

**SHOREHAM
PARISH
COUNCIL**

Parish Clerk: Sarah Moon
PO Box 618
Sevenoaks
TN13 9TW
clerk2012@shorehamparishcouncil.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

15th July remotely, via Zoom from 7:30pm

Present: R Blamey (in the Chair)
B Jeffery and M Sheward

Also Present: 0 members of the public

Clerk: Sarah Moon

1. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Cockburn and from Richard Boyle, who had technical difficulties accessing the meeting.
2. The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 1st July 2020 (copy circulated separately) were received and authorised by the Chairman and signed by the Clerk with the Committee's permission.
3. There were no declarations of interest.
4. The following applications were considered:
 - a) SE/20/01836/MMA – Preston Farmhouse, Shoreham Road, Shoreham
Development : Amendment to 20/00591/HOUSE
Comments due by 24th July 2020.
RESOLVED that Sevenoaks District Council be informed that Shoreham Parish Council has no objection and no comment to make on this application.
 - b) SE/19/5000/HYB – DSTL Fort Halstead, Crown Drive, Halstead
Changes to application SE/05000/HYB including: a reduction in the number of homes proposed from 750 to 635, associated changes to density, amendments to the design of both the outline and detailed parts of the application including highways amendments, change to site boundaries to remove development on the helipad (north eastern side of the site) and uplift in employment floor space. For a full summary of the changes, please refer to the Covering Letter by CBRE dated 9th June.
Comments made on the original application will be considered. Further comments due by 27th July 2020.
RESOLVED that Sevenoaks District Council be informed that Shoreham Parish Council objects to this development as it considers the development unsustainable for many reasons. Full details of the response can be found in Appendix A.
5. Correspondence/Information
 - a) SE/20/01830/WTPO – 23 Shoreham Place, Shoreham
Development : Work to T1 London Plane tree (TPO)
No comments necessary. Information only.
 - b) SE/20/00020/FUL – Demolition of existing light industrial units and erection of eight new dwellings and one office building.

REFUSED

- c) SE/20/01227/HOUSE – Dalhanna, Cockerhurst Road, Shoreham
Development : Constructions of a new greenhouse in back garden.
GRANTED

There were no questions from members of the public.

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 5th August via Zoom (if required)**

Meeting closed at 7.58 pm

Appendix A

Shoreham Parish Council objects to this development as it does not feel adequate provision has been made in terms of infrastructure for a development of this size. Lack of infrastructure applied to the original application (SE/1500628/OUT) for 450 houses and is now even more applicable given the significant increase (from 450 – 635) in homes proposed for this hybrid development.

The previous application was employment lead, which this one does not appear to be, thus, apart from the people who will be living and working on the site, most people will inevitably be using a car to travel to and from work. This will lead to congestion on the surrounding roads, which are already at full capacity as well as an increase in the amount of air pollution in an area already very close to the M25.

The size of the proposed development dwarfs the surrounding villages of Shoreham, Knockholt and Halstead, Badgers Mount which are already inundated with weekend visitors, many of whom come by car. Shoreham Parish Council is constantly under pressure to solve these vehicular problems, which will surely become much worse if a development such as this is built on its doorstep.

The nearest station is Knockholt Station but this is not suitable as it has a limited timetable and can only be accessed from Fort Halstead by car. The Old London Road is already given over to parking for this station and this is now at full capacity. No changes are planned to be made to this station until 2045.

Additionally, we have concerns about the amount of water required to service this number of new homes. It is generally accepted that in the UK, each adult consumes an average of 146 litres of water a day.

Thus a 'household' consisting of two adults and two children, can be estimated to consume 438 litres a day. The additional 635 homes proposed for Fort Halstead will require an additional 278,000 litres of water, every day which equates to almost 2 million litres a week.

Unless Thames Water can provide an alternative source for this supply, it will all come from the aquifer supplying our region with severe consequences.

Provision has been made for a new primary school but this does not consider the fact that residents from elsewhere may choose to send their children to this school, causing a further increase to the traffic problem. Furthermore, residents of the new development may elect to send their children to one of the undersubscribed schools in neighbouring villages, causing yet more daily car journeys.

A medical centre is planned for the new development and whilst this is welcomed it does by no means mean that there will be GPs who wish to run the practice (as was the case at Dunton Green). This could lead to the new centre not being built which would cause even more pressure existing services.

The application does not look at the whole area for which several other large applications have been submitted (Conway site, Broke Hill, Mumbai Central). In isolation, one of these developments may be sustainable, but if they are all approved, there will be a huge impact on the Green Belt, AONB and immediate area. A holistic approach must be taken and other applications considered when looking at this proposal. Due to its position at the top of the North Downs, this development will be seen from far and wide making it a blot on the landscape and having a detrimental effect on the views from the adjacent AONB. A development of this size and this proximity to the outer edges of London is a threat to the Green Belt. This, and other proposed developments in its vicinity, will cause neighbouring villages to be swallowed up in the urban sprawl. They will lose their identity and merge into one another as happened years ago with places such as Chislehurst, Farnborough and Sidcup, which have now become London suburbs. Development on this scale must not be permitted if we are to safeguard our countryside from encroachment.

We understand that SDC has not supported the proposed development of 1000 homes at Broke Hill. The Planning Inspector did not consider it to be in a sustainable location and should not therefore be granted planning. The Fort Halstead development is even further away from facilities and therefore the same should apply. We do not believe there are any exceptional circumstances for the building of such a large scale development in the Green Belt and for all the reasons above would urge SDC to refuse planning permission.