

**Wouldham**                      **TM/14/03341/FL**  
**Burham Eccles**  
**Wouldham**

**Formation of a lit paved runway with parallel grass runway, formation of grassed bund, re-siting of helipads, erection of two hangars, a hub building with control tower and associated building, erection of fencing and gates, formation of associated car parking areas, fuel tank enclosure, family viewing area and a memorial garden (detailed submission) plus demolition of a range of structures (identified on plan) and removal of portable structures at Rochester Airport Maidstone Road Chatham for Rochester Airport Ltd**

Additional representations:

CPRE: A representation has been received on behalf of the Kent Branch of the CPRE raising objection to the proposals. The intensification of use that would be allowed by the paving of the runway would cause an intolerable increase in the noise nuisance and disturbance to the protected landscape of the Kent Downs AONB. The year round intensification of use would have an inevitable negative impact on the tranquillity, recreational and amenity value of the area.

Wouldham Parish Council: Confirmed they do not have any comments to make on the revised acoustic survey information.

Burham Parish Council: The experience of aircraft take-offs from Rochester Airport as seen by the residents of Burham is that they do not turn west to the cross wind leg until they are over the main part of the village. Thus the noise contours over the village are higher than those shown in the report. Therefore with larger and noisier aircraft taking off on the new concrete runway will have an adverse effect on the residents of Burham.

Figure 5 unfortunately gives no indication of how far the outbound and circuit routes go but presumably they will cross above the village so increasing noise and "risk" levels.

Aylesford Parish Council: No objection.

Private Reps: Two further letters of representation have been received reiterating comments already included in the main report.

One further email has been received which reads:

*“We were told at the meeting [the Medway Council suite meeting] that the numbers of flights will be in line with previous practice. We were also told that there will not be permission for larger planes.*

*In other words, things will basically be **no different from how they have been up until now**. If this is so, what could there be to object about?*

*We also had pointed out to us the lack of investment at present, and the dilapidated state of the buildings etc. The Council sought to show that this is a prime factor in the thinking that the new plan is necessary - namely, that the fresh investment is essential to make the facility viable, modern, and attractive.*

*This raises the fundamental question.*

*HOW will the new consortium generate the profit they will need to make? After all, if, as we were assured, the flight numbers are in line with previous practice, and no larger planes are permitted, where is the extra revenue going to come from? The revenue needed - we were told - to update and re-energise the airfield and make it an ongoing commercial success?*

*Or is, just maybe, that the present proposal is a Trojan horse, so that, once they are in charge, they will take steps to increase revenue, so the numbers WILL rise, and larger planes will be allowed? How else are they going to turn a "make do and mend" operation into a profit spinner?*

*Thank you in advance for your help in putting this before the committee. I would greatly appreciate if you could acknowledge this e-mail and confirm that its contents will be given to them as they prepare to make their deliberations.”*

DPHEH:

The Borough Council has received notice that a Judicial Review has been made against the grant of planning permission by Medway Council for the new runway etc at Rochester Airport. On legal advice it has been concluded that application TM/14/03341 should be *Withdrawn from the Agenda* of the meeting on 19 March to enable the implications of the proposed legal action against Medway Council to be fully assessed in relation to this Council's consideration of its undetermined application.

Any further material matters raised from any source will be dealt with in the next report.

**APPLICATION WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA**

---

**Wouldham                      TM/14/04151/RM**  
**Burham Eccles**  
**Wouldham**

**Reserved matters application for phase 1 being appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to outline application TM/05/00989/OAEA (Formation of development platforms and creation of new community including residential development, mixed-use village centre (including A1; A3 and B1 use), community facilities and primary school and associated highways works) at Former Peters Pit And Peters Works Site Hall Road Wouldham Rochester Kent for Trenport (Peters Village) Limited**

Additional Information: The applicant has provided an additional plan which indicates the proposed play area to be sited on land adjoining the riverside walkway (paragraph 6.17 of the main report refers). The provision of this space has not involved altering the position of any dwellings or parking spaces but has resulted in a small modification to the route of paths and amount of hard and soft landscaping at this point. The applicant has also made the following points in support of this provision:

- *It is located with good natural surveillance from neighbouring dwellings*
- *It is located adjoining the riverside walkway which allows its use by those enjoying the riverside area as well as residents.*
- *It includes a buffer of 5m to adjoining properties.*
- *Clear views of the river are maintained, which is an important feature of the layout.*

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED** subject to this additional plan being cited as an approved plan.

---

**Snodland    TM/14/02831/FL**  
**Snodland West**

**Demolition of existing and erection of one detached house and four detached bungalows and associated parking provision at 206 Birling Road Snodland Kent ME6 5ET for Clarendon Homes**

Private Reps: A further representation has been received on behalf of several neighbours, requesting that Members carry out a site inspection to include neighbours properties prior to a decision being reached. The letter states that Councillors would benefit from a first-

hand view from the adjacent properties and that there remains concern about ground levels at the site and in relation to the surrounding properties.

TC: Regret they are unable to comment on site sections as detailed sections have not been supplied.

DPHEH: Drawings referenced Sections 2014-158 (P) 100 a dated 15.12.2014 and Proposed Plans and Elevations 2014-158 (P) 002 B dated 15.12.14 have been superseded and do not constitute submitted drawings as shown in the Committee Report.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED subject to deleting the above drawing numbers from the plan list**

---

**East Malling & Larkfield TM/14/04275/FL  
Larkfield South**

**Erection of a two storey attached dwelling at 22 Heron Road Larkfield Aylesford  
Kent ME20 6JF for Mr & Mrs F Price**

An amended site plan has been received to show the retention of a mature tree in the rear garden area of the proposed dwelling. In addition, supplementary information has been received to demonstrate that the area to the side of the on block garage is in the ownership of the applicants. The existing site therefore has a garage parking space along with a space to the side of the garage. The proposed development would retain these existing spaces and create two additional spaces on the proposed driveway area.

PC: Consider a site inspection is needed so that Members can see on the ground how the house would fit into the street scene. They feel that paragraph 6.5 of the report onwards and what is said about the general layout of this estate with its open plan character is relevant and can really only be seen on the ground.

Private Reps: 3 additional letters received supporting the PC's request that a site inspection be carried out, with one letter suggesting the applicants should be there as they do not appear to live in Larkfield.

DPHEH: The issue of openness has been fully considered in the committee report.

The additional details clarifying the parking situation further improve the proposed off road car parking provision which was previously considered to be acceptable.

Drawing number 1140.12 received 23.12.14 has been superseded by amended drawing number 1140.12A.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED subject to amending the above drawing numbers and the addition of a condition requiring the retention of the tree in the rear garden as follows**

The approved development shall be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to the existing trees as shown on drawing number 1140.12A, including their root systems, and other planting to be retained by observing the following:

- (a) All trees to be preserved shall be protected during any operation on site by temporary fencing. Such tree protection measures shall remain throughout the period of construction
- (b) No fires shall be lit within the spread of branches or downwind of the trees and other vegetation;
- (c) No materials or equipment shall be stored within the spread of the branches or Root Protection Area of the trees and other vegetation;
- (d) No roots over 50mm diameter shall be cut, and no buildings, roads or other engineering operations shall be constructed or carried out within the spread of the branches or Root Protection Areas of the trees and other vegetation;
- (e) Ground levels within the spread of the branches or Root Protection Areas (whichever the greater) of the trees and other vegetation shall not be raised or lowered in relation to the existing ground level, except as may be otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

---

**Burham TM/14/03612/FL  
Burham Eccles Wouldham**

**Extension to an existing agricultural building at Scarborough Buildings Rochester Road Burham Rochester Kent for N & D Attwood**

Private Reps: 1 further letter of representation received advising they would not be available for the committee as they would be out of the country, expressing their disappointment at the report's recommendation and stating that they hope common sense will prevail as there is never a chance to reclaim our heritage once it is destroyed.

DPHEH: The issue of impact upon heritage assets has been fully assessed within the committee report.

Members are advised that this extension requires planning permission due to the fact that the building measures 8.3 metres in height and is situated 2.5km from Rochester Airport. Schedule 2, Part 6 of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended) allows the erection of buildings up to 3 metres in height within 3km of an airport without the requirement for an application for planning permission.

---

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**

---

**East Malling & Larkfield TM/14/03467/FL  
Larkfield South**

**Change of use from office (B1) to an office (B1)/taxi control office (sui generis) at  
38A Larkfield Road Larkfield Aylesford Kent ME20 6BJ for Place2Place Cars Ltd**

PC: Accept that the two spaces for staff in the private car park meet the required standards but request marking or a sign to be provided to delineate them as part of the planning condition.

They state that the main concern of the local residents relates to parking at peak times and hope that if permission is granted that the conditions will be followed and request that the Borough Council give more attention to enforcing yellow lines especially on Mondays and Fridays. Just the presence of a parking warden results in people not parking on the yellow lines.

DPHEH: Although it would be beneficial to delineate the parking spaces, as the land is not in the ownership of the applicants it would not be reasonable to require signage or bays to be marked out by condition. It would be possible to make this suggestion by way of informative in order to ameliorate the parking situation.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED subject to the following additional Informative:**

**It is advised that the approved staff car parking area is demarcated either by the installation of signage or by the marking of bays in order to prevent general car parking from occurring within the taxi office spaces.**

---

**Aylesford  
Aylesford**

**TM/14/02455/FL**

**Change of use to the display and supply of specialist hydroponics equipment at  
Unit 12 Yew Tree Industrial Estate Mill Hall Aylesford Kent ME20 7ET for  
Motoliner/3CH**

DPHEH: The applicant has confirmed that Unit 12 has been used for the display and supply of specialist hydroponics equipment for the last 5 years, during which time the use been operated on Saturday afternoons between the hours of 13.00 and 18.00.

The operation of the use on Saturday afternoons was brought to the attention of the Council in January 2013 as the result of an ongoing enforcement investigation into the wider site, and not as a result of any specific complaint about the operation of Unit 12.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**

---

**Alleged Unauthorised Development**

**East Malling & Larkfield 15/00037/COH  
East Malling**

**Orchard Farm Well Street East Malling West Malling Kent ME19 6JW**

The site has been inspected this afternoon and the unauthorised lights remain erected.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**

---

**Enforcement Report:**

**Update on Unauthorised Developments in East Malling**

**13/00028/WORKM** Ivy House Farm, 42 Chapel Street, East Malling

**14/00289/WORKM** Invicta Works, Mill Street, East Malling

**14/00365-370/USEM 6** – 11 Darcy Court, East Malling

1. Members will have received an email from a third party suggesting that the fence is still over 2m. high. This matter has been the subject on ongoing discussion and the Council has reviewed the position. The height of the fence has to be measured against the previously existing land level upon which it was erected. For the avoidance of doubt the Enforcement Notice required the reduction in the height of the fence – it did not require the removal of the fence.
2. I should make it clear that in terms of the remedial works to the non-listed section of wall we encouraged the owner to not carry-out further works during the winter to avoid the risk of frost damage which could lead to the work having

to be done more than once.

3. In the Invicta Works/Darcy Court parts of the report we mention that it is appropriate to hold in abeyance action where an appeal has been lodged. For the avoidance of doubt the Council has no discretion on this matter – it is not able to pursue action on any Enforcement Notice under appeal until the appeal is decided and the Notice confirmed (or the appeal withdrawn).