

Draft minutes of Lyminge Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting.  
Held on Wednesday 1st May 2024 in Etchinghill Village Hall

**05.01 Present:** Cllrs Joyce, Heywood and Rising.

**In attendance:** Chani Sanger (Clerk) and eight members of the public.

**Apologies:** Cllrs Arnold and Trayner

**Declarations of interest:** None

**05.02 Minutes of 11th April 2024:**

- Add reference number for Fox Close as two applications on the system.
- Update with applications that were not commented on.

**05.03 Planning applications for discussion:**

<p>21/0077/FH</p> <p><i>This is a re-consultation following the submission of additional details or a change in circumstance.</i></p>	<p>21 Station Road, Lyminge, CT18 8HQ</p>	<p>Objection Proposed: Cllr Joyce Seconded: Cllr Heywood Motion passed</p>
<p>The following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The link received by LPC is different to the one on the public domain.</li><li>- The planning portal says 'refused' but it is still under consultation.</li><li>- This is a new scheme with a new agent but is being considered under the previous reference number.</li><li>- Chair feels that the committee should agree to requesting the application as a new application as it is confusing. This would make it clearer and give more opportunity to see what the new proposal is.</li><li>- Residents stated that they had not received consultation letters, some have received emails but only if they previously commented.</li></ul> <p>The following concerns were highlighted and should be used as the basis for an objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Drainage: No mains drainage available and no real provision explaining how it will be dealt with, just that it won't impact the Stodmarsh site. More information required.</li><li>- Would need to dig up Nash Hill for gas/water and the road is already poor quality.</li><li>- The proposal for the site is overdeveloped.</li><li>- The proposal shows a lack of understanding of the local area.</li><li>- The roof elevations on the rear end are very high/overbearing.</li><li>- The site would potentially be overbearing on number 23.</li><li>- How would surface water be dealt with?</li><li>- The application shows tandem parking but no details of how this will actually work. The proposed parking is unsafe.</li><li>- The documents don't give any dimensions.</li><li>- Archaeology would need to be considered as the site is close to other known sites of archaeological importance i.e Tayne Field.</li></ul>		

The committee felt that the proposal raised the issue of realistic deliverability. It was noted that the application should have been presented as a brand new application, not a resubmission and that residents raise fair and real issues with the proposal.

**05.04 Correspondence received:** None

**05.05 Date of next meeting:** TBC

Meeting closed at 14:16

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Chair (Date \_\_/\_\_/24)

DRAFT