

Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council

Minutes of the Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council Planning & Licensing Committee meeting held on 15th June 2021 at 7pm in the parish office

Present: Cllrs A. Humphryes (Meeting Chair)
R. Roome
L. Date
Clerk

1. Apologies: Cllrs Smith, Jessel and Redfearn
2. Notification of late items for the agenda : None
3. Declaration of Interests: None
4. Applications considered (plans were available at the meeting):

**21/501853 1 Cliff Cottages, Cliff Hill, Boughton Monchelsea
Demolition of existing garage, shed and erection of a single detached dwelling house**

The Parish Council wish to see the application refused for the following planning reasons. If MBC are minded to approve it then we wish to see the application reported to MBC planning committee for decision.

- a) We feel that this application fails to comply with the following MBC policies : SP17 sections 1 to 6; DM1 sections I, ii, iii, iv, vi, viii; DM8, DM30 sections i and ii
- b) Policy SP17 of MBC's Local Plan in part protects the open countryside, the LLV of the Loose Valley and the conservation areas. This site falls within all three land designations.
- c) Policy SP17 of MBC's Local Plan notes that the countryside is a sensitive location within which to integrate new development and the Council will expect proposals to respect the high quality and distinctive landscapes of the borough in accordance with policy DM30. In order to assist in the successful integration of new development into the countryside the Council will ensure Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments are carried out as appropriate to assess suitability and to aid and facilitate the design process.
- d) Development proposals within landscapes of local value (LLVs) should, through their siting, scale, mass, materials and design, seek to contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the protected landscape. Designated areas include parts of the Greensand Ridge and the Low Weald, and the Medway, the Loose and the Len river valleys. These landscapes were highlighted as areas of local value by the public through local plan consultations.

- e) MBC Local Plan policies SP11 and SP12 are quoted in the planning statement which relate to developments within the boundary of the larger village. This site is some three quarters of a mile from the boundary therefore these policies do not apply.
- f) With no services or public transport, the development site is completely unsustainable, contrary to the NPPF.
- g) The proposal lies within the newly approved extension to The Quarries conservation area. The planning statement acknowledges the fact that the site is in a conservation area and cites examples of other development that has been permitted. Part of the reason for the conservation area extension was to preserve the character of the area which was being harmed through unsympathetic development. None of the examples cited by the applicant were constructed since the extension to the area was granted.
- h) The proposal is completely out of character with its surroundings in terms of scale, bulk, design and materials. The building is approximately 20m wide x 7m deep x 12.785m high. It could never be considered to be infill development.
- i) The proposed dwelling would overlook at least 3 properties to the south and west. When applying the usual neighbour amenity tests we would ask you to consider that what is called 'ground level' in the drawings and documents is approximately 8m higher than the ground level of neighbouring properties. Any overlooking would be more than just a few windows, the front of the building is fully glazed, giving 2 storeys x 20m width of glass.
- j) The proposal is highly visible and would cause unacceptable harm to visual amenity, including long distance views.
- k) The proposal is contrary to objective 1 of the Boughton Monchelsea Neighbourhood Plan. It is an unsustainable location and the proposal would have a negative visual impact on its surroundings.
- l) The proposal is contrary to objective 5 of the Boughton Monchelsea Neighbourhood Plan which states that housing development must be sustainable, meet the needs of the local community and be in keeping with the existing properties in the village and parish, thus preserving the rural atmosphere for future generations.
- m) The proposal is contrary to policy PWP2 of the Boughton Monchelsea Neighbourhood Development Plan which states that the distinctive character of the Priority Local Landscape as defined on Map 9 will be conserved and enhanced. Development proposals in this area will not be permitted unless they accord with other policies in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and the MBC Local Plan and they will not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- n) The proposal is contrary to policy RH1 of the Boughton Monchelsea Neighbourhood Plan which states that applications for new development must demonstrate how it responds positively to the established local character, including rural character and topography, and sits comfortably alongside existing development, respecting the privacy, wellbeing and quality of life of any existing residents. Supporting information shall include information on street scene impact and relationship to wider context and topography, where appropriate, in order to properly assess the impact.

- o) The proposed lighting scheme is entirely inappropriate to the rural nature of the site and is contrary to policy PWP10 of the Boughton Monchelsea Neighbourhood Plan. The policy states that external lighting must be designed and managed to reduce: a) energy usage b) impact on biodiversity c) light pollution and d) any harmful visual impact on neighbouring activities and the character of the area. Where appropriate, applications should be accompanied by sufficient details to ensure the impact of the development can be assessed. This could include a Lighting Assessment to ensure it complies with national and local requirements.
- p) The proposal is contrary to policy PWP6 of the Boughton Monchelsea Neighbourhood Development Plan. The site is unsustainable.
- q) Due to the nature of the very narrow lane the proposal is sited on, KCC should provide a specific response in terms of highway safety and suitability.
- r) There are Tree Preservation Orders in place as a result of the site being within a conservation area. The application documents incorrectly state that there are no TPOs.
- s) The visuals provided by the applicant are highly misleading, implying the plot is generously sized and the road wider than it really is.
- t) The conservation officer should be invited to respond to the application in terms of the effect on the nearby listed buildings as well as the conservation area as a whole.
- u) The proposal is adjacent to a reptile release site therefore a full ecological survey should have been provided.

21/502738 8 Hook Way, Maidstone

Erection of two storey side extension and insertion of front solar PV panels

No objection / comment

5. Any other Business:
None

6. Date of Next Meeting: To be confirmed

Meeting closed at 7.30pm