

Planning Committee

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford on the **16th January 2019**.

Present:

Cllr. Burgess (Chairman);

Cllr. Link (Vice-Chairman);

Cllrs. Mrs Bell, Bennett, Buchanan, Chilton, Clarkson (ex officio), Clokie, Galpin, Heyes, Hicks, Knowles, Krause, Macpherson, Michael, Waters, Wedgbury.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2(iii) Cllrs. Mrs Bell and Michael attended as Substitute Members for Cllrs. Bradford and Ovenden respectively.

Apologies:

Cllrs. Bradford, Dehnel, Ovenden.

Also Present:

Cllrs. Farrell, Iliffe.

Joint Development Control Manager; Strategic Applications Team Leader; Principal Urban Designer; Local Transport and Development Planner (Kent County Council Highways and Transportation); Director of Place and Space; Head of Planning and Development; Principal Solicitor (Strategic Development); Member Services and Ombudsman Complaints Officer.

295 Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Interest	Minute No.
Mrs Bell	Made a Voluntary Announcement as she was the Council's Cabinet Member for Environment and Land Management and also the KCC Divisional Member for Ashford Rural East.	297 – 18/01140/AS
Bennett	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	297 – 18/00448/AS
Burgess	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	297 – 18/00448/AS
Clarkson	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	297 – 18/00448/AS

P
160119

Clokie	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society and Tenterden and District Residents' Association.	297 – 18/00448/AS
Farrell	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of KCC And Made a Voluntary Announcement that his employer had been a consultee on the application but had not commented on it.	297 – 18/01140/AS 18/01168/AS 18/01369/AS 297 – 18/01369/AS
Galpin	Declared that as he was Portfolio Holder for Corporate Property he had links with the application. He would speak on the item, but not present a motion or take part in the vote.	297 – 18/01369/AS
Michael	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society And Made a statement that as he was privy to some relevant information, he had sent an email on 13 January 2019 to Members raising some questions about this application, on the understanding that he would not be a member of the Committee. However, he was subsequently asked to substitute for a member of the Committee. He assured Members that he had come to the meeting to listen to the debate and hear answers to questions and issues with an open mind, and that he had no personal or prejudicial interest in the application.	297 – 18/00448/AS 297 – 18/01140/AS
Wedgbury	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was acquainted with people involved with the Hockey Club.	297 – 18/01140/AS

296 Minutes

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of this Committee held on the 12th December 2018 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

[Note: the corrective text set out under item 3, Minutes, in the Update Report, was not read, referred to or included in the above resolution, as it was an error.]

297 Schedule of Applications

Resolved:

That following consideration of (a), (b) and (c) below,

- (a) Private representations (number of consultation letters sent/number of representations received)**
- (b) The indication of the Parish Council's/Town Council's views**
- (c) The views of Statutory Consultees and Amenity Societies (abbreviation for consultee/society stated)**

Supports 'S', objects 'R', no objections/no comments 'X', still awaited '+', not applicable/none received '-'

decisions be made in respect of Planning Applications as follows: -

Application Number	18/01140/AS
Location	Land fronting Canterbury Road at Ashford Hockey Club and land to the north of Ball Lane, Kennington, Kent
Grid Reference	02823/455078
Ward	Kennington
Application Description	Outline application for the erection of 9 dwellings with access from Canterbury Road (with all other matters reserved), and change of use of land from agriculture to provide two football pitches on land at Ball Lane.
Applicant	Ashford Hockey Club
Agent	Mr S Davies, Hobbs Parker, Romney House, Monument Way, Orbital Park, Ashford, TN24 0HB
Site Area	2.98ha
(a) 372/193S, 53/R, 1+	(b) - (c) SE/X, KAS/X, KHS/X, KCC LLFA/X, BTOD/X, KCCE/X, EA/X, EHM/X, KCCPROW/X, Kent Police/X, CPRE/R

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Mr Street, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He had concerns regarding planning, security/safety and the suitability of the replacement pitches. His daughter was a keen member of the Hockey Club, and he himself had refereed matches and considered the Hockey Club to be an extremely valuable part of the local community. From a planning perspective, Mr Street noted that there were only 14 supporters living in Kennington whereas 45 objectors lived in Kennington. Many supporters lived away from the area or appeared to be friends and family of Club Members. The application was not necessary to Ashford's 5-year housing land supply or Local Plan, and the planning system was not designed to be used to compensate for poor management of finances, which had been part of the Hockey Club's problem. To do so would set a dangerous precedent. The Council could allocate S106 funds towards the Club if they considered it worthy. Residents would like to see the Hockey Club do a great deal more fundraising for themselves, in a similar way to the Kennington Cubs who had raised £250,000 for their own hut. This would be preferable to sacrificing the amenity of local residents. Kennington appeared to be taking more than its fair share of new development. In terms of the safety of the pitches, the replacement pitches would be 400m from the clubhouse. Children and young people would have to make their way through a busy car park and a single gate before walking along Ball Lane for 15-20m and crossing the road. This was a cause for concern from a safety point of view. There were also concerns about the suitability of the pitches. There were many requirements from the FA and from Sports England, including the requirement that the pitches should be open to the general public via a community use agreement. It was not clear whether this had been covered.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Mr Dawson, the Chairman of the Hockey Club, spoke in support of the application. He said the Club had 150 adult members and 10 senior teams. The Club also ran training sessions and organised matches for about 200 juniors. All the hockey was played on one astroturf pitch, which was hired out during the week to local clubs and schools for hockey and football. The redundant grass hockey pitches were used by Kennington Junior Football Club, which was a flourishing local club with about 450 members. They also shared the clubhouse facilities. The Council's 2017 review of sports facilities recognised the importance of the Hockey Club, and identified shortcomings in the facilities and the benefits that would be achieved by improving them. The astroturf pitch needed to be resurfaced and the clubhouse facilities required improvement, particularly the changing rooms. Hockey did not have access to the grant funding available to professional sports. Other Kent hockey clubs had recently upgraded their facilities with funding raised by land sales. Ashford Hockey Club had successfully maintained itself financially for many years. The Club had received moderate grant funding in the past but essentially provided a significant recreational and sporting facility to the local community without public subsidy. However, it was now necessary to spend a significant sum, in excess of £220,000, to resurface the pitch. Without this work, hockey could not be played and the Club would be at risk. This scheme involved selling the equivalent of just over a full size football pitch and renting land to build two new football pitches. The result for both hockey and junior football clubs would be a significant improvement to the facilities and playing surfaces. The scheme was supported by the Hockey Club, Kennington Junior Football Club, England Hockey, the Kent Football Association and Sport England. It met the priorities in the Council's playing pitch strategy and would provide funds to secure the long-term future of the Club. The Club was fortunate to have one of the best sporting sites in Kent and this plan would provide improved facilities, including overdue female changing rooms, and excellent sporting opportunities. The Club was a community-aided sports club and its constitution required all funds to be retained for the benefit of sport at the Club. Mr Dawson asked Members to support the Officer's recommendation.

The Ward Member attended and spoke in objection to the application.

Resolved:

Deferred for Officers to explore whether the football pitches are realistic given their flood zone location and ground conditions, whether the 9 homes that are proposed could be better accommodated elsewhere, and whether alternative methods of funding the hockey club have been fully explored.

Application Number	18/0448/AS
Location	Land South of Tilden Gill Road, Tilden Gill Road, Tenterden
Grid Reference	89372/33117
Parish Council	Tenterden Town Council

Ward	Tenterden South
Application Description	Application for the approval of reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale) pursuant to outline permission ref 14/01420/AS for the erection of up to 100 dwellings, parking, landscaping, open space and associated works
Applicant	Redrow Homes, Prince Regent House, Quayside, Chatham, Kent, ME4 4QZ
Agent	Ms J Hanslip, Urbanissta Ltd, Eastside, London, N1C 4AX
Site Area	5.6 ha

The Strategic Applications Team Leader drew Members' attention to the Update Report. Three additional emails of objection from a resident had been received, as well as a letter of objection from Tenterden Town Council. An email letter of objection had been submitted by Belgar Residents Association, and the Weald of Kent Protection Society had raised a number of objections to the amended layout. An email had been received from the applicant to advise on the changes made to the application, and 65 identical letters of objection had been received from local residents.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Mr Young, a local resident representing the Belgar Residents' Group, spoke in objection to the application. Belgar residents remained concerned that the response from the applicant had been inconsistent and some issues had still not been addressed to make the scheme acceptable. The applicant's process of negotiation appeared to be to respond only to a very specific and focused request from the Council. After the deferral, residents met with the applicant. In spite of representations from Tenterden Town Council and residents, the applicant made it clear that they would not discuss the buffer strip around other parts of the site and the 3-storey buildings. The applicant had made a revision to the buffer at units 54 and 46, which was now 15m, but a reduced buffer of 7.5m had appeared at units 55 and 64, and there was only a 5m buffer at the garage to unit 63. Residents were pleased with the 15m buffer but did not understand why the same buffer had not been applied consistently to the other sensitive boundaries around the site. If the 15m buffer was appropriate for the setting of the ancient woodland, and on one part of the boundary to the listed buildings, it should be consistently applied to the whole boundary of the green corridor. The applicant had confirmed that they would not investigate the root protection zones for TPO trees along the boundary. It was feared that without a 15m buffer the trees would ultimately be damaged and lost. WKPS had echoed all residents' concerns, as well as opposing the location of the 3-storey flats next to the AONB and on the highest part of the site. WKPS were concerned that the applicant had stated that this was their 'final amendment'. A large development such as this should respect the planning system and the representations made by local residents and the Town Council. The applicant's process was to implement changes reluctantly, and only in tiny degrees at a time. This was disrespectful to Council Members. There had been a further swell of objections recently, as well as a formal application to KCC to adopt a public footpath

through the development. Mr Young asked Members to defer this proposal until the best possible outcome could be achieved, and to seek further amendments to the reserved matters.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Ms Waldron, the agent, spoke in support of the application. She said the scheme now showed an increased buffer to the Belgar residents, as required, and plots 46 and 54 had been relocated within the site. A distance of over 18m had been achieved between plot 46 and the Belgar outbuilding. This increased strip would also be planted fully. The applicant had met with residents, the Town Council and the Ward Member to discuss the revision, and all parties had been kept up to date by letter. The scheme was the culmination of 18 months of discussion and agreement with Officers, as well as three re-submissions. As set out in the report, Officers had no objections to the scheme. The concern regarding the location of the apartment blocks was recognised. The approach to Affordable Housing had been agreed from an early stage of the proposals in order to meet local requirements for one and two-bed flats. It had also been necessary to meet the space and amenity standard. The location of the blocks had been considered carefully, taking into consideration the height, scale and massing of the new and existing development. The blocks were designed using local features, such as weatherboarding. The Appeal decision recognised that the site should not remain undeveloped and the setback of the boundary allowed for the existing landscaped boundary to be retained and enhanced. Ms Waldron urged Members to consider the benefits of the scheme as a whole, including the provision of much-needed housing in accordance with the land supply, 35% Affordable Housing to meet local needs, a high quality scheme, as recognised by the Officers, and the extensive S106 contributions to enhance local infrastructure. Ms Waldron asked Members to vote with the Officer's recommendation.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Mr Crawford, the Chairman of Tenterden Town Council's Planning Committee, spoke in objection to the application. He started by thanking the applicant for quickly turning around the request to re-position plots 46 and 54, thus increasing the buffer size at that point. However, the Town Council still objected to the overall application. There were two main objections, which were supported by other consultees, such as WKPS. The first was the ecological buffer around the site for sustainable natural conservation. This was particularly important around the northern end by the AONB as a natural corridor was required. An ecological buffer was one of the key elements of green infrastructure that could protect a sensitive location, such as this one. In addition, it would provide protection to the boundary trees designated as TPOs next to the Belgar settlement and privacy for existing residents. The Local Plan 2030 was now considered to be sound, and the section on the setting of the AONB held weight. It highlighted that the Local Authority was required to take into consideration the setting outside of an AONB when determining planning applications. The second issue was the positioning of the three-storey blocks of Affordable flats, in particular those adjacent to the AONB. It was considered that the blocks of flats should either be repositioned or reduced to 2-storeys by making them longer to accommodate the same number of units. It was critical that the number of Affordable units was not reduced as they were required by the local community. As had been demonstrated by the applicant, for plots 46 and 54, it was possible to produce an alternative solution when there was motivation to do so. The Town Council requested that the applicant consider the problem and come up with alternative solutions that met their

need for 100 units, and also satisfied the Town Council's need for a block of flats to fit in with the character of the neighbourhood and AONB, together with an acceptable perimeter buffer. Mr Crawford reiterated that his meeting with the applicant produced a good result regarding the repositioning of the two plots, and he asked the Committee to direct the applicant to produce an acceptable solution for the two remaining issues to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Resolved:

Deferred for Officers to seek amended plans to be brought back to the Committee in relation to moving Plot 64 and the garage to Plot 63 westwards in order to achieve a wider buffer zone in that part of the site adjacent to the western boundary of Belgar, and for there to be dialogue with the applicant about the relocation of the flats and their impacts.

Application Number	18/01168/AS	
Location	Kent Wool Growers Ltd, Brundrett House, Tannery Lane, Ashford, Kent, TN23 1PN	
Grid Reference	01316/42484	
Ward	Victoria (Ashford)	
Application Description	Demolition of existing buildings (except Whist House) and redevelopment to provide 254 residential units within four apartment buildings and works associated with the restoration of Whist House to provide a 4-bed dwelling. All together with associated areas of new public realm, hard and soft landscaping, parking, plant and storage and access works.	
Applicant	U+I (Ashford) Limited c/o Agent	
Agent	Lichfields, 14 Regents Wharf, All Saints Street, Islington, London, N1 9RL	
Site Area	1.19 hectares	
(a) 31/2R	(b) -	(c) AIA/R, EA/X, HE/X, KP/X NE/+, SG/X, SW/X, SER/X KCCH&T/R, KCC-H/R, KCC-ES/R, KCC-ED/X, KCCF&WM/X , ABC-EH/R, ABC-ES/X, ABC-HS/X, ABC-D/X, ABC-CSE/X

The Strategic Applications Team Leader drew Members' attention to the Update Report. There was a consultation response from KCC Ecology, and further technical

information had been submitted by the applicant in response to concerns by Kent Highways. A letter of objection had been received from Royal Mail. There was also a clarification of the increase in the number of units, changes to the Recommendation and changes to Condition 1.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Mr Gass, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The site was previously granted planning permission for a residential scheme in 2015 but it was never implemented due to viability issues. The applicant was keen to ensure their scheme was viable and deliverable, whilst also being of a high design quality. The applicant had invested heavily in Ashford over the last few years, and liked to think they were part of the transformation that was taking place, with two major schemes secured and construction underway on both. In planning terms, the site was allocated for residential use and formed an important part of the Commercial Quarter. From the outset, the applicant had considered the site's wider context and how it would one day interact with the wider redevelopment of the Commercial Quarter. With this in mind, the applicant had concentrated on creating better connections and provided a key street link between the International Station and the proposed multi-storey car park behind the bowling alley. Pedestrian links had been introduced from east to west, via an artistic footbridge designed by a local artist, through a fully-landscaped public realm. The proposals optimised and made the best use of this underutilised brownfield site in line with Government guidance. The design team had worked extensively with Officers and undertaken rigorous consultation with Historic England and the Design Review Panel to ensure a high quality of design. The resulting scheme gained strong support at public consultation. The proposals centred around four residential buildings, each with a different architectural character, collectively making reference to the site's heritage as a former tannery. A quality standards document provided further details on the materials and design quality and would ensure quality was maintained through to completion. Key to the proposal was a commitment to delivering a high-quality scheme to attract young, economically-active professionals, who would benefit from the site's highly sustainable location next to the International Station. There was one covered secure bike space per unit and 0.66 car spaces per residential unit were proposed, plus an additional 8 visitor spaces, to give an overall total of 0.7 car spaces per unit. It was proposed to include a car club and spaces to allow residents easy access to a rental car, should they need one. The applicant was committed to delivering a car club scheme in Ashford and this would be secured by the S106 agreement. Car club providers had confirmed their interest in operating in Ashford. The applicant had worked closely with KCC Highways and had agreed to undertake works at the Mace Lane junction to ease traffic pressures. The proposed development was an excellent opportunity to continue delivering the Commercial Quarter and to deliver high-quality homes.

The Ward Member attended and spoke on the application.

Resolved:

Deferred for Officers to seek amended plans to come back to Committee reducing the density & size of the development and increasing parking provision, as well as for further examination of the highway impact at the junction of Tannery Lane and Station Road.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.5, Councillor Galpin requested that his vote against the motion be recorded.

Application Number	18/01256/AS
Location	Whist House, Tannery Lane, Ashford, TN23 1PL
Grid Reference	601345 / 142465
Parish Council	Central Ashford
Ward	Victoria (Ashford)
Application Description	Demolition of two pre-1948 brick buildings. Internal and external restoration works to Whist House relating to its restoration to provide a 4-bed dwelling (associated to corresponding planning application 18/01168/AS for redevelopment of the site to provide to provide 251 residential units within four apartment buildings and works)
Applicant	U+I (Ashford) Limited
Agent	Litchfields, 14 Regents Wharf, All Saints Street, Islington, London, N1 9RL
Site Area	1.19 hectares

The Strategic Applications Team Leader drew Members' attention to the Update Report, which contained information on consultations with the Victorian Society and the Ancient Monuments Society.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3, Mr Gass, the applicant, said there was a close connection between this application and the preceding one and he did not address the Committee further.

Resolved:

Deferred

Application Number	18/01369/AS
Location	Old Corn Store and former Ashford Youth Theatre, Dover Place, Ashford, Kent TN23 1HU
Grid Reference	01207/42321
Parish Council	None

Ward	Victoria		
Application Description	Refurbishment of the existing Corn Store and former Youth Theatre buildings to provide workspace, food, drink, and event space. Demolition of the existing Youth Theatre Store to provide an enlarged flexible outdoor event space		
Applicant	Ashford Borough Council		
Agent	Carl Turner		
Site Area	0.16 hec		
(a) 60/3R, 1S	(b) -	(c) CACF +, KCC H&T X, KCC Bio X, CTRL +, NR +, PS X, ES X, EP X, CS X, PO (D) X, KPP, SWS X	

The Ward Member attended and spoke in support of the application.

Resolved:

Permit

Subject to the following Conditions and Notes:

1. Standard time condition.
2. Provision of cycle parking.
3. Details of existing and proposed surface water drainage.
4. Details of proposed sewerage disposal arrangements.
5. Details of all external lighting.
6. Details of any external signage.
7. Hours of use.
8. Noise limited to be installed.
9. Materials and surfacing treatment.
10. Investigation and control of contamination.
11. Uses to be in accordance with those applied for – no change of use.

12. Ecological enhancement.

13. CCTV.

Note to Applicant

1. Working with the Applicant

In accordance with paragraphs 38 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service,
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application
- where possible suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome,
- informing applicants/agents of any likely recommendation of refusal prior to a decision and,
- by adhering to the requirements of the Development Management Customer Charter.

In this instance,

- the applicant/agent was updated with issues after the initial site visit,
- was provided with pre-application advice,
- The applicant was provided the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme/ address issues.
- The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

Application Number	18/01627/AS
Location	Pound House, Trumpet House, Waterman House and Bears End House, Godfrey Walk, Ashford, Kent
Grid Reference	6000886/141893
Parish Council	South Ashford
Ward	Victoria
Application Description	Replacement of existing UPVC windows and balcony doors for maintenance reasons. Although the material and colour will remain, the fenestration design is intended to change.

Applicant	Ashford Borough Council
Agent	N/A
Site Area	1.44 Ha.

The Ward Member attended and stated he had no objection to the application.

Resolved:

Permit

Subject to the following Conditions and Notes:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details of external materials specified in the application which shall not be varied without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans listed in the section of this decision notice headed Plans/Documents Approved by this decision, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approval and to ensure the quality of development indicated on the approved plans is achieved in practice.

4. The development approved shall be made available for inspection, at a reasonable time, by the local Planning authority to ascertain whether a breach of planning control may have occurred on the land (as a result of departure from the plans hereby approved and the specific terms of this permission/consent/approval).

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the proper planning of the locality, the protection of amenity and the environment, securing high quality development through adherence to the terms of planning approvals and to ensure community confidence in the operation of the planning system.

Note to Applicant

1. Working with the Applicant

In accordance with paragraphs 38 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service,
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application
- where possible suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome,
- informing applicants/agents of any likely recommendation of refusal prior to a decision and,
- by adhering to the requirements of the Development Management Customer Charter.

In this instance

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

Queries concerning these Minutes?

Please contact membersservices@ashford.gov.uk

Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: www.ashford.moderngov.co.uk