

Minutes of the Meeting of Planning and Transport held in Rickards Hall on 20 April 2026 at 7:30 pm

Present: Cllrs. Jon Aldridge (*Chairman*), Alan Layland, Margot McArthur, Angela Read (*Vice-Chairwoman*), Michael Stockdale, Jeff Streets, Bob Todd

In attendance: The Planning officer, three members of the public and no members of the press.

Meeting started 19.31

1 To Receive Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received, noted, and accepted, from Cllrs Baker, Gemmell Smith and McGregor.

2 Declaration of Interests or Predetermination, including interests not already registered

None.

3 Public Questions and Statements

Meeting closed 19.32

A resident spoke on Item 6.2, and expressed concern that the proposed permissive path would only remove 640m of pedestrian use from the 1.4km of Hilders Lane, so this new path, while increasing walking distance by 25%, makes it unlikely to be used. Pedestrians are already walking on Hilders Lane, and the proposed permissive footpath would improve a section which is fairly straight, with a good line of view, and not the blind bends. Objection was made to the loss of hedging to create access points, with concerns about the creation of an isolated area of land, potential for fly-tipping, and difficulties in maintenance responsibility. Additional concerns included increased risk of trespass and burglary to nearby properties, and potential unauthorised access to adjoining fields. Concern was also expressed regarding the construction of a 2m wide path of compacted crushed stone across three fields within the Green Belt and its impact on the openness of the countryside. It was further suggested that the proposal may set a precedent for further development along the lane.

Meeting opened 19.35

4 To receive, approve and sign the minutes of the Planning and Transport Meeting held on 23 March 2026 (pages 2023-132/1-4).

Resolved: to adopt the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 March 2026 and that they be signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record, pages 132/1-4.

5 Matters Arising Not Covered Elsewhere

None.

6 Planning Applications to Be Considered

6.1 26/00306/FUL - Stanholm Residential Care Home Mill Hill Edenbridge Kent TN8 5DB

Recommendation: *Members supported this application and commented:*

Members agree to the noise Report but:

Members maintain their wider objections on application 26/00306/FUL:

The original application was for two dwellings, which is now increased to four smaller dwellings, and members still had parking and access concerns on this compact site.

6.2 26/00470/FUL - Land West Of Kettle Cottage Hilders Lane Edenbridge Kent TN8 6LG

While Members were positive about the provision of a footpath, they were not convinced the proposal would address the existing pedestrian dangers on Hilders Lane.

Recommendation: *Members objected to this application and commented:*

The western sections of Hilders Lane have no footpath, but this new path, only addresses a straight (safer) section of the road, providing a much longer alternative route. Members were concerned the longer route would not be used by residents, who would continue to walk along the road instead.

The planning term 'permissive' implies that there was already an unrecognised footpath in existence, while there was never a trodden-in footpath across these fields and this new one just does not seem appropriate.

Members would prefer to see a pavement along Hilders Lane, especially the more dangerous parts of Hilders Lane.

This site is greenfield, and to lay a path through three fields is inappropriate, and in any case the footpath will not be of any use to residents wanting to walk into the town centre. Members were concerned that there is a different reason for providing the footpath. 'Planning by stealth'.

6.3 25/03056/CONVAR - Doggettes Cottage 1 Lingfield Road Edenbridge Kent TN8 5DR

Recommendation: *Members objected to this application and wish to repeat their previous comments:*

- Overlooking*
- No provision for parking*
- Flood risk would increase*
- The site is very close to the Crown Inn and Waitrose. No noise assessment has been provided*

7 For Information

7.1 26/00380/DETAIL - Cherry Bryn Stick Hill Edenbridge Kent TN8 5NJ

Noted.

8 SDC Planning Decisions

8.1 25/03407/HOUSE - 10 Lingfield Road Edenbridge Kent TN8 5DR

Noted.

8.2 25/03433/HOUSE - One Oak Little Browns Lane Edenbridge Kent TN8 6LJ

Noted.

8.3 25/02900/LDCPR - Croft Hall 13 High Street Edenbridge Kent TN8 5AB

Noted.

8.4 26/00216/MMA - New Barns Farm Greybury Lane Marsh Green Kent TN8 5QP

Noted.

8.5 26/00390/LDCEX - Ockhams Shernden Lane Marsh Green Edenbridge Kent TN8 5PS

Noted.

9 Planning Applications Considered Outside of A Meeting

9.1 25/03241/OUT - Land South Of Phillippines Close Edenbridge Kent

Ratified.

9.2 25/03241/OUT - Land South Of Phillippines Close Edenbridge Kent

Ratified.

9.3 25/03416/MMA - Town Station Coal Yard Station Approach Edenbridge Kent TN8 5LP

Ratified.

9.4 26/00378/VAR106 - Oast Farm Lydens Lane Hever Kent TN8 7EP

Ratified.

10 Other Planning Business

None.

11 Local Plan Update

Members discussed the Local Plan, noting the summary in the meeting papers:

The Local Plan is also an agenda item on full Council meetings. At the March meeting it was noted the next steps for Council was to:

- Review published consultation responses, including developer representations.
- Meet with the Planning Consultant to assess implications.
- Prepare for formal representations at Regulation 19 stage.

We have met the planning consultant and started to review responses. One matter discussed was the limited number of Development Briefs provided in the Regulation 18; this has been raised with SDC.

Work has commenced on reviewing responses. It has been noted that some developers have submitted their own responses to the Reg 18; details of these are currently being looked at. We will re-evaluate our responses and raise with the planning consultant so that we can ensure appropriate balanced informed responses.

We have also asked additional questions to SDC including:

- Concerns regarding Jacobs' modelling work. Especially, noting that junctions already identified as operating at or over capacity, including Crouch House Road/Lingfield Road and Stangrove Road/Mont St Aignan Way, have not, to date, been identified for mitigation.
- KCC response - school provision. There is currently no detail on timescales or the level of housing required to support delivery, which makes it difficult to fully understand how this aligns with the scale of growth proposed
- Bus and Cycle provision. Are there any proposals being considered to improve bus frequency and/or provide dedicated cycle links between development sites and the town centre, given the limited existing provision.
- Land locking. Is the Plan going to include provision to ensure future access is retained to avoid land locking, and enabling utilising this land.
- As the IDP continues to evolve, will there be an opportunity for the Town Council to review and provide informal comments on the draft IDP ahead of Regulation 19.

Members discussed at length, the importance of the design briefs to help understand developers proposals and the potential for sites. They expressed frustrations that so few had been made available, and felt that SDC should be providing these to the Town Council. Committee asked officers to continue liaising with SDC planning team.

12 Consultations

None.

13 Transportation Information

13.1 Highways Improvement Plan (HIP)

Members supported the changes to the HIP to be forwarded to Kent County Council and to publish on the council's website.

13.2 Speedwatch and Portable Speed Indicator Device (SID)

Cllrs Stockdale and Aldridge will work together to download the data and produce the reports.

13.3 Highways maintenance

Noted.

13.4 Buses and Trains

Noted.

14 Press Release

None.

15 Date of Next Meeting 18th May 2026

Meeting ended 20.16

Draft Published