Neighbourhood plan policy has been amended by the Parish Council from the original draft. As submitted it now says: “Not less than 50% of the site shall be undeveloped”. The proposed development is in accordance with this.)

### Update on Bethersden Neighbourhood Plan

The Bethersden Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) has progressed since paras. 27 and 45 of the report was written. The Council has very recently received a ‘submission version’ of the BNP in which the draft allocation policy for this site has been amended from that quoted in para. 29 of the report, together with a consultation statement, an environmental report and other required documents. The Council has now agreed to formally publicise the ‘submission’ BNP and its supporting documents for an eight-week public consultation commencing at the end of this week. Thereafter, an independent Examiner will consider the BNP, its supporting documents and the consultation responses, whether the BNP meets relevant requirements, and if so whether it should proceed to a referendum (with or without modifications) prior to adoption.

The NPPF does not include “prematurity” as a reason to refuse planning permission when a new Plan is being prepared. The PPG advises that, in the context of the NPPF, arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of permission, unless the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to neighbourhood planning; and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan has reached at least the end of the public consultation period when all comments have been received. Para. 216 of the NPPF advises that the degree of weight to be given to an emerging Neighbourhood Plan depends on:-

- (a) its stage of preparation (the BNP is still at an early stage, with the above important processes outstanding);
- (b) the extent of unresolved objections to relevant policies (this is difficult to know until the consultation stage has been carried out and the Examiner has considered objections, so a cautious approach should be adopted and it should not be presumed that relevant policies are widely supported);
- (c) the degree of consistency of relevant policies with the NPPF (see below for an assessment of whether the revised BNP site policy H4 Site B is consistent with the NPPF).

It follows that it is appropriate for the Committee to have regard to the BNP, but to give it only limited weight at this stage. The BNP policies relevant to this application are listed in the table below.

Ultimately, the decision on whether to grant permission should not depend predominantly on the position of the BNP, but on the overall balance of planning considerations including the existing Development Plan as a starting-point, and all other material considerations, of which the principles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF are particularly important, and the emerging BNP less so. Therefore, notwithstanding that the BNP has progressed, it remains Officers' recommendation to the Committee to grant planning permission as set out in the report.

#### Assessment against Bethersden Neighbourhood Plan

<b>Bethersden Neighbourhood Plan Policy</b>	<b>Assessment against policy</b>
<p><b>Policy R1 Protection of Views, Vistas and Setting</b>            All development proposals shall protect the identified views important to the village setting, particularly those that create a link to the open countryside and reflect the historic character of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Range of views around the church.</li> <li>b) Across and into and out of the George Field.</li> <li>c) View across the Recreation Ground.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal respects its setting protecting the key view of the church (looking up Church Hill) and views across the site of open countryside.</p> <p>I consider the proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy R2 Landscape, Character and Design</b>            Developments must protect and enhance the established local character and sit comfortably alongside existing development.</p>	<p>The proposal would not cause harm to the setting of listed buildings or the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would sit alongside existing development to the east and south preserving a soft edge to the open countryside and to the flood plain.</p> <p>I consider the proposal complies with</p>

	this policy.
<p><b>Policy R3 Conservation of Local Habitats, Landscape and Character</b>  Developments in the Parish shall preserve &amp; protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Ancient and semi-natural woodland and rural Lanes;</li> <li>b) River corridors and tributaries;</li> <li>c) Landscape, nature conservation of historic importance.</li> <li>d) Biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<p>The Environment Agency has raised no objections to the amended scheme subject to a condition. KCC Biodiversity raises no objection subject to a condition. I consider the proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy R4 Public Rights of Way</b>  Development in the Parish shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Protect and improve public rights of way.</li> <li>b) Construct or provide proportionate contributions towards new rights of way or extensions to link development to the village centre</li> </ul>	<p>There are no PROW within or immediately adjoining the site. The closest PROW lies to the north of the site beyond the next field boundary. I do not consider that the proposed development would impact adversely on views either to or from this route.</p>
<p><b>Policy R6 Recreation and Community Use Areas</b>  Retain &amp; protect community Open Spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Scout Hut</li> <li>b) Bull Field Cricket Ground</li> <li>c) George Field</li> <li>d) Village Hall</li> <li>e) The Recreation Ground</li> <li>f) Any other open space acquired for public use with new developments.</li> </ul> <p>Development will be supported where it will result in the improved management and improvement of these spaces, where it would not damage the environmental quality, biodiversity or character of the area and where it is for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Facilities ancillary to outdoor sport and recreation or other uses appropriate to the purpose of this policy; or</li> <li>b) the limited extension of or alteration to existing buildings: or</li> <li>c) in exceptional circumstances for example, to meet essential agriculture or forestry or utility infrastructure needs and no alternative site is available.</li> </ul>	<p>If permission is granted, open space contributions will be secured through the legal agreement. These relate specifically to the cricket ground and recreation ground. I therefore consider that the proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy R7 Drainage and Water Management</b></p>	

<p>New developments in Bethersden parish will be supported where they meet the other requirements of this Plan and provide evidence of effective &amp; sustainable surface water, wastewater and sewerage drainage management systems to the satisfaction of the relevant authorities. Opportunities should be taken to improve the local sewerage system in a proportionate manner, as relevant, in liaison with the statutory undertaker.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency raises no objections to this proposal on flooding grounds. The EA and the Council's Project Office raise no objection to the proposed strategy for managing surface water on the site. Southern Water raise no objections subject to conditions.</p> <p>The proposal therefore complies with Policy R7.</p>
<p><b>Policy R9 Community Benefits</b> Applications for new housing, commercial or industrial developments shall be required to contribute to and/or provide for such benefits to come to the community from developer contributions via S.106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). These shall be proportionate or provide proportionate benefits.</p>	<p>See Assessment against Policy R6 above in respect of open space contributions.</p> <p>Contributions have also been secured in respect of secondary schools and libraries. I therefore consider that the proposed development is in accordance with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy H1 New Residential Development</b> Up to 34 additional dwellings of mixed type shall be delivered on three identified sites within the central area of the village, and delivered in phases over the Plan period to 2030. The sites are shown in Policy H2.</p>	<p>The site subject to this planning application is one of the sites identified by this policy. The proposal therefore complies with policy H1</p>
<p><b>Policy H2 Housing site allocations</b> Only the sites noted below (see page 27) shall be allocated for housing development: <b>Submitted Site A</b> (WC33): Up to 10 dwellings <b>Submitted Site B</b> (WC5): Up to 14 dwellings <b>Submitted Site C</b> (WC34): Up to 10 dwellings Part of each site shall be permanent Public Open Space as per the ratio shown on the individual site diagrams.</p>	<p>The site subject to this planning application proposes a net 16 units, whereas the policy advocates up to 14 dwellings. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on exiting residential properties. The proposed units meet Nationally Described Standards and have generous garden areas, which either comply with or exceed the Council's Residential Space Standards. The proposal also meets standards for parking and turning. It is considered also that the proposal achieves a high quality of design and layout. The proposal makes provision for permanent public open space which would be managed by a management company. On balance, whilst this proposal is for</p>

	<p>an additional two units than stated in the policy, it is not considered that this would result in harm. It would have the social benefit of providing additional housing, including an extra unit of affordable housing, to the benefit also of the local economy.</p>
<p><b>Policy H4 Site B Next to village school</b></p> <p>Not less than 50% of the site shall be undeveloped.</p> <p>Up to 14 new dwellings on this site shall have a mix of housing types in line with the Ashford current Local Plan; 6 will be affordable, of which 3 will be Local Needs and 3 will be shared ownership; at least half of these should be family homes.</p> <p>The housing development here should enable views out to open countryside and through the site to the Conservation Area and nearby historic assets including the Grade I listed Church, an important heritage asset and a key feature in the landscape (ref Policy R1) and respect and reflect the wider landscape setting and the topography of the site.</p>	<p>This has been achieved.</p> <p>See assessment against Policy H2 on housing numbers. The proposal provides 6 units of affordable housing in line with this policy. All six are two-bed family homes. The council's Housing department supports the proposal.</p> <p>See assessment against Policy R1. Policy H4 identifies two specific key views: one looking up Church Hill to the church and the other looking from the school playing ground across the site to open countryside. The proposed development has been set back significantly from Church Hill to preserve the view of the church and to continue the existing building line. This has meant that the developable area has been shifted northwards, thereby encroaching on the view from the school playing field. This is a trade-off which given the importance of the view of the church is considered necessary to ensure that the development does not impact adversely on the listed church. In any event, views of open countryside would still be achieved across the development, albeit slightly to the north than the one identified on the plan.</p> <p>The site is relatively well contained with boundary planting which would help reduce its impact on the wider landscape. The proposed open space and planting within the site would help break up views of the development. The proposal respects site topography by massing development away from the floodplain and tucking it beneath the brow of higher land to the north.</p>

<p>The scale and density of any development on this site must reflect its surroundings.</p> <p>Dwellings should be limited to two-storey in height to prevent a prominent visual edge to the village (ref Policy H8), and shall be adjacent to the existing built area.</p> <p>Existing hedging should be retained or enhanced to preserve the rural green character of the Bethersden Conservation Area.</p> <p>An area of land in the south western part of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and therefore a full flood risk assessment will need to be carried out in consultation with the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>The density of development is higher than for the residential development opposite but this area is characterised by deep front gardens which is not necessarily a desirable characteristic to replicate. The proposed units have shallower front gardens with parking placed more discretely to the side of properties. This more intimate urban form is considered more appropriate in a village setting.</p> <p>This has been achieved</p> <p>Boundaries are largely retained with new planting proposed where appropriate.</p> <p>This was carried out and the Environment Agency has raised no objections on flooding grounds.</p> <p>I consider that the proposed development is broadly in accordance with the emerging site policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy H6 Local Needs Housing</b> 40% of the homes built on allocated sites will be classified as affordable, of which 30% will be affordable homes for purchase/ownership, and the remainder divided equally between affordable social rent, and shared ownership. This would total as follows: 14 affordable homes, of which 7 would be designated as 'local needs', and 7 for shared ownership. As per Ashford's current Local Plan, <i>“the local need housing element is conditioned so that subsequent occupancy of the dwelling will be controlled by a binding agreement to ensure the property remains available to meet local needs in the future and does not only benefit the first occupier”</i></p>	<p>The proposed development provides 35% affordable housing in accordance with adopted plan policy, which carries more weight at this time. The provision of an additional two units on the site (above that advocated by the emerging BNP policy) does allow for 6 units of affordable to be achieved (the equivalent of 40% of 14 units).</p> <p>The tenure mix / local lettings can be secured through the legal agreement.</p>
<p><b>Policy H7 Internal Space Standards</b> Internal Spaces for all new dwellings should meet the Nationally Described</p>	<p>This has been achieved</p>



Space Standards.	
<p><b>Policy H8 External Design Standards</b> All new housing should be designed to accord with the local character and distinctiveness. Where 'low rise' is preferred, this shall mean housing is single storey in height with, or without attic bedrooms. Where parking is provided, the layout shall not be dominated by car access and parking facilities.</p>	<p>This has been achieved.</p> <p>The proposed units have a traditional form and design. They would be constructed from high quality materials appropriate on this conservation area site. A number of traditional design elements are proposed, such as cat slide rooves; exposed eaves and functioning chimneys which would add to sense of place.</p> <p>Parking is mostly provided to the side of properties which ensures street frontages are not dominated by cars. Visitor parking is designed into streets.</p>
<p><b>Policy H12 Parking</b> Layout of housing developments shall not be dominated by car access or parking. It should also accord with the Building for Life Framework. Parking should incorporate soft landscaping where possible to maintain overall rural character. Proposals for residential development shall achieve the following minimum parking standards: 1 Bed Flat or House 1 Spaces per unit 2 Bed Flat or House 2 Spaces per unit 3 Bed Dwellings 2 Spaces per unit 4 Bed House 3 Spaces per unit</p>	<p>The site meets the Borough Council's parking standards. KCC Highways and Transportation raises no objections and is satisfied that the scheme would not be detrimental to highway safety.</p>
<p><b>Policy H13 Community Engagement</b> As recommended by Ashford's current Local Plan, site promoters shall involve the community and work with local people (via the Parish Council) to ensure full resident engagement in the process and ensure high design quality using the Building for Life Toolkit as a framework. Residents shall also be included in dialogue about the plans for on going maintenance of public open space (and the funding of this), and these proposals shall form part of any planning applications, which come forward. See example of benefits (Orange section para 5.10 Page 14).</p>	<p>The developers have been mindful of the emerging local plan and have developed a scheme that is largely in accordance with it.</p> <p>Once it became apparent that a neighbourhood plan was proposed for the village, the applicants contacted the parish council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The applicants have shown a willingness to work with the NP steering group. This process has resulted in a reduction in the proposed number of housing units (from an original layout of 34 units) to an agreement to include a 20 -space car park for the school.</p>

<p><b>Policy H14 Drainage System</b>  Development in Bethersden Parish will be supported subject to meeting other policies in this Plan. Developers will therefore be required to make a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network. Early liaison should take place between the developer and the service provider. Provision shall be made for onsite attenuation of surface water flow, to be approved by the relevant authorities</p>	<p>Southern Water has raised no objections to this proposal subject to a condition.</p>
<p><b>Policy H15 Maintenance of Public Open Space</b>  a) Proposals that deliver substantial community space and facilities will be supported subject to meeting the other policies in this Plan. A viable management plan will need to be agreed with the Parish Council which sets out what facilities are to be delivered by whom and by when.  b) Where the Parish Council, or another not for profit community body, takes on an adoption role, financial contributions will be secured from the developer towards the maintenance of facilities for at least a ten year period.</p>	<p>The applicants have provided a management plan, which clearly defines those areas which will be managed by the management company. An appropriate condition is attached to secure the management of these spaces in the long term.</p>

Condition 33 needs to be amended as follows:

A public access and management plan for the public open spaces and car park shown in purple on Plan 2380-05 (to include management objectives and any restrictions on full and unrestricted access and use by the public at all times) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any development above foundation level. The public open space and car park shall then be provided in accordance with the approved plan prior to occupation of the 15<sup>th</sup> property and the plan shall thereafter be implemented in full and retained in force unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that the public open spaces and car park are secured and properly maintained.

- (b) **17/01118/AS - Prince Albert, 109 New Street, Ashford, Kent, TN24 8TP - Demolition of existing public houses and associated buildings and erection of a five storey apartment building containing fourteen 2**

**bedroom units and 84m<sup>2</sup> of commercial space at ground floor level including 14 car parking spaces, refuse and cycle storage and a vehicle layby**

### **Further Representations**

Clarification of the position of Southern Water (received on 6th December)

“Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

*“A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. To initiate a sewer capacity check to identify the appropriate connection point for the development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or [www.southernwater.co.uk](http://www.southernwater.co.uk)”.*

It is the responsibility of the developer to make suitable provision for the disposal of surface water. Part H3 of the Building Regulations prioritises the means of surface water disposal in the order

- a Adequate soakaway or infiltration system
- b Water course
- c Where neither of the above is practicable sewer

Southern Water supports this stance and seeks through appropriate Planning Conditions to ensure that appropriate means of surface water disposal are proposed for each development. It is important that discharge to sewer occurs only where this is necessary and where adequate capacity exists to serve the development. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer the prior approval of Southern Water is required.

Due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or [www.southernwater.co.uk](http://www.southernwater.co.uk)”.

**(Officer comment:**If the proposals are supported I do not propose to amend condition 29 (Drainage) as it addresses these points. I will however add the suggested further informatives so that the applicants attention is drawn to the comments received from Southern Water.

### **Additional Comments**

Further objection comments have been received from two of the original objectors and a new objector. Two statements from Ward Councillors, one of which is objecting and one of which is supporting.

Alexander Cumming-Webb & Rose Davis

*"We live at 8 Barrow Hill Place and would like to register an objection to the above proposal on a number of grounds -*

*1. The site is a listed building in an area surrounded by other listed buildings the design of which has been heavily (if insensitively) lent on in this proposal. An example of redevelopment more in keeping with the local environment can be seen diagonally opposite at 60 New Street also a former public house, now sensitively restored. The demolition of the existing structure would deprive Ashford of a piece of its history and replace it with an incongruous structure without reasonable precedent.*

*2. The proposed height of the development is taller than all the other surrounding buildings specifically 1-6 Barrow Hill Place at a height of 5 storeys compared to 4 in the existing period properties. Owing to the offset of the site from the existing buildings my concern is that my property will no longer enjoy the same level of morning light in / rear of my property and the back garden. Additionally this will add to the level which my garden is overlooked.*

*3. The number of new flats and the commercial development threaten to exacerbate the already scarce parking available in Barrow Hill Place. No provision appears to have been made for customers visiting the commercial unit or the commercial loading and unloading needs of the business. This will adversely affect existing permit holders and increase the level of short term parking and permit applications in what is already an overcrowded scheme.*

*4. The disruption caused by building work on this scale in what is already a narrow road with limited parking and room for the necessary plant and material needs of the proposed work.*

Comments from Sir Jason Fawcett, Birling Road, Ashford

*"I for one agree that preserving this building is important to the surrounding area. Its maybe unsightly but its about time the owner preserve it and to do the repairs needed. The plans for the block of flats are going to look ugly. They will look out of place and ruin the beauty of Ashford. There are already to many eye sore flats with in the town. So PRESERVE HISTORY NOT DESTORY IT."*

Comments were received from Steve Salter C/O Unit 4 Park Mall

*"Please find the attached Kent Archaeological Society Manorial Records for the town and indeed the Fountain at no.111 plus the Andrew's and Mudge maps of 1796 and 1801 respectively. The manorial records indicate a hostelry on the site in approximately 1680 and have been confirmed by an official source and the County's archaeological experts. On provision of this information extensively researched by myself and the late Richard Filmer to Historic England, they confirmed that the 1976 listing was incorrect and that they would be altering their legacy records accordingly.*



*Mr Savio the previous owner at the time of the fire and just prior to commissioned a report by Heritage Collective who based their appraisal on this flawed listing information and there on subsequent reports have mirrored the flawed information. The discovered information of at least a year ago indicates a building (number 111) of at least 330 years old. Councillors have been copied this information which in our view (Richard and I) is of extreme importance, but I do not see adequate reference to this in your report. Should the council be allowing the demolition of a building of such vintage?. The lack of precise reference to these points would render the application an open and shut case. Until the relevant officers are brought up to speed and the content of the report amended, I do not think it appropriate that the application be subject to a decision on Wednesday. Equally having been the founder of such information, for the council to not consider and include this in the case, severely discredits me as a historian. I do not hold you responsible for this because I have spoken to and corresponded with your colleagues and councillors beforehand.*





***Attachment 1 – Prince Albert Before Neglect  
7.***



***Attachment 2 – Oak Lintels***

## Ashford Manor & other property - Reference numbers 21 to 40

These webpages are designed to be viewed with the screen resolution set at 800 x 600 and text size at normal. [HOW TO](#)

	Owner	Occupier
<b>Reference 21</b>		
<b>I.21 F mess in New Rents [17-19] - Rent 4d</b>		
	MR Sturton	
	MR Wage Robert	John Barrow?
	MR Wage Matthew	
	MR Austen John	Lekeine wid
	MR Smith Elizabeth (school)	
1773	MR Adcock Mary	
1796	MR Geott Catherine	
18 ?	MR Lewis George A	self
<b>Abuttals - north to New Rents</b>		
	- east to mess	reference 16
1773	MR Farrant Thomas	
1773	MR Apsley John	
	- south to old cherry garden	reference 195
	- west to mess reference 219	
1773	MR March William (wife Mary née Kingham)	

## Reference 22

<b>H.22 F mess in New Street [111] - Rent 3¼d</b>		
previously <i>Fountain</i> later <i>Prince of Orange</i>		
	EB17 May Cecilia	
1680	EB17 Barlow Frances wid	
	MR Jacob Edward Dr	
	MR Bate Roberta	
	MR Bate Elizabeth	
	MR Wage Matthew	
	MR Austen John	Roe Elizabeth
1773	MR Gorsse James A	self
1788	IN Gorsse James A	self
1797	IN Baldock William	barracks
1802	IN Lasaux [later Ayerst] Robert G	self
<b>Abuttals</b>		
	- north to highway to Barrow hill	
	- east to cherry garden	reference 121
1680	EB17 Starr Comfort	
	IN Starr Joy	
	IN Flint Thomas	
1773	MR Flint Abraham	
	- south to land (1680)	
1680	EB17 Sharp John heirs	
	- south & west to footway to Barrow hill	
<b>H.22a - Rent 1½d</b>		
1845	MR Norwood C Y	
<b>H.22b - Rent 1d</b>		
1845	MR Fowler John	
<b>H.22c - Rent 1¼d</b>		
1799	MR Andrews Pierce	
1845	MR Betts William	

## Reference 23

### Attachment 3 – KAS listing

#### A design objection statement by Peter Feacey (Ward Councillor)

*"I do welcome redevelopment of this site as I believe it's been an eyesore on one of the main route into the town centre for a number of years. Although the Prince Albert was of historic value there is little or no chance of it reopening as a public house and the site is in urgent need of redevelopment.*

*The town at the moment is going through a renaissance with good solid designs transforming it into a cosmopolitan centre, I have meet and voiced*

*my concern with planners over this development as I believe the architect could do better and make it more aesthetically pleasing.*

*Although the design is trying to reflect the surrounding buildings which are set back from the road and shielded by trees. This proposal is five storeys high and so close to the road it will dominate the corner and I believe it will not fit comfortably into the area.”*

*A statement in support by Graham Galpin (Local Resident, Member for Stour ward and Portfolio Holder for Commercial Property)*

*“I have a number of points to make regarding this application, but I am unfortunately unable to attend this evening’s Planning Committee. I have therefore asked this letter to be read out by Cllr Clarkson.*

*I am writing with three roles in mind, first as a resident of Barrow Hill, second as a ward member for Stour ward, and thirdly and most importantly as Portfolio Holder for Commercial Property including town centre issues.*

*There have been suggestions that the property could be returned to its previous state and even re-instated as a pub. As a resident of Barrow Hill for over 30 years I have seen both the Prince Albert (109 New Street) and the Prince of Orange (111 New Street) operate as public houses until the combined plot closed about 8 years ago.*

*During the whole of that period various landlords have had the license has varied to experiment with ways of making trading viable. None has been successful. The resulting closure is evidence of this.*

*Much has been made of the history of the property. The delisting of the property was in recognition of the loss of a very small historic section lost during the recent fire. Similarly, the loss of the “historic” portico is overstated. I have seen repairs to the plinths of the columns some years ago where the plywood used had rotted. When the portico was taken down it was clearly made of plywood; hardly a historic material.*

*I do recognise that the Pubs had a place in the social history of Ashford, but economic changes make the position of any public house tenuous. The smoking ban has had an impact on all licensed premises. Added to this, the fact that there is no parking for patrons of the Prince Albert and it lays too far from the town hub to be access easily by foot add to the pressures of its continued life as a pub.*

*We as a Council looked at the economic viability of investing in the site when it became available, but could not make it stack up as a reasonable use of Council Tax payers’ money. I am therefore very pleased that there is this interest in the site.*

*The site is located at one of the most important gateways to Ashford Town and at present does not reflect the excellent works being carried out by existing and new investors to utilise property and brown field sites – Ashford is a town to be very proud off and is “on the up”. Unfortunately 109 New Street is a blight on our town. The brownfield site must be brought back into*



use. To do this, alternative designs and uses have been explored and “viability” is a key point.

*To provide an adequate return for an investor the conversion to apartments with associated parking and a commercial unit seems a sensible way forward and the design offered has been warmly received by the Design Panel. The developer has listened to local people and arranged that the balconies have restricted views to existing properties. Parking is more than adequate, and the general presentation offered has my wholehearted support.*

*I fully support this application as it stands and will be pleased to see a new, imposing gateway to Ashford, even if it is very close to my own home. The sweeping away of a redundant shell of a building, presently used by vagrants, and people carrying out what appears to be illegal activities is exciting in itself. For it then to be replaced with a managed and character-filled new development is most welcome.*

*I ask that colleagues remember that we are creating a new history for Ashford to complement the existing one – we cannot do this by retaining unremarkable brownfield sites.”*

#### New Conditions

In light of the comments regarding the history of the building the following archaeological recording condition is recommended to be added -

#### Archaeological Recording

*No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

**Reason:** *To ensure that any historic building features are properly examined and recorded.*

- (c) **17/00396/AS - Land Parcels 8 & 10 Former Rowcroft and Templer Barracks site, Templer Way, Ashford, Kent - Reserved matters application for 62 residential apartments including affordable housing, together with flexible employment floorspace (B1/ A1/ A2/ A3/ A4 or A5 Use Classes), 7 mixed use units comprising flexible ground floor employment floorspace (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1 or D1 uses classes), associated landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks**

#### Recommendation

#### **Approve Reserved Matters**

Subject to the following further conditions

#### New Condition

17. Prior to the first occupation of any units details including plans for the provision of at least two electric vehicle charging points within both Parcel 8 and Parcel 10 shall be provided to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter the charging points shall be implemented and maintained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details and retained available, in a working order for the charging of electric vehicles. The charging point may be a dedicated electric vehicle charging socket capable of safely providing a slow charge to an electric vehicle via a domestic charging cable.

**Reason:** To take into account the cumulative impacts of development on air quality and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes including incorporation of facilities for charging plug-in vehicles.

- (d) **17/00578AS - Land Parcel 9 Former Rowcroft and Templer Barracks site, Templer Way, Ashford, Kent - Reserved matters application for 31 residential apartments together with flexible employment floorspace (B1/ A1/ A2/ A3/ A4 or A5 Use Classes), associated landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks pursuant to outline planning permission 02/01565/AS**

Recommendation

**Approve Reserved Matters**

Subject to the following further conditions

New Conditions

15. Prior to the first occupation of any units details including plans for the provision of at least two electric vehicle charging points within both Parcel 8 and Parcel 10 shall be provided to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter the charging points shall be implemented and maintained in in perpetuity accordance with the approved details and retained available, in a working order for the charging of electric vehicles. The charging point may be a dedicated electric vehicle charging socket capable of safely providing a slow charge to an electric vehicle via a domestic charging cable.

**Reason:** To take into account the cumulative impacts of development on air quality and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes including incorporation of facilities for charging plug-in vehicles.

16. Prior to the first occupation of any unit details of a parking strategy setting out the precise allocation of private parking spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and maintained in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing. The strategy shall include but not limited to:

- Plans showing which spaces are dual use and which are private
- 2 Parking Spaces allocated for each of the 3 bedroom apartments
- Details of signage to indicate how each space is to be used

**Reason:** In the interests of ensuring that parking provision is deployed and used effectively and in the interests of residential amenity.

(e) **16/01828/AS - Land to the rear of 1 Ragstone Hollow, Aldington, Kent TN25 7DL - Demolition of existing garages and erection of 4 new bungalows and associated works including 11 additional community spaces**

Additional objection comments received from two of the original objectors – raising the following concerns:

- Additional traffic in the village
- This is one of the access points onto the Village Green and would have the potential adverse impact on the future occupiers of the proposed dwellings [**JDCM comment:** this would not result in noise and disturbance to the future occupiers of these dwellings]
- The proposed parking is insufficient for the number of occupants [**JDCM comment:** the proposed parking for the dwellings is in accordance with the Council's Residential Parking Standards]
- The existing garages are all still in use [**JDCM comment:** five of the six garages remain in use, one of these is by the Parish Council for storage and the others by private individuals]
- Other small developments in Aldington have impacted upon the village without any obvious infrastructure to mitigate the effect on existing residents.
- The village is not sustainably located due to the potential loss of the bus service. [**JDCM comment:** Aldington is considered to be a sustainable settlement, as outlined under policy TRS1 of the TRS DPD. Minor residential infilling is considered acceptable, a bus service remains in place but there are sufficient services within the village to support new residential development of this scale and to gain access to these within a reasonable distance.]
- The officer comment regarding the disabled space is not a planning consideration but I feel as a resident of the Borough, they should be afforded some concern [**JDCM comment:** this would be a matter for Parking Services, an application for a disabled parking space can be applied for through their application process]

Comments received from Ward Member, Cllr Miss Jane Martin in support of the application which states:

Aldington Parish is desperately in need of truly affordable homes for local people. A local need housing survey conducted in 2015 demonstrated a strong need for at least 16 homes.

This application has been widely debated in the village and residents largely support its approval because these are delivering for local need. It is in line with Paragraph 17 of the NPPF seeking to meet the housing needs of the area, is also utilising a brownfield site, enhancing the visual impact on the built up area and on the open green space adjacent.

Whilst the loss of the land has caused concern as noted on pages 5.6 and 5.7 of the Officer's report, due to loss of temporary parking, the planners and the Housing department have gone to great lengths to add additional parking to minimise the loss and to create a formal parking area that improves the look of this amenity.

I welcome the officer recommendation in paragraph 27 on page 5.13 to impose a condition ensuring windows from plot 3 do not overlook neighbouring properties, and I ask the Committee to include this in the application.

I would ask however that consideration be given to the commencement of development. Aldington has been deluged by development in the main village area. One development has just come to completion and another across the road from Ragstone Hollow has just begun.

**As ward member I support the application and commend the Officers report.**

Additional information

- i) Concerns raised relating to damage during pile driving would be covered by warranties sought through the design process, which is by qualified engineers. The works would also have to comply with the Party Wall Act 1996 which seeks to prevent and resolve disputes in relation to party walls, boundary walls and excavation.
- ii) The site was previously in use as a quarry and Environmental Health have provided additional clarification regarding the proposed works required to remediate against any contamination on the site in association with this previous use. The conditions imposed would require a schedule of works and further details to be submitted to the Council and should any unexpected contamination be found during the works. There is the potential for landfill gas on the site associated with the previous use and the backfilling which took place subsequently, this is identified in the reports submitted by the applicant, which have been considered by Environmental Health who raise no objection subject to these two conditions.

- (f) **17/01602/AS - Flats 1 – 27 Martin House, Little Chequers, Wye - The replacement of existing uPVC windows for reason of repair**

The Parish Council considered the above planning application and resolved to SUPPORT. The Parish Council welcomes the upgrading of the windows at Martin House.