

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE REMOTE MEETING HELD ON 25 JUNE 2020 **ADJOURNED TO 2 JULY 2020**

Present: Councillor English (Chairman) and
25 June Councillors Adkinson, Chappell-Tay, Eves, Harwood,
2020 Kimmance, Munford, Parfitt-Reid, Perry, Spooner,
Vizzard, Wilby and Young

Also Councillors Harper, McKay, Newton, Springett and
Present: de Wiggondene-Sheppard

276. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Brindle.

277. **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

It was noted that Councillor Young was substituting for Councillor Brindle.

278. **NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS**

Councillors Harper, McKay, Newton and Springett had given notice of their wish to speak on the report of the Head of Planning and Development relating to applications 19/501600/OUT and 19/506182/FULL – Land West of Church Road, Otham, Kent and were present at the meeting.

Councillor Springett had also given notice of her wish to speak on the report of the Head of Planning and Development relating to application 19/504734/FULL – 127 Hockers Lane, Thurnham, Maidstone, Kent.

Councillor de Wiggondene-Sheppard had given notice of his wish to speak on the report of the Head of Planning and Development relating to application 19/504734/FULL – 127 Hockers Lane, Thurnham, Maidstone, Kent and was present at the meeting.

279. **ITEMS WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA**

There were none.

280. **URGENT ITEMS**

The Chairman said that, in his opinion, the update reports of the Head of Planning and Development and any updates to be included in the Officer presentations should be taken as urgent items as they contained further information relating to the applications to be considered at the meeting.

281. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

With regard to the report of the Head of Planning and Development relating to applications 19/501600/OUT and 19/506182/FULL (Land West of Church Road, Otham, Kent), Councillor Spooner said that he was a Member of Bearsted Parish Council. However, he had not participated in the Parish Council's discussions on the applications and intended to speak and vote when they were considered.

282. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

The following disclosures of lobbying were noted:

Item 12.	19/501600/OUT & 19/506182/FULL - Land West of Church Road, Otham, Kent	Councillors Adkinson, Chapell-Tay, English, Eves, Harwood, Kimmance, Munford, Parfitt-Reid, Perry, Spooner, Vizzard, Wilby and Young
Item 13.	19/504734/FULL - 127 Hockers Lane, Thurnham, Maidstone, Kent	Councillors Adkinson, Chappell-Tay, Eves, Harwood, Munford, Parfitt-Reid, Perry, Spooner, Wilby and Young
Item 14.	19/503584/FULL - Kingsbrooke, Cranbrook Road, Staplehurst, Tonbridge, Kent	Councillor Wilby
Item 15.	20/501604/FULL - Maidstone Cemetery, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent	Councillor Wilby
Item 16.	20/500780/FULL - The Mellows, Marley Road, Harrietsham, Maidstone, Kent	Councillors Adkinson, Chappell-Tay, English, Eves, Kimmance, Munford, Parfitt-Reid, Perry, Vizzard, Wilby and Young
Item 17.	20/501035/HEDGE - Land South of Marden Rd - Staplehurst, Marden Road, Staplehurst, Kent	Councillors Perry and Wilby
Item 18.	19/500765/OUT & 19/501988/ADJ - Gibraltar Farm, Ham Lane, Hempstead, Gillingham, Kent	Councillors English, Kimmance, Perry, Spooner, Vizzard and Wilby
Item 19.	20/501029/FULL & 20/501030/LBC - Len House, Mill Street, Maidstone, Kent	Councillors Munford and Wilby
Item 20.	20/500442/FULL - Little Spitzbrook Farm, Haviker Street, Collier Street, Kent	Councillor Wilby

Item 21.	20/502043/FULL - Maidstone Lawn Tennis Club, Poplar Grove, Maidstone, Kent	Councillor Wilby
Item 23.	Exempt Appendix - 19/501600/OUT & 19/506182/FULL - Land West of Church Road, Otham, Kent	Councillors Adkinson, English, Kimmance, Munford, Parfitt-Reid, Vizzard and Wilby
Item 24.	Exempt Appendix - 20/500780/FULL - The Mellows, Marley Road, Harrietsham, Maidstone, Kent	Councillors Adkinson and Wilby

283. EXEMPT ITEMS

RESOLVED: That the public be excluded from the meeting in the event of Members wishing to discuss the information contained in the exempt Appendices to the reports of the Head of Planning and Development relating to applications 19/501600/OUT and 19/506182/FULL (Land West of Church Road, Otham, Kent) and 20/500780/FULL (The Mellows, Marley Road, Harrietsham, Maidstone, Kent) because of the likely disclosure of exempt information pursuant to paragraphs 5 and 1 respectively of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, having applied the public interest test.

284. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 MAY 2020

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed.

285. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

It was noted that petitions might be referred to in relation to agenda item 12 – 19/501600/OUT and 19/506182/FULL (Land West of Church Road, Otham, Kent).

286. 19/501600/OUT & 19/506182/FULL - LAND WEST OF CHURCH ROAD, OTHAM, KENT

19/501600/OUT - OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR UP TO 440 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS, WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, INFRASTRUCTURE, DRAINAGE, LANDSCAPING AND OPEN SPACE (ACCESS BEING SOUGHT WITH ALL OTHER MATTERS RESERVED FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION) - LAND WEST OF CHURCH ROAD, OTHAM, KENT

19/506182/FULL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR 421 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, INFRASTRUCTURE, DRAINAGE, OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING - LAND WEST OF CHURCH ROAD, OTHAM, KENT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Development providing further advice (including Counsel's Opinion) on the prospects of successfully defending its reasons for refusing applications 19/501600/OUT and 19/506182/FULL for 440 or 421 dwellings respectively on land west of Church Road, Otham and the likely risks of costs being awarded against the Council at appeal.

It was noted that:

- Both applications were considered by the Committee on 28 May 2020. Contrary to the recommendations of the Head of Planning and Development, the Committee voted to refuse the applications for the following reasons:

Outline Application

1. The proposal will result in severe traffic congestion on local road networks (Deringwood Drive, Spot Lane, Mallards Way and Madginford Road) and the increase in traffic will adversely affect residents to the point that air pollution is beyond what is reasonable for the Council to accept contrary to Policies H1(8) criteria 9, DM1 and DM6 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017.
2. The proposal will result in worsening safety issues on Church Road to the south of the site which has not been addressed and due to the constraints of the road likely will never be able to be addressed contrary to Policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017.
3. The proposal will adversely affect the settings of the Grade I listed Church and other listed buildings contrary to Policies SP18 and DM4 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 where the development will not be protecting or enhancing the characteristics, distinctiveness, diversity and quality of the heritage assets.

Full Application

1. The proposal will result in severe traffic congestion on local road networks (Deringwood Drive, Spot Lane, Mallards Way and Madginford Road) and the increase in traffic will adversely affect residents to the point that air pollution is beyond what is reasonable for the Council to accept contrary to Policies H1(8) criteria 9, DM1 and DM6 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017.
2. The proposal will result in worsening safety issues on Church Road to the south of the site which has not been addressed and due to the constraints of the road likely will never be able to be addressed contrary to Policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017.

3. The proposal will adversely affect the settings of the Grade I listed Church and Grade II listed Church House contrary to Policies SP18 and DM4 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 due to the visual effect of the whole development in both long and short term views and the development will not be protecting or enhancing the characteristics, distinctiveness, diversity and quality of the heritage assets.
- Pursuant to paragraph 30.3 (a) of Part 3.1 of the Council's Constitution and paragraph 17 (a) of the Local Code of Conduct for Councillors and Officers Dealing with Planning Matters (Part 4.4 of the Constitution), before the votes were taken, Planning and Legal Officers advised the Committee that they did not consider each reason for refusal to be sustainable and that they could have significant cost implications. The Head of Planning and Development gave a costs warning in respect of each application. Therefore, the decisions of the Committee were deferred to this meeting.

In presenting the report, the Principal Planning Officer summarised the advice which had been provided concluding that reasons for refusal 1 and 3 on both applications were unreasonable, could not be sustained at appeal and were highly likely to result in significant costs awards against the Council. Reason for refusal 2 was unreasonable, could not be sustained at appeal and there was a risk of a significant costs award against the Council but this risk was considered to be lower.

The Principal Planning Officer also provided the following updates:

- The applicant had lodged an appeal on the basis of non-determination of the outline application with the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 11 June 2020. This meant that the decision on the application would be made by PINS and not the Council. The Committee would now need to inform PINS what decision it would have made and therefore what position the Council would take at the appeal. The appellant had requested a Public Inquiry procedure and the Officers had advised PINS that they considered this to be appropriate. The Council had instructed Counsel and preliminary work was underway for the appeal. The start date for the Public Inquiry was awaited.
- The applicant had confirmed that the dedicated Church car park would form part of their proposals at appeal and also the additional widening of Church Road to the south of the site.
- Since the last meeting there had been a number of new representations on both applications, but none of them had raised any new material planning issues. The petition which had been submitted had been reported to the Committee at its last meeting.

Application 19/501600/OUT

The Chairman read out statements which had been submitted by Mr Everett of the Downswood Community Association (an objector) and Councillor Gray of Otham Parish Council. Councillor Weeks of Downswood Parish Council and Mr Goodban (agent for the applicant) addressed the meeting by video links.

Councillors Newton, Harper, McKay and Springett (Visiting Members) addressed the meeting.

In making his representations, Councillor Harper asked the Committee to consider adding the following either as additional conditions or reasons for refusal:

- That all pedestrian/cycle routes on the site should be a minimum of 3m in width in accordance with Sustrans and national standards;
- That the pedestrian/cycle path to the north east corner of the site should be connected to Foxden Drive and The Beams by a 3m wide walking/cycling route avoiding any steps to ensure full accessibility; and
- That the site layout be adjusted to provide a central north/south cycle/walking route linking through to Woolley Road, retaining open views of the North Downs and giving an alternative to Church Road for active travel.

Contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development, it was proposed and seconded that the Planning Inspectorate be informed that if the applicant had not lodged an appeal on the basis of non-determination of the application, the Committee would have refused permission for the following reasons:

1. Whilst mitigating increased traffic congestion on Deringwood Drive, the proposed improvements to the Deringwood Drive and Willington Street junction will result in severe traffic congestion on Willington Street contrary to Policy DM21 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal will result in worsening safety issues on Church Road to the south of the site which have not been addressed and due to the constraints of the road are likely to not be addressed by the application proposals and the mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the safety concerns contrary to Policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The representative of the Head of Legal Partnership advised the Committee that, in her opinion, to now make reference to severe traffic congestion on Willington Street would be unreasonable and escalate the risk of costs. The Principal Planning Officer concurred with this view.

The representative of KCC Highways advised the Committee that in the case of the Church Road applications, the Highway Authority had raised two objections in relation to highway safety and traffic congestion. In terms of the proposed reasons for refusal, reason 2 relating to worsening highway safety on Church Road was consistent with the objection raised by the Highway Authority and would be supported in the event of any appeal. In terms of reason 1 regarding traffic congestion on various local roads, he could also confirm that the addition regarding Willington Street would enable the Highway Authority to support the reason in the event of any appeal. The proposed mitigation put forward by the applicant would relieve congestion on Deringwood Drive but in doing so introduce delays onto Willington Street.

During the discussion, the Committee considered the Council's position at appeal and, specifically, conditions to be attached to any planning permission. It was suggested and agreed that in terms of the Church car park, the Council should be seeking a crescent parking approach rather than a more conventional car park approach as this would cause less harm to the listed buildings and the landscape. The Council should also seek to include the suggestions made regarding pedestrian/cycle routes.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Planning Inspectorate be informed that if the applicant had not lodged an appeal on the basis of non-determination of this application, the Committee would have refused permission for the following reasons:
 1. Whilst mitigating increased traffic congestion on Deringwood Drive, the proposed improvements to the Deringwood Drive and Willington Street junction will result in severe traffic congestion on Willington Street contrary to Policy DM21 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
 2. The proposal will result in worsening safety issues on Church Road to the south of the site which have not been addressed and due to the constraints of the road are likely to not be addressed by the application proposals and the mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the safety concerns contrary to Policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. That at the Public Inquiry, the Officers be requested to seek to include the Committee's suggestions regarding conditions to be attached to any planning permission.

Voting: 9 – For 2 – Against 2 – Abstentions

Having regard to the potential associated substantial costs, the Head of Planning and Development asked the Committee to move into Part II of

the meeting (private session) in accordance with paragraph 30.3 (b) of Part 3.1 of the Council's Constitution and paragraph 17 (b) of the Local Code of Conduct for Councillors and Officers Dealing with Planning Matters (Part 4.4 of the Constitution). However, in so doing, the Head of Planning and Development advised the Committee that he considered that the report contained all the salient information to support the Officer's recommendation. The Committee agreed that it was not necessary to move into Part II of the meeting at this stage.

Application 19/506182/FULL

Mr Hatcher of the Chapman Avenue Area Residents' Association (an objector) addressed the meeting by video link. Councillor Gray of Otham Parish Council, Councillor Weeks of Downswood Parish Council and Mr Goodban (agent for the applicant) had already addressed the meeting.

Councillors Newton, McKay and Springett (Visiting Members) indicated that they had nothing further to add.

Contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development, it was proposed and seconded that permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Whilst mitigating increased traffic congestion on Deringwood Drive, the proposed improvements to the Deringwood Drive and Willington Street junction will result in severe traffic congestion on Willington Street contrary to Policy DM21 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal will result in worsening safety issues on Church Road to the south of the site which have not been addressed and due to the constraints of the road are likely to not be addressed by the application proposals and the mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the safety concerns contrary to Policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

During the discussion, the Committee considered the Council's position in the event of an appeal and, specifically, conditions to be attached to any planning permission. It was noted that the detailed plans showed the additional landscape buffers previously requested by Members and, in terms of the Church car park, a crescent parking approach rather than a more conventional car park approach. In addition to the suggestions made regarding pedestrian/cycle routes in relation to the outline application, it was agreed that the Council should request the incorporation of renewable energy measures on the affordable housing element of the development.

RESOLVED:

1. That permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Whilst mitigating increased traffic congestion on Deringwood Drive, the proposed improvements to the Deringwood Drive and Willington Street junction will result in severe traffic congestion on Willington Street contrary to Policy DM21 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
 2. The proposal will result in worsening safety issues on Church Road to the south of the site which have not been addressed and due to the constraints of the road are likely to not be addressed by the application proposals and the mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the safety concerns contrary to Policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. That, in the event of an appeal, the Officers be requested to seek to include the Committee's suggestions regarding conditions to be attached to any planning permission.

Voting: 10 – For 2 – Against 1 – Abstention

Immediately after the vote was taken, the Head of Planning and Development advised the Committee that on the assumption that Members did not wish to move into Part II of the meeting (private session) to receive further advice as they had not done so in relation to the outline application, it was his recommendation, due to the risk of substantial costs, that the outline application and the full application be referred to the Policy and Resources Committee for determination pursuant to paragraph 30.3 (b) of Part 3.1 of the Council's Constitution and paragraph 17 (b) of the Local Code of Conduct for Councillors and Officers Dealing with Planning Matters (Part 4.4 of the Constitution).

The representative of the Head of Legal Partnership advised the Committee that she agreed with the Head of Planning and Development that given the risk of significant costs being awarded against the Council at appeal and the implications for the Council's budget, the applications should be referred to the Policy and Resources Committee in line with the Council's Constitution.

The Chairman indicated that he concurred with the Officers in line with the provisions of the Council's Constitution.

APPLICATION 19/501600/OUT & APPLICATION 19/506182/FULL REFERRED TO THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE FOR DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 30.3 (b) OF PART 3.1 OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION AND PARAGRAPH 17 (b) OF THE LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS DEALING WITH PLANNING MATTERS (PART 4.4 OF THE CONSTITUTION).

287. 20/501035/HEDGE - HEDGEROW REMOVAL NOTICE - TO ESTABLISH ACCESS AND WORKING AREA FOR SOUTHERN WATER SEWER CONNECTION FOR A DEVELOPMENT - LAND SOUTH OF MARDEN ROAD - STAPLEHURST, MARDEN ROAD, STAPLEHURST, KENT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Development. In presenting the application, the Landscape Officer advised the Committee that since the publication of the agenda, the applicant had provided further information in response to some of the objections and comments set out in the report, summarised as follows:

- The applicant had confirmed that the Southern Water scheme was a foul sewer connection to serve the Hen and Duckhurst development. This solution was the only one progressed as a result of the optioneering process on the outline proposal that showed the sewage for the site going north was discounted. The solution had been designed to ensure no detriment downstream and another scheme was under development to address existing issues.
- Access to the site would be taken from the proposed eastern gap in the hedgerow. A preliminary ecological appraisal and hedgerow assessment would be undertaken to identify and mitigate for all potential ecological impacts.
- Southern Water policy was to work towards a net gain in biodiversity. The hedgerow would be fully reinstated upon completion of the work. An ecological site visit had been undertaken and the relevant reports were under development.
- Southern Water Property would handle all land access requirements. The location of the connection into the existing network necessitated removal of the sections of the hedgerow. The connection was beneath the hedgerow and a working area was required to facilitate the proposed works which would be carried out under Southern Water's permitted development rights. The box culvert storage tank would be located below ground.

The Chairman read out a statement which had been submitted by Mr Buller (an objector) and the representative of the Head of Legal Partnership read out a statement which had been submitted by Councillor Sharp of Staplehurst Parish Council.

Contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development, which was to raise no objection to the proposed removal of the hedgerow, the Committee agreed that a Hedgerow Retention Notice should be issued. In making this decision, the Committee considered that, taking into account its entire length, there are more than seven woody species within the hedgerow so it would appear to qualify as "important". The Committee considered that by designating the hedge as important, a less damaging approach to achieving the sewer connection can be progressed.

RESOLVED: That a Hedgerow Retention Notice be issued as, taking into account its entire length, there are more than seven woody species within the hedgerow so it would appear to qualify as "important". Also, by designating the hedge as important, a less damaging approach to achieving the sewer connection can be progressed.

Voting: 13 – For 0 – Against 0 – Abstentions

288. 19/504734/FULL - ERECTION OF 5 NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH NEW ACCESS ROAD AND ASSOCIATED PARKING - 127 HOCKERS LANE, THURNHAM, MAIDSTONE, KENT

The Committee considered the report and the urgent update report of the Head of Planning and Development.

In presenting the application, the Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that following publication of the agenda further email comments had been received from an adjacent resident setting out that the site is mainly flat grassland which is regularly mown. This appearance had not changed from when the site was agricultural land and the site contributes to the local landscape in that way. The resident considered that the site was probably closer in description to a meadow than a garden.

The Chairman read out a statement which had been submitted by Mr Pollitt (an objector). Mr Street (agent for the applicant) addressed the meeting by video link.

Councillors Springett and de Wiggondene-Sheppard (Visiting Members) addressed the meeting.

Contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development, the Committee agreed to refuse permission. In making this decision, the Committee considered that the proposed development would be contrary to policy for the following summarised reasons:

1. Harm to the setting of the Kent Downs AONB;
2. Harmful backland development encroaching into open countryside which is intrusive and urbanising;
3. Introduction of domestic paraphernalia, artificial lighting, tarmac etc. which is harmful to the landscape character; and
4. Views across the site from Hockers Lane towards open countryside would be lost.

The Development Manager requested that delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning and Development to finalise the reasons for refusal which would include those key issues cited above and those matters raised by the Inspector's decision letter.

RESOLVED: That permission be refused and that the Head of Planning and Development be given delegated powers to finalise the reasons for

refusal to include those key issues cited above and those matters raised by the Inspector's decision letter.

Voting: 13 – For 0 – Against 0 – Abstentions

Note: Councillor Harwood left the meeting after consideration of this application (9.11 p.m.).

289. 19/503584/FULL - CREATION OF ALTERNATIVE ACCESS ACROSS EXISTING DRAINAGE DITCH WITH IMPROVED DRAINAGE - KINGSBROOKE, CRANBROOK ROAD, STAPLEHURST, TONBRIDGE, KENT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Development.

The Chairman read out a statement which had been submitted by Councillor Sharp of Staplehurst Parish Council.

RESOLVED:

1. That permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report with (a) the amendment of condition 5 (Landscaping) to clarify that the landscape scheme shall comprise native species and (b) the amendment of the words in brackets in lines 2 and 3 of condition 6 (Arboricultural Amenity and Method Statement) to read:

(e.g. through the use of no-dig construction ~~if necessary~~)

2. That the Head of Planning and Development be given delegated powers to finalise the wording of the amended conditions and to amend any other conditions as a consequence.

Voting: 12 – For 0 – Against 0 – Abstentions

290. 20/500780/FULL - RETENTION OF DWELLING WITH ALTERATIONS (PART RETROSPECTIVE) - THE MELLOWS, MARLEY ROAD, HARRIETSHAM, MAIDSTONE, KENT

The Committee considered the report and the urgent update report of the Head of Planning and Development.

In presenting the report, the Development Manager advised the Committee that:

- Having reviewed the application, he wished to reduce the red line boundary to more concisely reflect the planning unit and to exclude the southern and western parts of the site. In his view it would not be necessary to re-advertise because it was a smaller red line boundary than previously. However, if Members considered that it was necessary to consult on the amended red-line boundary, then he was seeking delegated powers to grant permission subject to no new

material planning issues being raised as a result of the consultation exercise.

- Condition 7 specified that the building shall only be occupied by the applicant and her son. He wished to amend this to include the names of these individuals.

Members accepted the amended red line boundary without the need to re-advertise.

RESOLVED:

1. That permission be granted with the amended red line boundary plan subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report with the amendment of condition 2 to reflect the amended red line boundary and condition 7 to include the names of the applicant and her son.
2. That the Head of Planning and Development be given delegated powers to finalise the wording of the amended conditions and to amend any other conditions as a consequence.

Voting: 12 – For 0 – Against 0 – Abstentions

291. 20/501604/FULL - ERECTION OF A STAFF MESS HUT BUILDING - MAIDSTONE CEMETERY, SUTTON ROAD, MAIDSTONE, KENT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Development.

RESOLVED:

1. That permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report with delegated powers being given to the Head of Planning and Development to negotiate/include the following:

The incorporation of a ragstone plinth within the building to reflect the use of ragstone within the rest of the cemetery;

The installation of solar PV panels on the roof of the building;

The amendment of condition 4 (Ecological Enhancement Measures) to require the incorporation of bee bricks within the fabric of the building; and

An informative advising the applicant that the demolished brick pillar at the entrance to the site should be rebuilt and the large pot hole infilled.

2. That the Head of Planning and Development be given delegated powers to finalise the wording of the amended/additional conditions and the informative.

Voting: 12 – For 0 – Against 0 – Abstentions

292. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Following consideration of the report of the Head of Planning and Development relating to application 20/501604/FULL (Maidstone Cemetery, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent), the Committee:

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned until 6.00 p.m. on Thursday 2 July 2020 when the remaining items on the agenda will be discussed.

293. DURATION OF MEETING

6.00 p.m. to 9.40 p.m.