



STAPLEHURST

PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

12TH JANUARY 2026

MINUTES

PUBLIC FORUM –

A resident raised a number of concerns about application 25/504992.

Loss of light, privacy

Out of character with the area street scene

Traffic, noise, and disruption

Lack of adequate road / footpaths

The land floods and is currently flooded.

A resident spoke about 25/505144 and that the intention is only to do the porch at the front.

Present: Cllrs Arger, Ash, Farragher, Pett, Sharp and Clerk

APOLOGIES: Cllrs Mclaughlin and Wakeford

APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES: Minute Pages 1833P-1834P of 15th December 2025 available at: <http://www.staplehurst-pc.uk/community/staplehurst-parish-council-13607/planning-committee/>

Cllr Sharp proposed, and Cllr Pett seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting on 15th December 2025. Agreed unanimously.

COUNCILLOR DECLARATIONS regarding items on the Agenda: -

1. Declarations of Lobbying - NA
2. Declarations of Changes to the Register of Interests - NA
3. Declarations of Interest in Items on the Agenda Cllr Pett knows the applicant of 25/505144.
4. Requests for Dispensation - NA

Signed by Chairman.....Dated.....

CLERK'S PLANNING REPORT:

Planning presentation at next meeting on proposed Housing Development on Marden Road
 MBC Consultation response on Gypsy, Traveller & Showpeople Consultation – supported KALC
 Maidstone's comments – note MBC report does not include many of the sites in Staplehurst. It is important it is accurate so that services to support these residents can be put in place.
 Chart Hill Golf Course development – potential traffic movement through Staplehurst on A229. Important wheel washing facilities on site, plus road cleaning along route.
 It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the MBC Cllrs asking them to report to the next Full Council meeting on:

- Clarify 5-year housing land supply principle
- What is the current housing land supply in Maidstone?
- What are MBC doing about it?
- When will the 5-year housing land supply be achieved in Maidstone?

FULL PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

21/504832 **Iden Grange Cranbrook Road TN12 0ET** - Demolition of 19(no) storage buildings and erection of 5(no) detached dwellings (with plots 1 and 5 having detached car barns), conversion of existing Kentish barn to single dwellinghouse, and associated works including parking, amenity areas, and infrastructure. Amended and additional information received. SPC had recommended Refusal (Min 1548P, 1566P).

Following a debate which highlighted the following.

Bat Survey - The bat survey indicates 3 possible species present at some time. We would hope that the KCC and MBC Ecology teams ensure that the appropriate protections are implemented and that the roof space detailed Bat Emergence Survey is incorporated as well as integrated bat bricks and swift bricks in all houses.

Tree Survey - this appears to indicate only minimal impact and no trees felled but the MBC Tree Officer will no doubt comment.

Landscape Strategy - preference would be for more native trees planted even if it's smaller trees such as Hawthorn and Crab Apple, especially on the southern boundary where it will be partially visible from the A229. This would soften the impact over time.

Ecology Survey Required - as mentioned by KCC in 2023 a full ecology survey is required!

Surface Water Drainage - there needs to be a full SuDS report plus the site partially falls under the scope of the Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board so they should be consulted. We can't see any surface water strategy plus we can't see anything regarding the installation of water butts to help slow the runoff of surface water.

Environmental Credentials - we can't see anything regarding air source heat pumps, solar panels, EV charging points, recycling rainwater etc.

Site Access - we couldn't see any objection by KCC in 2022 regarding the site access. we would assume we rely on their judgement as to what they see as required, or not, in this case.

Cllr Arger proposed, and Cllr Pett seconded to recommend refusal – agreed unanimously - based on the following:

- Reiterate our previous comments.
- The application is outside the village envelope – LPRHOU11, LPRTRA2 LPRQD4 and LPRQD5

Signed by Chairman.....Dated.....

- Still no full Ecology report and no BNG assessment or action plan
- Still no Surface Water strategy
- Sustainability still lacking – LPRQD1.
- Consideration of the application by Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board
- Lack of Tree Officer comments.

However, if the Borough Council approve the application or the application is won on appeal, we recommend meaningful conditions on;

- Sustainable Drainage plan for the site such as SuDs etc
- Environmental design such as integrated Bat / Swift boxes / loft spaces and hedgehog access etc
- Sustainable design such as solar panels, rain water collection (help with flooding) EV Charging or air source heat pumps etc
- Landscape – use of native trees

25/504006 **Iden Manor Nursing Home, Cranbrook Road TN12 0ER** - Demolition of existing shed and erection of single storey detached building, to provide temporary on-site staff living accommodation comprising 6no. bedrooms with communal facilities, for a period of 5 years. Additional documents received. SPC had recommended Refusal (Min 1831P).

Following a debate which highlighted the following.

- The issue of parking for these staff has been raised by KCC Highways as it was assumed these staff won't need parking as they can't afford it/will live on site?
Plus, they state appropriate bike storage should be provided.
- There is a drainage statement on the portal (shows as 'Attachment' on 3 December). It now includes a foul water pumping station to link this property to the main foul water drains.
- For the surface water there will be no gutter but a gravel trench and *"will discharge from that trench in part by infiltration and in part by overland flow through the existing wooded area to the existing pond located at the north east of the wider site thereby mimicking the overland flow from the site as it was prior to the Nursing Home development being constructed under Planning Application [23/505361/FULL](#)."*
That might be OK but I'd be interested to see what KCC say to that. It sounds a bit like the gravel trench is just a glorified small soak away?

Cllr Arger proposed, and Cllr Pett seconded to recommend refusal – agreed unanimously - based on the following;

- Reiterate previous comments.
- Support KCC comments.
- Surface water drainage plan unclear
- Lack of parking / safe access – LPRTRA2

However, if the Borough Council approve the application or the application is won on appeal, we recommend meaningful conditions on;

- Drainage plan for the site such as SuDs etc
- Environmental design such as integrated Bat / Swift boxes etc
- Sustainable design such as solar panels or air source heat pumps etc
- Appropriate access in and out of the site

25/504992 **Land Adjacent to Dane Mead Villas, George Street TN12 0RB** - Demolition of 4no. sheds. Erection of 6no. dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), comprising 4 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed with access provided from George Street including the repositioning of the kerb, provision of 16 car parking spaces, 20 cycle spaces and associated landscaping and hardstanding.

Following a debate which highlighted the following.

Signed by Chairman.....Dated.....

Surface water - Initially we thought the site went all the way back to the POW alongside the railway line, but it doesn't which, as it's a self-contained site, surely there should be a comprehensive SuDS requirement here? There will be the 6 houses together with the runoff from the road and drives which all needs to go somewhere.

If you look at the plans, we estimate 60+ % of the existing site will be either housing or road/drives. We can't see anything for SuDS but there is a mention that it's not directly affected by flooding.

The nearby golf course, we know from experience, especially towards the railway line becomes a quagmire in winter and earlier this year they installed a French drain to try to alleviate this, but it is still closed at various times due to the clay holding the water.

Ecology - on the southern boundary the plans state there will be a chain link fence. Surely to enable hedgehogs and other wildlife to move in and out of the site this should at least have suitable openings in it. The golf course has grass snakes, rabbits, hedgehogs, woodpeckers plus other wildlife.

The Ecology Scoping Report does mention integrated bat and swift boxes which is good. As with any new houses we would like to see integrated bat and swift boxes on every property.

Environmental Improvements - we can't see anything (but may well have missed them) regarding air source heat pumps, solar panels, EV charging points, recycling rainwater etc.

Transport Statement - this includes the walking times to places such as the station and Sainsburys. We did a test from the site entrance to Station Road using the footpath and crossing the railway line. Without rushing we would think the timings in Table 2.2 are overstated and we did a video of the walk. It's hardly going to go viral but at least you can see it without getting cold and muddy.

<https://youtu.be/raw9MapVpIc>

The most obvious comments about the walk would be:

- It is unlit, both George Street itself and the footpath on the south side. So, whichever route you take you're in the dark for the rush hour in winter. The A229 is lit and has a pavement from the junction with George Street into the village.
- The footpath is not exactly fit for purpose if you were wearing your decent shoes to go to work or school. Some of it has at some point had roadstone (Type 1) put down but it's still muddy in most places.
We don't know who owns the footpath but if this got approval could a condition be that the footpath is improved to make it good enough you could walk on it all year in decent shoes? Depending on ownership and then ongoing maintenance this may not be feasible or practical. We have sent an email to KCC to ask if they know.
- The road surface of George Street to the A229 is, in places, in need of repair. It floods close to the junction of the A229 and it doesn't have any 'formal' passing places for traffic.

The only other comment on the road is that George Street floods to the west of the site entrance at times. There is a roadside drainage ditch which comes down from alongside the golf course. When it reaches the first house it has nowhere to go so it just overflows across the road.

Photos of localised flooding shared.

Cllr Sharp proposed and Cllr Farragher seconded to recommend refusal – agreed unanimously - based on the following.

- The application is outside the village envelope – LPRHOU11, LPRTRA2 LPRQD4 and LPRQD5
- Still no full Ecology report and BNG assessment or action plan
- Sustainability still lacking footpath (KCC Highways)– LPRQD1

Signed by Chairman.....Dated.....

- Density of development – LPRHOU5
- Privacy / overlooking neighbours – LPRRSP15.

However, if the Borough Council approve the application or the application is won on appeal, we recommend meaningful conditions on;

- Drainage plan for the site such as SuDs etc
- Environmental design such as integrated Bat / Swift boxes etc
- Sustainable design such as solar panels, rain water collection (help with flooding) or air source heat pumps etc
- Support KCC Highways comments to improve footpath.

25/505117 **52 Iden Crescent TN12 0NU** - Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of single storey rear extension, with alterations to fenestration.

Following a debate which highlighted the following.

- Whilst it's replacing an existing conservatory it is a greater footprint which goes past the existing width of the property; is that allowed?
- The side walls are higher than the roof line which could reduce the light to the adjoining property as it's probably 0.5 to 1m higher than the existing conservatory. Plus, the extension extends further out to the rear. So, it would reduce the light to the neighbouring property. As with the previous one is it a case of whether it's permissible?

Cllr Farragher proposed and Cllr Sharp seconded to recommend approval, subject to meeting the MBC Residential Extension SPD – agreed unanimously.

Cllr Pett left the meeting for this item.

25/505144 **17 Gybbon Rise TN12 0LT** - Erection of single storey front/side extension and single storey rear extension.

Following a debate which highlighted the following.

- Whilst the extension is not overly large being a westerly orientated back garden it could cause some shading to the back garden next door but, that said, if it's within the regulations that's fine.
- The small extension to the front we actually think is an improvement on the existing property where it is just a blank brick wall.

Cllr Arger proposed, and Cllr Farragher seconded to recommend approval, subject to meeting the MBC Residential Extension SPD – agreed majority 4 for, 0 against 1 not present.

Cllr Pett returned to the meeting

25/505223/SUB: Jubilee Playing Fields Headcorn Road Staplehurst Kent TN12 0BU

Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to conditions 3 - Virtual samples of materials . 4 - Landscaping scheme 5 - Timetable for hard landscape works, 6 - Drainage interceptors, 8 - Management and maintenance scheme, 9 - Crime prevention, 10 - Habitat management and monitoring plan and 11 - Parking management, Subject to 24/502740/FULL Applicant: Staplehurst Parish Council Contact Address: C/O S&C Slatter Mr Tom Betts Stephen's Yard Enborne Newbury Berkshire

No comment as this is a Parish Council application.

Signed by Chairman.....Dated.....

Tree Preservation Orders

25/505262/TPOA | 2 Hurst Close Staplehurst Kent TN12 0BX TPO application to cut the over hanging roof limb of one Oak (T7) back by 3m to appropriate branch unions (TPO 14 of 1997).

Defer to the Tree Officer

DECISIONS: (noted)

25/504127 **Land West of Lodge Road** - Erection of temporary boundary fencing and retention of an existing access gate (retrospective). MBC GRANTED with 2 conditions. SPC had recommended Refusal (Min 1828P).

25/504457/TPO **The Maples, Old Rectory Lane, Staplehurst TN12 0AF** - Tree Preservation Order application: (TPO 26 of 1988) T1 - Sycamore - Reduction of the top growth by approximately 4 meters and reduction of the photo tropic growth on one side by approximately 2 to 4 meters, bringing the Sycamore back in to proportion. T2 - Yew - Reduce property side by approximately 1 to 2 meters, reduce the height by 1 meter, reduce the photo tropic growth by 2 meters, bringing the Yew back into proportion, and 15% crown thin. MBC Granted with 2 conditions. SPC had deferred to the Conservation and Tree Officers expertise (Min 1832p)

Meeting close.....7.50pm

Signed by Chairman.....Dated.....