

MINUTES
of
A Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee
Held in the Assembly Rooms, Church Approach, New Romney
on 18th June 2025
Commencing at 6.45pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: K Terry, S O'Hare, P Coe, J Rivers, P Carey, and J Davies.

In the Chair: Councillor K Terry

In Attendance: Planning Clerk - Miss S Walmsley
 Members of public - x 3

084/2025-26 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
 No apologies

085/2025-26 **DISPENSATION TO PARTICIPATE**
 No new applications for Dispensation to Participate had been received.

086/2025-26 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
 Cllr K Terry declared a Pecuniary interest in application 25/1080/FH, Cllr K Terry is a Contractor for the applicant and works from the building in the application.
 Cllr P Coe declared a personal interest in application 25/1039/FH, Cllr Coe knows the applicant.

087/2025-26 **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**
 It was not necessary to adjourn the meeting as no questions had been received in writing.

088/2025-26 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**
 None received.

089/2025-26 **RE-CONVENING OF MEETING**
 Not applicable.

090/2025-26 **MINUTES**
Minutes of the Meeting Held on 21st May 2025
 The Chairman presented the **Minutes of the Planning and Environment Committee Meeting Held on 21st May 2025**, a copy of which had been previously circulated to all Councillors.

Having duly considered the afore-mentioned minutes, it was:

PROPOSED BY: Councillor Rivers
SECONDED BY: Councillor Coe

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY – that (ii) the Minutes of the Planning and Environment Committee Meeting held on 21st May 2025 be

amended to correctly record NRTC comments for application 25/0740/FH, that NRTC recommend refusal due to the points made by the environment agency, which is in fact a material amendment and not a variation with the increase of a bedroom.

And (ii) The Planning Clerk be instructed to contact Cllr P Thomas and ask for the application to be called in to the FHDC Planning Committee.

091/2025-26

PLANNING CLERK'S REPORT

The Planning Clerk's report, which included information about New Romney Town Councils register of current councillor / staff authorities pertaining to Planning and Environment had been previously circulated to all Committee Members, was duly received and noted.

092/2025-26

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

It was

PROPOSED BY: Councillor Davies

SECONDED BY: Councillor O'Hare

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY – that NRTC Planning and Environment Committee comments, including those comments relating to additional planning applications received after publication of the agenda for this meeting, be submitted to FHDC Planning Department:

Application No

Location and Description

(i) [25/0416/FH](#)

Springwood Court, Church Road,
New Romney, TN28 8 TY.

works to trees the subject of
TPO No. 7 of 2007 T1 sycamore, reduce
canopy by 2-2.5m, remove major
deadwood, crown thin y removing
crossing and rubbing branches and
crown lift to 3m over footpath and 5m
over highway.

RECOMMENDATION

Voting:

For Application:

Against Application:

Abstained:

**NRTC PREVIOUSLY COMMENTED
FOR APPLICATION 21/05/2025.**

(ii) [25/0855/FH](#)

Martinfield Manor, Lydd Road, New Romney, TN28 8HB

Change of use from a mixed use of guest house and private residential dwelling house to a single dwelling (Use Class C).

RECOMMENDATION

Voting:

For Application:

Against Application:

Abstained:

NRTC applied Delegated Authority

Commented: In Favour / No

Objection.

(iii) [25/0866/FH/TCA](#)

Caldecot House, North Street, New

Romney TN28 8DW.

Situated in conservation area -Felling of a Bramley Apple tree.

RECOMMENDATION

Voting:

For Application:

Against Application:

Abstained:

**NTRC PREVIOUSLY COMMENTED
FOR APPLICATION 21/05/25**

(iv) [25/0979/FH](#)

The Priory, Ashford Road, New Romney, TN28 8BZ

Works to trees the subject of TPO No. 03 of 2017 Pine fell to Ground level.

RECOMMENDATION

Voting:

For Application:

Against Application:

Abstained:

No objection – However concern raised that the identified tree is not a pine.

6

0

0

(v) [25/1039/FH](#)

5 Blenheim Road, Littlestone, New Romney, TN28 8PR

Single storey rear extension.

RECOMMENDATION

Voting:

For Application:

Against Application:

No objection

6

0

Abstained:**0**(vi) 24/1516/FHAP-6695

Land adjoining 10 Links Way, New Romney, TN28 8PS

Appeal against refusal of 24/1516/FH erection of 1no. dwelling

Planning inspectorate number – APP/L2250/W/25/3364333

This appeal will be determined on the basis of written representations. The procedure to be followed is set out in part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Written Representations Procedure)(England)Hearing. The procedure to be followed is set out in The Town and Country Planning (Hearings Procedure)(England) Rules 2000, as amended.

We have forwarded all the representations made to us on the application to the Planning Inspectorate and the appellant. Theses will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

If you wish to make comments, or modify/withdraw your previous representation, you can do so online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

The Planning Inspectorate will no longer accept interested party comments by email only through the link above.

If you do not have access to the internet, you can send your comments to The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol.

All representations must be received by 10/07/2025. Any representations submitted after the deadline will not usually be considered and will be returned. The Planning inspectorate does not acknowledge representations. All representations must quote the appeal reference. Please note that any

representations you submit to the Planning Inspectorate will be copied to the appellant and this local authority and will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

The appeal documents are available for inspection online at:

https://folkestonehythedc.my.site.com/PR3/s/detail/a1ebH000000drhBQAQ?c__r=Arcus_BE_Public_Register

You can get a copy of one of the Planning Inspectorate's "Guide to taking part in planning appeals" booklet free of charge at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/taking-part-in-a-planning-listed-building-or-enforcement-appeal>.

When made, the decision will be published online at

<https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Yours faithfully,

Llywelyn Lloyd
Chief Planning Officer

NRTC Previously commented
02/04/2025

Recommended refusal – Contravenes policies HB1, HB3 and HB10 due to lack of specification and dimensions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend refusal - NRTC views remain the same as previous submitted comments, Application contravenes policies HB1, HB3 and HB10 due to lack of Specification and dimensions.

Voting:

For application:

0

Against Application:

6

Abstained:

0

Additional Plans Received:

- (i) [25/1004/FH](#) 3 Meehan Road, Greatstone, New Romney,
TN28 8SQ

Erection of garage

RECOMMENDATION

No objection

Voting:

For Application:

6

Against Application:

0

Abstained:

0

@ 7:01PM Councillor K Terry left the meeting, having declared a DPI in respect of this application.

- (ii) [25/1080/FH](#) Unit 12, Mountfield Road, TN28 8LH

Change of use from classroom to 3 offices and the insertion of new windows and a roof light to the North and East elevations.

RECOMMENDATION

No objection

Voting:

For Application

5

Against Application:

0

Abstained:

0

@ 7:02PM Councillor K Terry rejoined the meeting.

- (iii) [25/1057/FH](#) St Clair, Park Road, New Romney,
TN28 8NJ

Replacement dwelling

RECOMMENDATION

No objection

Voting:

For Application:

6

Against Application:

0

Abstained:

0

- (iv) [25/0755/FH](#)

Lindau Retirement Home, 104

Littlestone Road, Littlestone, TN28 8NH

Side and rear single storey rear extension to provide additional residential

care rooms and increase the size of the communal lounge.

RECOMMENDATION

No objection – Cllrs pleased to see investment in the community facility.

Voting:

For Application:

6

Against Application:

0

Abstained:

0

093/2025-26

SCHEDULE OF LICENCE APPLICATIONS

There were no licence applications for consideration.

094/2025-26

FOLKESTONE & HYTHE DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORTS/ DECISIONS/MATTERS

A schedule of delegated decisions of Folkestone & Hythe District Council Planning Department for the periods ending of 18th May 2025, 1st June 2025 and 8th June 2025 were duly received and noted.

095/2025-26

ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

The Kent & Medway Air Quality Forecast for Wednesday 18th June 2025 & The latest Water Quality Sampling Information which had previously been circulated to all Committee Members, Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2024-39 Adoption Statement was duly received and noted.

096/2025-26

REPORTS FROM WORKING PARTIES

None

097/2025-26

REQUEST FOR COMMENT FROM PERSIMMON HOMES REFERENCE TRO APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT 23/0769/FH – VICTORIA ROAD WEST.

NRTC Comments - Victoria Road West, Littlestone Traffic Regulation Order Plan – Persimmon Homes, May 2025

- The supporting documents predate the pandemic.
 - Transport Technical Note (04/04/2019)
 - Proposed Access Strategy drawing (23/10/2017)
 - Parking Beat Survey (11/09/2018)
- Parking observed on Tuesday 17th June in Victoria Road West from the Park Road Junction. This data is similar in nature to the Parking Beat Survey of 2018.
 - 8.10am - 10 cars parked on road, 3 cars parked on pavement, verge or crossover
 - 4.05pm - 11 cars parked on road, 1 car parked on pavement, verge or crossover
 - 8.20pm - 11 cars parked on road (including a drop side truck), 3 cars parked on pavement, verge or crossover

- The majority of vehicles parked on the road and verges were to the development end of Victoria Road West (The last 2 sections shown on the Persimmon Homes design)
- NRTC surmise that the majority of building work will occur between 8am and 4pm. At that time an average of 10 cars parking on the road have been noted. NRTC believe that the proposed TRO, placing double yellow lines over the distance specified, is overkill.
- The last 28.16m (closest to the new development boundary) should be allowed to have double yellow lines on one side. The cars that would be misplaced should be able to park in developed parking bays using the current verges.

Chicane design:

- Recent traffic survey data showed that over a 7 day period there were 744 vehicles travelling East and 741 vehicles travelling West. The average speed was 17.6 mph (E) and 18mph (W) with 98.9% (E) and 98.7% (W) complying with the 30mph speed limit. In addition, 99.6% (E) and 98.7% (W) were under the enforcement threshold of 35mph and 74.1% (E) and 71.9% (W) were compliant with a proposed 20mph limit for this road. This data suggests that traffic calming measures are not required in Victoria Road West. There is evidence that a chicane design will increase speed rather than decrease speed as vehicles try to “get through” the chicane as quickly as possible. In addition, without parked cars, the average speed will increase from that shown in the data.
- The traffic survey data would appear to show that the amount of traffic referred to in the Technical Note for 80 dwellings (more than the current number of dwellings) of 42-45 two way trips per day is most likely underestimated as from the survey data the average number of daily trips would be 106 (E) and 105 (W). The underestimation in the Technical Note means there is more traffic travelling up and down Victoria Road West. This will naturally increase when the new houses are occupied and the road becomes a through road to the new development rather than the existing no through road.
- The proposed plan produces a chicane type effect with double yellow lines and on-road parking alternating as vehicles move towards the end of Victoria Road West towards the new development area. This proposed layout starts from the Park Road Junction. It is felt that the proposed design will cause difficulties with safe traffic flow for both residents and emergency and larger vehicles due to the length of the chicane and also the lack of priority signing. In addition, for anyone travelling along the chicane, if cars are parked on the roadside with no double yellow lines, there is no safe place for vehicles to pass each other. Even with priority signing – the length of the

design is too long for this to be safe and effective. There is no possibility of 2-way traffic for the entire proposed distance. Visibility from one end of the chicane to the other would not be possible.

- Just adding in passing areas will not overly improve the problem as this will further restrict parking for current residents and it is felt a positive solution has not yet been found to address these parking issues.

Parking considerations for current residents:

- It is reported by the Chair of Littlestone Residents Association that there is insufficient parking at the back of the flats and surrounding properties. There are not parking courts at the back of the flats – there are garages – one per flat, which are not big enough to hold modern cars. There is not room for residents with more than one vehicle per property and there is also not room for cars to park and manoeuvre (U-turn) at the back of the flats. In the technical report (2.1.1) it mentions that residents may not park at the rear of their properties due to walking distances and security reasons. (2.1.2) states that KCC advised that rear and remote parking should be avoided as part of the proposed development – therefore this should also apply to current residents impacted because of the development.
- During holiday seasons, it is reported by the Chair of Littlestone Residents Association that holiday makers park along Victoria Road West in the area where the TRO is proposed – this does not seem to have been considered. This increased parking also occurs with the weekly market and events on The Greens. All neighbouring roads, including Victoria Road West, are filled to capacity.
- In the Technical Note it states (2.3.5) *“we are of the view that when construction traffic starts to use the road to access the site, followed by the development traffic, the existing residents are likely to use the parking courts to the rear of their properties as per their intended use. We feel that many residents are currently parking on-street out of convenience and as there is very little passing traffic - virtually none at the north-western end of the road. It is also important to note that public roads are for the passage of vehicles, not the parking of them, with residents not having a right to park on-street. We do however believe that some on-street parking can be beneficial from a 'natural' traffic calming perspective.”* It is felt that the developer should be trying to consider the needs of the current residents as well as residents of the development, when trying to find a positive outcome. This in turn will lead to a more successful project both for the developer and the community. The tone of this note is condescending and shows a lack of understanding of the residents position.

- 2.4.3 of the Technical Note states “*A copy of the proposals were provided to the Transportation Manager at FHDC on 28th March 2019 via email for their opinion on the proposals, specifically whether the authority would be happy to enforce them. The Transportation Manager responded the following day stating that they would have 'no problem enforcing this once the traffic regulation order and road markings are in place'. The applicant is willing to provide the necessary funding for the traffic regulation order (TRO) that will be required in order to provide the parking restrictions.*” This comment was made 6 years ago and very much has changed since this conversation occurred. There is very limited enforcement in and around New Romney, even in the main High Street. The reality is that enforcement is very unlikely to happen.
- A way forward:
 - Meet with New Romney Town Council Planning and Environment Committee, including the Chair of the Littlestone Residents Association, to address the parking concerns and the construction traffic approach raised in these comments and identify a more suitable solution to this issue.
 - Rather than surmising that residents from the flats and surrounding properties can park behind their buildings (which do not have appropriate, usable parking), survey and report on the actual current parking situation and find a workable solution to this. The PBS survey does not go far enough to give an accurate picture of current parking options. The Chair of the Littlestone Residents Association reports that residents have a clause in their deeds that says they cannot park in front of the garages to the rear of their property due to blocking access for others. They cannot park in front of their garages as they are too small for modern vehicles.
 - Developing the current verges into parking bays should be considered as an option to allow 2-way traffic to safely travel and emergency vehicle access to be achieved.
 - Construction traffic should park within the boundaries of the development only.

It Was:

PROPOSED BY: Councillor Terry

SECONDED BY: Councillor Rivers

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY- That (a) the Planning Clerk and Chairman be instructed to submit the above comments for Persimmon Homes TRO Application from New Romney Town Council to Ardent Consulting Engineers and take necessary action where appropriate.

(b) the Committee instruct the Clerk to inform the Chair of Littlestone Residents Association when the TRO is issued for Consultation. *

(c) the Committee instruct the Clerk to request a meeting between the Planning and Environment Committee, the Chair of Littlestone Residents Association and Ardent / Persimmon Homes.

* if and when a notification is received.

The Chairman thanked those present for their attendance and the meeting Concluded **at 8:36PM.**

Minutes prepared by the Planning Clerk.