

TENTERDEN TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM 7

3rd April 2018
DECISIONS LIST NO. 564

DECISIONS OF ASHFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL'S PLANNING COMMITTEE.

The following decisions have been made:

Planning Applications:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 16/01853/CONA/AS | <u>Land south west of Recreation Ground Road and north and east of, Smallhythe Road.</u>
Discharge of conditions 13 & 16.
PERMIT. |
| 16/01853/CONE/AS | <u>Land south west of Recreation Ground Road and north and east of, Smallhythe Road.</u>
Discharge of condition 28.
WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT. |
| 16/01853/CONQ/AS | <u>Land south west of Recreation Ground Road and north and east of, Smallhythe Road.</u>
Discharge of condition 19.
PERMIT. |
| 17/01633/CONA/AS | <u>Land rear of Roundstone, Six Fields Path.</u>
Discharge of condition 2.
PERMIT. |
| 17/01893/AS | <u>Haffenden Farm, Bugglesden Road.</u>
Provision of a new hop processing building with associated staff offices and welfare/comfort facilities.
PERMIT. |
| 18/00048/AS | <u>Pickhill, Smallhythe Road.</u>
Proposed Agricultural Hay and Machinery Store.
PERMIT. |
| 18/00084/AS | <u>32 Leslie Crescent.</u>
Single storey side/front/rear extension.
PERMIT. |
| 18/00123/AS | <u>17 Pittlesden.</u>
Two storey extension to the side of the residence.
PERMIT. |
| 18/00181/AS | <u>Leigh Green House, Appledore Road.</u>
Ground floor extension to kitchen.
PERMIT. |
| 18/00192/AS | <u>Waters Land, Grange Road.</u>
Single storey linked annexe extension.
WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT. |

18/00193/AS

Waters Land, Grange Road.

Single storey linked annexe extension; removal and relocation of existing partition walls at ground floor level.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

18/00235/AS

22-22A High Street.

New non-illuminated fascia sign and new non-illuminated projecting sign.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

18/00256/AS

15 Springfield Avenue.

Lawful development certificate - Proposed - Loft conversion including rear dormer window, 1No, side facing window at first floor, change of door to window on front elevation and 3No. front facing roof lights.

PROPOSED USE/DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE LAWFUL.

18/00306/AS

22-22A High Street.

Fit out of premises at ground floor level only. Installation of fascia and projecting signs. Installation of outdoor air conditioning condenser units.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

18/00360/AS

The Dandy, Preston Hill Lane.

Application for prior notification of proposed agricultural development for erection of a oak weather-boarded, oak framed agricultural building.

PRIOR APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED.

Tree Applications.

18/00017/TP

42 St Benets Way.

Ash (T1) - Reduce tree by 6M in height and 2M on all sides. Hedge is causing excessive shading to adjacent properties. REVISED SPEC 15/03/18 Crown lift to 7m maximum height, no limbs greater than 100mm to be removed.

GRANT CONSENT.

18/00052/TC

The Briars, High Street.

Holly Tree: the tree is a nuisance, causing potential damage to newly replaced timber boards on wall of Tenterden Museum. Pruning and reduction of size required as a preventative measure.

RAISE NO OBJECTION.

Planning Committee 3rd April 2018
Local Plan 2030 – Tent1b Housing allocation
Agenda Item 8

The hearing for TTC with the planning inspectors will take place at 2pm on Thursday 17th May. This occurs within the new council year. A link to the full schedule is attached.

<https://www.ashford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/local-plan-to-2030/hearing-agendas-statements-and-participants/>

A request was received at the last planning meeting to re-visit the decision by TTC (last year) to oppose the additional 50 dwellings (flats) which would increase the allocation on Tent1b from 175 to 225.

When deciding on this issue councillors should consider the following:

1. An allocation of 175 for Tent1b was determined by the public consultation workshops for Tent1 as a whole.
2. Whether the increased allocation will affect the desire to make Tent1b the southern boundary to the town and achieve a semi-rural & low-density feel to the development.
3. Whether the flats would be easily absorbed into the development. (The view of Batcheller Monkhouse is that they would).
4. Whether design restrictions would reduce the allocation anyway as they did with Tent1a.

The council's representative should be selected at the meeting. A place has been reserved temporarily for Cllr Lusty but we can change the name should the committee decide to send a different representative.

Proposal:

1. That a decision should be made whether to oppose or support the 50 additional dwellings.
2. That a councillor should be selected to represent TTC in their adopted viewpoint



Phil Burgess
Town Clerk

Impact on Crime and Disorder	:	None
Impact on Bio-diversity	:	None
Budgetary Impact	:	None

Ashford

Gypsy and Traveller

Issues and Options



Response form

The preferred method for receiving comments is on-line by using the consultation portal. You can register to access the consultation portal at: www.ashford.gov.uk/consult. If you are unable to use the on-line method of submitting comments you may still submit comments by using this form to Planning Policy, Ashford Borough Council, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford, TN23 1PL

Please return this form by 5pm on 6th April 2018

Personal Details

Name of individual:	Phil Burgess		
Organisation (where relevant):	Tenterden Town Council		
Address:	Town Hall, 24 High St Tenterden, Kent		
	Postcode:	TN30 6AN	
Email address:	tamblerh@tenterdentown	Daytime Tel. No:	01580 762271
	council.gov.uk		
If an agent has been appointed to act on your behalf please give the agent's details			
Name:			
Address:			
	Postcode:		
Email address:		Daytime Tel. No:	

This form is to be used in conjunction with the Gypsy and Traveller Issues and Options document.

Question 1: Do you agree with these objectives? Are there any other objectives which the DPD should seek to achieve?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Suggested additional objectives:

Question 2: Does the proposed site selection methodology and the range of factors to be considered provide a reasonable and robust means of assessing potential site suitability?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Question 3: Are there any additional criteria that should be considered in selecting appropriate sites for Gypsies and Travellers?

N/A

Question 4: Should the Council allow for the appropriate limited expansion of existing sites, and only where this would fulfil emerging household needs?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Question 5: Should the council seek to locate new sites in areas of the borough where they will not significantly increase pressures on local services?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Question 6: What should be the balance between urban and rural locations?

Preference for urban locations 80/20

Question 7: What should the balance be between large and small site allocations?

Evenly spread

Question 8: Taking into account the typical characteristics of a pitch the need to provide amenity space and parking, should the DPD seek to set a minimum pitch size and site requirements?

Yes ☒ No ☒

Comments:

Question 9: How should this pitch size be determined? (Eg based on number of households occupying a pitch)

Question 10: What form of tenure and management would best suit the needs of Gypsy and Traveller communities in Ashford?

*No experience of this. Dependent on
circumstances*

Question 11: Do you know of any land in the district that, may be suitable, available and deliverable to provide Gypsy and Traveller pitches? If the answer to the above is yes, please supply details including ownership if known, on the form in appendix 2 of this document.

Yes ☐ No ☒

Question 12: Do you think that Ashford should have a transit site or temporary stopping place? If so, where should such a site be provided?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Proposed location:

Not known

Question 13: What indicators should be used for monitoring the council's performance in managing Gypsy and Traveller site provision?

No of caravans is still the most accurate measure. Population would be difficult to determine

Question 14: Are there any other matters concerning sites for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling showpeople that should be dealt with by way of additional planning policies?

None

Q14 is the most likely to attract suggestions

JOINT PARISHES PLANNING GROUP

Open Letter to the Minister of State for Housing and Planning

cc. Secretary of State, Housing and Planning Communities & Local Government

We the Joint Parishes Planning Group consisting of the undersigned Parishes within the Ashford Borough consider that **national planning legislation and policy** have become far too heavily weighted in favour of speculative developers and against proper democratic local policy-led decision making. The government consultation 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' was very timely, and communities must indeed have a better say in the new homes that are built.

The future use of land overall should also be better planned. For example, with the likely need for more self-sufficiency in our food production after Brexit, uncontrolled building on agricultural land would be shortsighted.

Smaller communities with valuable rural assets deserve to be better protected from developers, who can manipulate planning laws to acquire piecemeal many of our vital, and often historic, green spaces, cumulatively making huge changes to our environment without improving local infrastructure. Such spaces would now be carefully planned into new developments, but in the villages, we are very vulnerable to unplanned losses of land and amenity, with no benefit to the community in return.

We recognise that there will inevitably be more house building (though the methods for deciding where and how many need more local consultation and review) and we simply ask that this is achieved without destroying our heritage.

History has already proved that targeting areas 'where people want to live' to deliver the most new housing soon turns them into areas where people don't want to live, creating social and economic problems, instead of providing safe and viable communities. To decide where the most homes will be built by reference to the earnings/house-price ratio will simply create more estates of unaffordable executive homes, to be sufficiently profitable for developers who have to pay top dollar for the land in the most expensive areas of the country. This will still not satisfy the housing needs of the social sectors where pressure is most felt - young people, families and the elderly.

The following matters must be rectified so that elected local borough and district council members, (as well as town and parish councillors) can better make decisions in their own areas which fully comply with locally led planning policies within the national framework:

1. The NPPF paragraph 14 needs to be altered so that failure to meet the requirement for a **five year housing land supply** does not automatically override existing and otherwise valid planning policies which are not the reason for any shortfall.
2. A recent Supreme Court judgment (10 May 2017)¹ goes a long way towards restoring the proper weight which should be given to such policies. Government should be leading the way to implement this interpretation within the drive for development, so that growth does not lead to the destruction of healthy, currently sustainable communities.
3. Furthermore, the question and test of **sustainability** in these circumstances needs to be better defined nationally and then maintained during planning decisions. Either a site is sustainable, or it is not, therefore it should not be a variable position depending on whether or not there is a technical housing shortfall. This is particularly the case where developers are stockpiling land and not building on it, thereby reducing the LPA's 5-year housing land supply and, in Ashford's case, bringing further pressure to bear on the area, particularly the villages - a patently unfair situation. LPAs must have the power to impose financial penalties on developers that gain permission to build, and then choose not to complete the building programme within a defined time.
4. Hitherto, **housing land supply shortfalls** have been easily exploited by developers to undermine current planning policies. Through the Government White Paper and forthcoming consultation in 2018, the NPPF needs to redress this imbalance in line with the Supreme Court ruling. LPAs should not be penalised for apparent slowness in bringing land forward; the current situation follows the slump of 2008-9, for example, where economic constraints slowed or even stopped house building and the state of the housing market has resulted also from other factors, such as years of foreign investment, mainly in London, and the sale of council housing in the 1980s. Nonetheless, LPAs are expected to deliver from an historical shortfall that has carried on, year on year, regardless of the variations in the country's economic situation.
5. The method for determining the actual 5-year housing land supply needs to be radically revised to take it as a rolling year on year requirement which dates back too far. It also seems to be fuelled more by developer profits - building homes for commuters - than by local needs.
6. The 'required numbers' for Ashford Borough Council, as revised in the 'Main Changes' consultation on the Local Plan, is 16,120. The five-year target is stated to be 6120. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) supplied in a recent planning case confirms a requirement for 6,923 units and a supply of 4,547, providing a supply of only 3.28 years or a shortfall in the region of 2,376 units. The historical knock-on effect makes it very difficult for LPAs (not just Ashford) ever to catch up. Now realistic numbers need to be created which take account of historical economic up and down turns. **This must also include**

¹ Suffolk Coastal District Council (Appellant) v Hopkins Homes Ltd and another (Respondents)
Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and another (Respondents) v Cheshire East Borough Council (Appellant)

true and accurate assessments of local needs. The consultation proposes a new method of assessing housing need which unfortunately we are not convinced will adequately address this concern.

7. In its draft Local Plan 2030, Ashford Borough Council has proposed a policy to prevent 'coalescence' of villages and their satellite areas by creating a protected zone of open countryside around them, which we commend.

8. The NPPF also needs to provide that all villages and defined rural communities have a **similarly enforceable "green belt"** that is completely protected from any form of encroaching development. This will maintain separation and definition of each village and community, and ensure that conurbations and other defined developments do not encroach on and absorb such communities without suitable green space and green corridors being maintained and protected in perpetuity. This will allow communities to retain their individual character, identity, sustainability and historical integrity.

9. Neighbourhood Plans, Village Envelopes and Landscape Protection Policies need to be given full weight through the Local Plan process, irrespective of any shortfall in the 5-year housing supply. Again, the Supreme Court judgment seems to give clear guidance for decision makers by narrowing the scope of the term 'policies for the supply of housing'.

10. The NPPF also needs to emphasise the importance of assessing and taking account of the **cumulative effects** of developments on existing local and nearby communities and the often serious impact on fragile rural infrastructure.

11. When assessing development, the NPPF must afford greater importance and weight to village heritage and local green spaces in terms of their value to local communities and their visitors. Our part of Kent contains some of the loveliest rural landscapes in the UK, and Ashford Borough has more listed buildings than any other in the county. Their loss, or the destruction of their settings, would be catastrophic for new as well as established communities here, and for the many local businesses which depend on visitor numbers for their success.

12. Parish and Town Councils know their areas. Pressures on LPAs to aim for a 5-year housing supply mean that sites are being included in local plans primarily because they appear to be deliverable within this time frame, whether or not they are the most suitable or sustainable. In the spirit of localism, LPAs should be encouraged to consult fully and openly with Parish and Town Councils where there is intention to impose development, whether in terms of specific sites or rates of growth. We have examples where doing this would actually increase housing capacity in a village, which demonstrates that this would be a productive method.

13. Due weight must be given to the adverse impacts on the quality of life of residents when LPAs give priority for development that delivers housing within five years regardless of any necessary infrastructure, including medical and schooling needs, roads, drainage and broadband networks.

14. If it is right that the government is also considering creating more social housing in the countryside, to which vulnerable families will be moved, away from their own communities and often with no means of transport to shops, schools or medical care, then - if coupled with 12 above - there is a real danger of creating isolated housing estates, whether upmarket or social needs housing, with no jobs, no cohesive communities and no effective support services, all in the name of 'growth'.

15. Rural communities used to grow organically, and there is still a powerful argument for providing housing for older residents, freeing up their larger homes for families, rather than building large estates of houses which are too expensive for anyone but London commuters. We recognise that our area is expected to deliver a disproportionate amount of new housing, compared with existing numbers, over a relatively short time.

16. We will work with government to achieve this and are confident that it will be quicker and more cost-effective to consult and collaborate locally, before finalising plans for expansion, than to try and impose inappropriate development on existing communities, which will ultimately be unsustainable. However, this will also depend for its success on a strong message coming from central government to local authorities that their planning processes must be adapted to meet the need, without causing irrevocable damage to our existing communities.

We ask the Minister of State to consider these points as a matter of urgency in order to assist with a much-needed adjustment of the government's national housing policy and to allow all local communities to take their rightful and constructive place in the future development of our nation.

This Open Letter is formally supported by the following 35 Parish and Town Councils

Aldington & Bonnington	Molash
Appledore	Newenden
Bethersden	Orlestone
Biddenden	Pluckley
Bilsington	Rolvenden
Boughton Aluph	Ruckinge
Brook	Sevington
Charing	Shadoxhurst
Eastwell	Smarden
Egerton	Smeeth
Great Chart with Singleton	Stone-cum-Ebony
Hastingleigh	Tenterden
High Halden	Warehorne
Hothfield	Westwell
Kenardington	Wittersham
Kingsnorth	Woodchurch
Little Chart	Wye with Hinxhill
Mersham	



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

*Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local
Government*

Planning Policy and Reform Division
3rd floor, Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

David Ledger, *Chairman*
Shadoxhurst Parish Council
Keg Barn
Shadoxhurst
Kent
TN26 1HX

Tel: 0303 44 41665
Email: alan.scott@communities.gsi.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/dclg

Our Ref: 3656161

21 February 2018

Dear Mr Ledger

Thank you for your letter of 17 January to the Minister for Housing and Planning, covering an open letter from the Ashford Joint Parishes Planning Group, and requesting a meeting with the Minister to discuss the consequences of the 5-year land supply requirement and other planning issues. We have noted the points you have made. Unfortunately, because of diary pressures, the Minister is not able to meet you, but it may be useful to make a few general comments.

The quasi-judicial role of our Secretary of State means that the Department would not be able to comment on the effect of particular court judgments on the way future housing development is planned. However, in last year's Housing White Paper we acknowledged that, though the current policy on 5 year land supply had been effective, it has had some negative effects. The White Paper consultation included a proposal to offer local authorities the opportunity to have their 5-year housing land supply agreed on an annual basis and fixed for a one year period.

We subsequently carried out a further consultation on the way local housing need could be assessed more transparently and by a method that is easier for communities to understand. Our aim is to achieve more certainty about whether a 5-year land supply exists, as well as reducing the number of appeals.

We will shortly be publishing the Government's conclusions on the response to both these consultations, alongside a draft of the revised National Planning Policy Framework. This work is at an advanced stage. However, we would encourage your group to respond, using the consultation package that will be available with the draft NPPF2, to indicate whether what we propose would help to address the concerns of Ashford Joint Parishes Planning Group.

Yours sincerely,

ALAN C SCOTT

Planning policy adviser