

Aylesford Parish Council

Planning Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 4th August 2026 at Aylesford Parish Council, Aylesford

Present: Councillors Smith (Chair), Mrs Anderson, Mrs Birkbeck, Balcombe, Davies, Mrs Eves, Fuller, Mrs Gadd, Gledhill, Netzel, Sharp and Sullivan

Melanie Randall (Clerk of the Council)

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for Absence from Councillors Ludlow, Rillie, Mrs Waters were received and the reason for absence agreed.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest additional to those contained in the Register of Members. Councillor Smith declared an interest in item 4.2 and Councillor Sullivan declared an interest in item 4.3 as they are known to them and they took no part in the discussion or decision.

3. Minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday 21st July 2026

It was **Resolved** that the Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 21st July 2026 be approved as a correct record and signed. It was noted that the date on the Minutes was 7th July 2026, it should be 21st July 2026 – the original minutes have been amended by hand.

4. Planning Applications

4.1 TM/26/01085/FL 54 56 58 And 60 Hall Road, Aylesford South

New access and driveway to property numbers 54, 56, 58 & 60

It was **Resolved** to raise an objection.

The Parish Council is concerned that the proposed access would require vehicles to enter and exit directly onto Hall Road, which is a heavily trafficked route. Whilst the application proposes alterations to facilitate the new access, these do not remove the inherent safety concerns associated with vehicles joining and leaving such a busy road.

The Council notes that the properties already benefit from existing parking to the rear. Although the application states that the current arrangement is less desirable, the Council is unable to identify any evidence within the submitted documents demonstrating that the existing parking provision is inadequate or unsuitable. In the Council's view, the existing rear access provides a safer means of access and egress than that proposed.

The Council is also concerned that the proposed walls either side of the new access could restrict visibility for motorists exiting the site, as well as for other road users and pedestrians. The submitted plans do not appear to specify the proposed height of these walls, making it difficult to fully assess the impact on visibility.

The Parish Council also requests clarification as to whether the existing boundary wall is a listed structure or otherwise forms part of a heritage asset.

4.2 TM/26/01250/TPOC 259 Robin Hood Lane, Blue Bell Hill

1 x twin-stemmed Sweet Chestnut (applicants ref. T3) Reduce dead stem to a safe height (3m) and remove dead top of remaining stem only. 1 x Sweet Chestnut (applicants ref. T4) Remove deadwood as specified and dead hung up Ash limb only. Standing in

Woodland W1 of Tree Preservation Order.

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.3 TM/26/01263/FL 61 Salisbury Road, Blue Bell Hill

Demolition of the existing bungalow and structures and erection of two detached houses (one self-build, one open market), with associated landscaping, parking, garages, covered cycle parking and access

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.4 TM/26/01291/RD Land South of Barming Station and East of Hermitage Lane Maidstone

Details of condition 4 (LAP) pursuant to planning permission TM/24/00055/RMMAJ Reserved Matters application for approval of layout, appearance, landscaping and scale of 166 dwellings at Phase 2, Hermitage Park pursuant to outline planning permission TM/20/02749/OAEA (APP/H2265/W/21/3288065)

It was **Agreed** to note the Condition

4.5 TM/26/01292/FL 78 Teapot Lane, Aylesford South

Single storey rear extension

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.6 TM/26/01301/RD Land South of Barming Station and East of Hermitage Lane Maidstone

Details of condition 13 (Piling Impact Assessment) applicable to phase 1b only. - pursuant to planning permission TM/20/02749/OAEA Outline Application: erection of up to 330 dwellings (including 40% affordable homes), together with associated open space, play areas, and landscaping (including details of access)

It was **Agreed** to note the Condition

4.7 TM/26/01357/TPOC 174 Woodlands Road, Ditton

T1 (Applicants ref) Silver Birch - Crown reduction by Approximately 3m all round leaving an even shape and balance. Standing in Woodland W1 of Tree Preservation Order.

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.8 TM/26/01324/TPOC 21 Finch Close, Ditton

2 x Chestnut trees - Fell due to close proximity to the house. Also concerns that as the roots are apparently the same size as the height of the tree that they could be causing damage to the foundations of the house. Trees standing in rear garden in W1 of TPO

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.9 TM/26/01327/FL 66 High Street, Aylesford North

Proposed replacement windows to front elevation

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.10 TM/26/01338/TPOC 9 Sadlers Close, Walderslade

1 x mature Oak in front garden (applicants ref: T1) - Reduce height to 15.m and radial spread to 5.5 metres, standing in Woodland W4 of Tree Preservation Order

It was **Resolved** to raise **No Objection**

4.11 TM/26/01349/FL Land North of London Road and South of East Park Road and East of Coldharbour Lane, Aylesford South

Erection of a Warehouse Club (Sui Generis) including, tyre installation and sales, a petrol filling station, car parking, accesses, landscaping, engineering and associated works.

It was **Resolved** to raise an Objection to the Traffic Plan for this application.

Aylesford Parish Council wishes to make clear that it is not objecting to the principle of the proposed Costco development. However, the Council has significant concerns regarding the potential impact the additional traffic generated by the development may have on the local highway network.

The proposed development is located in an area that already experiences congestion at busy times, and the introduction of a large retail facility attracting customers from a wide catchment area is likely to result in a significant increase in vehicle movements.

Of particular concern is the impact when incidents occur on the M20. Accidents, breakdowns and closures on the M20 are frequent occurrences, and when these incidents happen, traffic is often diverted from Junction 5 onto the local road network. Vehicles are then likely to travel via the A20 London Road, which passes the proposed development site.

Junction 5 of the M20 is also a key access point for traffic travelling to and from Maidstone Hospital, which is approximately two miles from the proposed site. The Council understands that Junction 5 is one of the most frequently used motorway access points for those accessing the hospital. Any significant congestion or disruption around this junction and the surrounding road network, particularly at peak times could therefore have wider implications, including for patients, visitors, staff and emergency access.

The Council also notes the proposed introduction of new traffic signal controls associated with the development. Whilst the intention of these signals is understood, there is concern that additional stopping points and increased traffic control measures may contribute to further traffic build-up, particularly during peak periods when the surrounding highway network is already under pressure. Careful consideration should therefore be given to how these signals will operate in practice and the impact they may have on traffic flow.

The Council is concerned that, during periods of disruption on the M20, the combination of existing traffic, diverted motorway traffic, additional traffic generated by Costco and any potential delays caused by increased traffic control measures could result in severe

congestion and potentially gridlock within the surrounding area. This would have an impact on local residents, businesses and those travelling through the area, as well as potentially affecting access routes for emergency services.

Whilst the proposed opening hours of Monday to Friday, 10:00 to 20:30 are noted, these hours do not remove the Council's concerns regarding peak-time congestion. The store would remain open throughout the evening rush hour, when the local highway network is already under pressure due to commuter traffic. Additional customer journeys during this period could further increase delays and congestion.

The Council requests that the highway impacts of the proposal are fully assessed, including not only normal traffic conditions but also realistic scenarios involving M20 disruption and the resulting diversion of traffic onto the local road network, particularly at peak times.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that development should only be refused on highways grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Whilst the Parish Council is not seeking to prevent the development, it considers it essential that the cumulative impact of additional traffic, existing congestion, motorway disruption, access to key local facilities and the operation of the proposed traffic signals is properly understood and appropriately mitigated.

Aylesford Parish Council therefore asks that Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority, carefully considers whether the surrounding road network has sufficient resilience to accommodate the additional traffic generated by this proposal, particularly during periods of disruption on the M20, and that appropriate mitigation measures are identified if required.

5. Any Other Correspondence

There was no Other Correspondence

6. Duration of Meeting

7.30pm to 7.45pm