

Hawkhurst Parish Council

Meeting: Full Council

Date 14th January 2019

Copt Hall

Ref: RG706/18

Present: Mrs. J Newman (Chairman), Ms. C Escombe (Vice Chairman), Mr. J Hunt, Mr. M Appelbe, Mr. P Jones, Mrs. J Pyne, Dr M Robertson, Mr. M Taylor Smith, Mr. B Fitzpatrick Mr. D Blackman, Mr. P Whittle and Mrs. B Weeden.

Additional circulation

Mr. S Holden, Mrs. B Palmer, Mr. P Thomson and Mr. G Bland.

Meeting started 7 minutes late due to congestion on Cophall Avenue

Agenda Item 1. Adjournment for public speaking

- 1.1 A resident spoke about their concerns and objections to planning application 18/03976/OUT, most notably regarding environmental and ecological factors.
- 1.2 Another resident also emphasised their concerns about planning application 18/03976/OUT, most notably on environmental, ecological, historic buildings issues and the lack of public notices. Also the need for the application not to be delegated to an officer at TWBC but considered by the Planning Committee.
- 1.3 Mrs R McChesney, Chairman of HCT 2018, spoke regarding item 12.2 and stated that on behalf of all the HCT 2018 Trustees if the motion was carried the HCT 2018 trustees would have no objections.
- 1.4 A resident spoke on planning application 18/01063/FULL and their concern that only minor amendments have been made, none of which address the issues originally raised: impact on landscape and access issues along Cophall Avenue. They requested that the application be considered by the Planning Committee rather than delegated to an TWBC planning officer.
- 1.5 Cllr Patrick Thomson thanked Cllr Newman for all her hard work, especially on the Hawkhurst NDP which is a legal document that Hawkhurst can be proud of and is unique in the Borough. Cllr Newman thanked Cllr Thomson for his comments but emphasised that it was the work of the NDP Committee and the people of Hawkhurst.
- 1.6 Cllr Palmer also thanked Cllr Newman for all her hard work and echoed Cllr Thomson on the Hawkhurst NDP. She asked if any issues can be raised by HPC or residents that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could consider.
- 1.7 The Clerk noted that KCC Cllr Sean Holden sent his apologies and that he thanked Cllr Newman for all her hard work over the years.
- 1.8 In addition, Cllr Holden said that the Cranbrook Road and Heartenoak Road junction now had an agreed way forward but a date for the work needed to be confirmed. The Clerk would carry on chasing this matter.

Agenda Item 2. Apologise for Absence - None

Agenda Item 3. Declaration of interest

- 3.1. Cllr Weeden declared a pecuniary interest regarding planning applications 90,91,93,96 and 98.
- 3.2 Cllr Taylor-Smith declared a personnel interest regarding planning application 90.
- 3.3 Cllr Whittle declared a personnel interest regarding planning application 96.
- 3.4 Cllr's Jones, Payne and Robertson declared that they had been lobbied regarding planning application 98.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of minutes

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

4.1 Approval

- i) The Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 12th November 2018 were approved (Cllr Blackman abstained as he was not at the meeting)
- ii) The Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 10th December 2018 were approved (Cllr's Blackman and Whittle abstained as they were not at the meeting)
- iii) The Minutes of the Parish Council confidential strategy review meeting held on the 20th December were approved. (Cllr's Blackman and Whittle abstained as they were not at the meeting)

4.2 Note Minutes of meetings

- i) The Council noted the minutes of Buildings Committee 17th December 2018.
- ii) The Council noted the minutes of Finance and General Purposes Committee 20th December 2018.

Agenda item 5. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- i) Birchfield, planning application (18/01313/ADV) the period for advertising has expired and the adverts should have come down – Clerk asked for clarity from TWBC planning without a response.
- ii) Cllr Newman updated the Council on feedback to Goudhurst Parish on their draft NDP Regulation 14 Consultation and the Rother District Development plan. Cllr Newman highlighted Goudhurst had a “Dark Skies policy” and that Rother had defined a major development in villages as “more than 6 dwellings”.

AGENDA ITEM 6 PLANNING

6a) Planning applications

| No | Application No | Proposal | Location |
|----|----------------|----------|----------|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|---|
| 90 | 18/02767/FULL | Demolition of existing dwelling with reception of 43 retirement living apartments with associated communal facilities, access, parking and landscaping | The White House, Highgate Hill, Hawkhurst, Cranbrook TN18 4LB |
| <p>PAC Comments</p> <p>We objected to the previous application and this does not appear to address the issues that we raised. We stand by our previous objections, and Other concerns are the demolition of historic Whitehouse with its typical character of the area, height and scale of proposed new apartments, out of keeping with street scene.</p> <p>PAC Recommendation: Against</p> <p>It was noted that it does not meet Local Plan parking standards</p> <p>In favour 0, Against 9 Abstained 1 (JN) plus BW and TS absent due to declared interest</p> <p>Decision: Object</p> | | | |
| 91 | 18/03401/FULL | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 6no. bungalows and creation of new access to Rye Road | Land adjacent To Dee House, Rye Road, Hawkhurst, Kent |
| <p>PAC Comments</p> <p>This is outside the LBD and is agricultural land, which is currently used for grazing sheep, with a few sheds. Therefore, it does not comply with the NDP. The proposal is for the entrance to be knocked through the existing wall.</p> <p>This is a sustainable location.</p> <p>It is for 6 two bedroomed bungalows and so is in line with the NDP, both in terms of the size of site, size of the houses and the need for bungalows. Only some of the bungalows have chimneys. Materials - brick walls, reconstituted slate roof, UPVC windows etc. Do these fit with Hawkhurst vernacular? Can't see a reference to life time homes standards.</p> <p>Two parking spaces are allocated for each house, plus two additional visitor spaces for the site as a whole. This development will add to the traffic congestion in Hawkhurst. Concerns another entrance on to the Rye Road through a characterful wall, footpath safety and whether viability of the site remains self-contained.</p> <p>Objections from residents - 5 - Infrastructure, amount of building, need to cross the road to get to pavement, traffic.</p> <p>1 neither objecting or supporting.</p> <p>Recommendation: Against</p> <p>Major concerns about the access / egress onto Rye Road through a feature wall. Also a small part of a large site in the call 4 sites.</p> <p>In favour 0, Against 10, Abstained 1 (JN) plus BW absent due to declared interest</p> <p>Decision: Object</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|---|
| 92 | 18/03669/FULL | Two storey infill front extension | Green Banks, Cranbrook Road, Hawkhurst Kent TN18 5EF |
| <p>PAC Comments</p> <p>Materials to match existing. Parking will be retained. Corner infill, so not forward of the existing house.</p> <p>No comments from neighbours.</p> <p>Recommendation: Agree – Support</p> <p>In favour unanimously Against 0 Abstained 0</p> <p>Decision: Support</p> | | | |
| 93 | 18/03385/OUT | Outline (Access not reserved) Proposed demolition of Existing Building and Erection of 25 apartments with affordable housing, parking provision, new highways access and other ancillary works. | Brook House, Cranbrook Road, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 5EE |
| <p>PAC Comments</p> <p>This is a new application, which is an update of the previous application that we supported. We supported it because it provided smaller, more affordable apartments (mainly 1 & 2 bed, with 1 three bed), which we felt met the housing need in Hawkhurst. It is also on previously developed land - so in line with NDP in that respect. The proposal is also relatively well screened.</p> <p>The main change is to do with access as Highways objected to the previous application. They have also changed the design so that it is possible for this to provide access to the rest of the site if/when this is developed - a request from the planners.</p> <p>Previously developed land within LBD. The site is already allocated in the old Local Plan.</p> <p>This is outline planning so not fully detailed, but the Design & Access statement recognises that Hawkhurst has a dark skies policy and states that they aim to reflect this in their lighting design.</p> <p>All significant trees will be protected.</p> <p>Design shows a chimney – these will be non-functional as they are apartments.</p> <p>An additional 25 dwellings will add to traffic congestion - but the land is already allocated for planning so presumably something will be built here so it's a question of ensuring that it's the right thing.</p> <p>Natural England - no objection, Police - need further information and No comments from residents.</p> <p>Recommendation: Agree- Support</p> <p>In favour 11, Against 0 Abstained 0 plus BW absent due to declared interest</p> <p>Decision: Support</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| 94 | 18/03679/PNR | Change of use of an agricultural building to a flexible use of falling within Class B8 (storage and distribution) For its prior approval to: Transport and Highways impacts, Noise impacts, Contamination Risk and Flooding Risk | Hawkhurst Place Farm, Rye Road, Hawkhurst Kent |
| <p>PAC Comments</p> <p>Not clear what they're proposing to store and distribute. Insufficient information to support would require, Transport and Highways impacts, e.g. HGVs, Noise impacts, Contamination Risk and Flooding Risk reports.</p> <p>Recommendation: Against</p> <p>In favour 1 (JH), Against 9 Abstained 2 (JN / MTS)</p> <p>Decision: Object</p> | | | |
| 95 | 18/03591/FULL | Demolition of previous additions to dwelling and addition of single and two storey extensions to front, side and rear of property | Vellenoweth, Stream Lane, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 4RD |
| <p>PAC Comments</p> <p>Outside LBD.</p> <p>Over development of plot, looks like more than 50%, size of property, closeness to neighbouring boundary, use of un- sympathetic materials different from existing.</p> <p>Recommendation: Against</p> <p>In favour 0, Against unanimous Abstained 0</p> <p>Decision: Object</p> | | | |
| 96 | 18/01063/FULL | Demolition of a 1no. dwelling house and agricultural storage barn to the rear and erection of 49no. dwellings including car parking, cycle parking, sustainable drainage, internal road network and the creation of a new access with associated landscaping | Fieldways Hawkhurst Cranbrook Kent |

PAC Comments

We have already objected to this, as well as written a second letter objecting.

This is one less dwelling than previously, and they have increased the number of affordable from 15 to 17.

Cannot see how the changes would make any difference to the reasons for our objections. It's still in a sensitive location and the access is still through Cophall Avenue.

Highways are no longer objecting; the Clerk has asked them why.

WKPS have added an objection.

More than 100 objections from residents.

Consider call in for planning committee.

Recommendation: Against

In favour 0, Against 10, abstained 0 plus PW and BW absent due to declared interest

Decision: Object

| | | | |
|----|---------------|--|--|
| 97 | 18/03620/FULL | Change of use of retail shop area to domestic dwelling | Septimus Qualyes Emporium Ockley Road, Hawkhurst Kent TN18 4DP |
|----|---------------|--|--|

PAC Comments

Retains existing shop front character for provision of living room

Recommendation: Agree – support

Many felt a common-sense approach should be taken as this area does not have the footfall of the High Street Colonnade and therefore it is not contrary to the NDP

In favour 9, Against 0 Abstained 2 (JN and CE)

Decision: Support on condition it can be returned to retail in the future

| | | | |
|----|--------------|---|--|
| 98 | 18/03976/OUT | Outline (Access Not Reserved) - Erection of 62 dwellings | Land At Ockley Road And Heartenoak Road Ockley Lane Hawkhurst Kent |
|----|--------------|---|--|

PAC Comments

Outside LBD, in AONB, Agricultural land.

Not in line with NDP. Traffic. Access.

We objected to previous application, also for 62 houses. This was refused by TWBC. Do not feel differently about this one. All our objections still stand.

Lots of objections from neighbours.

Consider calling in for planning committee

Recommendation: Against

In favour 0, Against 11 Abstained 0 plus BW absent due to declared interest

Decision: Object

- 6.2 A discussion on Section 106 requests took place and it was agreed for a full guidance report to come back via Finance and General Purposes Committee and onto Full Council.
- 6.3 Cllr Newman asked for questions regarding the additional TWBC planning information, approved and refused applications that were on file. No questions were asked.

Agenda Item 7 REPORTS OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND UPDATES

- I. Building – Cllr Whittle noted the work required to the Copt Hall.
- II. Land – Cllr Robertson noted the need for a new Chairman of Land Committee as he was stepping down and that footpaths had been added.
- III. Finance and General Purposes – Cllr Newman noted the Planning Consultant report and the agreement for the requested KALC Health Check 24 January 2019.
- IV. Transport & Highways – Cllr Appelbe nothing to report.
- V. Personnel – no meeting held.
- VI. Fete Committee (21.11.2018 on file) Cllr Newman noted the success of the Winter Festival, despite the weather. Cllr Hunt asked for the Clerk to write to Tina and Harvey Cobbold and thank them for all the hard work they and others put into making a success of the Winter Festival.
- VII. New Community Hall Working Group – Cllr Whittle noted a meeting later this week.
- VIII. War Memorial Project – Cllr Jones noted that the funding from TWBC Cllr's was in and that KCC were processing the funding application. The Clerk was still chasing the Countryside Properties Offer.

ITEM 8 FINANCE

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR FULL COUNCIL MEETING 11.1.2019

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|
| Accounts for payment | £ | 8,174.13 | to 14.1.19 |
| Payment received | £ | 1,264.00 | to 16.11.18 |
| Net Expenditure | -£ | 6,910.13 | |
| Cambridge & Counties | £ | 77,400.90 | to 30.4.18 |
| Cambridge Building Society | £ | 75,201.05 | to 31.12.17 |
| Lloyds Current | £ | 10,339.50 | to 16.11.18 |
| Lloyds Access Reserve | £ | 104,019.82 | to 1.11.18 |

Please see bank reconciliation sheet attached to 16.11.18 for bank statements reconciled

- 8.1 Income, expenditure and payments were approved unanimously.

ITEM 9 CORRESPONDENCE

| | Date Received | From | Subject |
|---|---------------|-------------|---|
| 1 | 7.1.2019 | TWBC | Confirmation of £200 Members Grant for Remembrance Day events |
| 2 | 7.1.2019 | Cllr Newman | Letter of resignation as a Councillor as of 31 st January 2019 |
| 3 | 11.1.2019 | Mrs Wilson | Thank you to Cllr Julia Newman |

9.1 Cllr Escombe thanked Cllr Newman for all her hard work over the years and wished her all the best. This was echoed by the other Cllrs

9.2 The Clerk thanked Cllr Newman for her support over the past six months and noted the amount of hard work she has done.

ITEM 10 NOTES AND INFORMATION

| | Date | From | Subject |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|---|
| 1 | 14.12.18 | Spencer Pimley | Concern about Fieldways planning application |
| 2 | 7.1.19 | HPC | Feedback on Goudhurst Draft NDP Regulation 14 Consultation |
| 3 | 7.1.19 | HPC | Feedback on Rother District Development and site allocation Plan |
| 4 | December Parish Magazine | | |
| 5 | 8.1.19 | Esquire | Information pack on Land adjacent To Dee House, Rye Road, Hawkhurst, Kent |

ITEM 11 BURIALS - None

ITEM 12 MATTERS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION:

12.1 Hawkhurst Parish Council budget 2019/20

Cllr Newman explained that at the previous meeting the 2019/20 precept had been agreed as £149,265. This was a reduction of £23,000 from the original proposed budget which included cuts of £5,000 with £18,000 being transferred to unallocated reserves.

Cllr Newman felt uncomfortable with the latter because unallocated reserves are required to manage HPC risk.

Reserves are required for each parish council as “50% of precept” to cover risks such as contracts etc. There are no “general reserves”.

Allocated reserves are stated to be for specific projects – such as MUGA, new Community Hall – when the amount is reserved.

By transferring £18,000 expenditure to unallocated reserves increases HPC risk and may result in a reduction in the reserves allocated for specific projects.

The proposed precept is set out in **Appendix A** translating to an increase of £8.29 per year for Band D. This is below comparable neighbouring parishes. Parish precept increases are currently uncapped but may be capped in the future limiting the ability to replace spent reserves.

Cllr Taylor-Smith felt that the 14% increase was too high in these times of austerity and that one further item should be transferred to reserves, the impression at the previous meeting was an increase of around 8%. Therefore, he suggested transferring the £6,500 SID to reserves as this would reduce the precept to £142,000 and a 7.5% increase. In addition, we are seeking Section 106 funding for a SID.

Cllr Newman explained that section 106 money was not guaranteed and would take some years to become available and the Council were committed to a SID.

Cllr Taylor-Smith felt it was a one-off item and should not be in the precept.

Cllr Newman noted that the minutes had been agreed and signed and did not include an estimated percentage increase following adjustments. If the agreed SID is successful in reducing traffic speed, more would be purchased so it is not a one-off.

Cllr Hunt raised the point that he felt uncomfortable with an excessive increase.

Cllr Taylor-Smith proposed and Cllr Weeden seconded the following amendment to the motion:

That the precept should be increased by 7.5% by transferring £6,500 (SID) to reserves.

The Clerk emphasised that if the amendment was approved then there would not a vote on the original motion.

Those in favour – 4 (MTS, JP, BW and JH)

Those against – 8 (PW, PJ, CE, BF, JN, MR, DB and MA)

Cllr Newman then proposed, and Cllr Escombe seconded the original motion:

To adopt the 2019/2020 precept as set out in Appendix A.

Those in favour – 8(PW, PJ, CE, BF, JN, MR, DB and MA)

Against – 1 (JH)

Abstained – 3 (MTS, JP, BW)

Hawkhurst Parish precept of £149,265 for 2019/2020 was agreed.

12.2 Special Motion: The Site for the new community hall should be at King George V Playing Field

Cllr Escombe apologised for bring back the issue of the location of Community Hall but was one of those who mis-understood the voting last time.

Cllr Escombe explained that her main concern was timing. We do not currently control a site near the centre of Highgate, TWBC Local Plan may deliver a site but when? A new community hall is the most important project for this Council so we should have control.

Cllr Escombe felt it would be very difficult to get land and a financial contribution so maybe alternative uses of the land should be considered – such as public car parking.

Cllr Fitzpatrick supported Cllr Escombe and stated other opportunities associated with this site – such as small shop for the Moor area would be beneficial.

Cllr Robertson stated that he had proposed the amendment at the previous meeting and felt he had represented those who had spoken to him during the NDP process. However, he is now aware that a procedural misunderstanding occurred at the last meeting and would therefore be abstaining from the vote this time.

Cllr Weeden stated that we are at a crossroads by using the KGV field we will save costs as we have access to the utilities, services etc. The Parish Office can be located there and we will have more efficient use of our land. Strategically, The Moor could be for Leisure and Recreation, Highgate for retail and Gills Green for employment.

The Clerk emphasised that we may need to go into closed session if we debate “sites discussed in confidence with TWBC”.

Cllr Newman stated the recent Golf Club EIA application included Community facilities and that this was in the public domain.

Cllr Taylor –Smith stated this is about the difference between a speculative site - who knows where and when - against a site within our control. The KGV has increased usage so we have a user base, it has a part time Post office, it came high as a location in all the surveys, it will help reduce costs, it is not on a greenfield site and the Chair of the HCT 2018 trustees does not object.

Cllr Whittle stated that the Council has access to the KGV site now, a developer led site could be 15 / 20 years away. Secondly he recognises the majority of respondents were in favour of a site near the Highgate area, but it was a very small percentage of the Hawkhurst population.

Cllr Newman stated that this motion is contrary to the NDP to site a new community hall “in the heart of the village” - 91% of the residents voted in favour of the NDP. We would be setting a dangerous precedent if we ignored the NDP.

Cllr Weeden felt that we were reviewing the NDP and this could be part of the review.

Cllr Newman emphasised that the consultation was for eight weeks and closed on the 31st December 2018, so we are now outside the consultation period.

The debate then went into closed session

Session returned to open

Cllr Hunt suggested retaining options and, having built the KGV Sports Hall originally, that only limited extension was possible.

Cllr Weeden stated that the we could buy further land at the Moor, it was pointed out that Hands of Hope now own the surrounding land.

The Clerk noted that in 2013 FIT agreed in principle to a land swap with HCT, who at the time were going to lead the project.

Cllr Taylor-Smith suggested all we need to do is change All Saints with KGV in the NDP and was then called out of order for discussing a confidential matter in public. Cllr Taylor-Smith apologised.

A vote was then taken:

The site for the new community hall should be King George V Playing Field

In favour – 7 – (BW, BF, CE, PW, JP, DB, TS)

Against – 3 – (PJ,MA,JN)

Abstain – 2 – (MR, JH)

Agenda item 13: Confidential

An update on the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Local Plan 2013 – 2033 took place.

Meeting closed at 10.28pm

Agenda Notes for Members:

Item 3 on the Agenda, Declaration of Interests. If a Member has a prejudicial interest, this should be declared at the start of the meeting. Personal interests may be declared at this point or alternatively can be declared at the time when the specific item is being discussed, if a Member wishes to speak on an item in which s/he has a personal interest. Members in doubt about such a declaration are advised to contact the Monitoring Officer before the date of the meeting. This may also be used by Members to advise the Council of any relevant changes that may have occurred since they first completed the register of interests.

Signed.....Date.....
Julia Newman, Chairman of the Parish Council.