

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS

AREA 2 PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATED 4th December 2024

East Malling, West Malling and Offham

TM/23/03060

East Malling and Larkfield

Location: Land west of Stickens Lane Mill Street and southwest of Clare Lane East Malling West Malling

Proposal: Outline Application: The erection of up to 150 dwellings (including affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point. All matters reserved except for means of access.

Ward Cllr Michelle Tatton has provided an extract from the particulars of sale for the Clare House estate from when it was broken up in 1953. This shows that the northern-most field where access is proposed was previously within the ownership of the Clare House estate. It was however let-out to an agricultural tenant and did not form part of the Clare House Park and garden. This information relates to paragraph 6.23 of the committee report, however it does not affect the level of harm in heritage terms and the overall conclusion in relation to impact to heritage assets and the acceptability of the proposed development.

Following publication of the committee report, there have been four further public comments on the application. Of which, 1X(raising no objection)/3R(raising objection)/0S(in support), summarised as follows:

- Developer is exploiting TMBC not having a Local Plan.
- Suburban estate being tagged onto the existing village of East Malling.
- Narrow roads locally, limited/no footpaths, high likelihood of accidents.
- Railway commuters will travel to stations by car, they will not walk.
- Will be car dependent.
- Negative visual impact.
- Result in congestion, air pollution, noise, dust, smell and vibration.
- Vehicles have damaged Listed Building previously; development will result in an increased risk of such damage to heritage.
- Require a plan for East Malling to improve highways safety.
- Insufficient services, school places, dentists, transport infrastructure.
- Development should only be permitted where there is sufficient infrastructure.
- Harm to biodiversity/no independent ecological study undertaken.

- Disappointed at reduction in number of public speakers – blocking free speech.
- Overdevelopment/urbanisation of a historic village - harm to village distinctiveness by cumulative developments, must consider this impact – not yet seen the impact of these developments.
- Village important for physical and mental health, calmness, walking, fields, fresh air and heritage. Development destroying this.
- Improvements are false, losses not shown.

DPHEH: In response to the comments raised, no independent ecological study has been undertaken. This is because the Council does not undertake independent reports on matters, it instead assesses the information submitted by applicants. This is standard procedure across planning authorities. The ecological information has been assessed by Kent County Council's Ecological Advice Service, who are happy with the information submitted subject to details being submitted via planning condition.

The other issues raised have already been addressed in the committee report and are therefore not responded to here.

MY RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED