

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF BRENCHLEY AND MATFIELD PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY  
3<sup>RD</sup> MAY 2022 AT 7.30PM AT MATFIELD PAVILION**

**Present:** Councillors J. Buttery (Chair) presided, C. Churchill, G. Warner, C. Miconnet, J. Spencer, A. Stout, E Akenhead, A. Wells, C. Brooks (Clerk), P. Horn (RFO)

**In attendance:** Cllr Alan McDermott (TWBC), Fiona Pengelly (PWCAC), 12 members of the public

**1. Election of Chairman of the Parish Council and Declaration of Acceptance of Office**

In the absence of Cllr Butler, Cllr Buttery requested nominations for Chair.

Cllr Wells nominated Cllr Buttery and this was seconded by Cllr Spencer. There were no other nominations and Cllr Buttery was therefore elected as Chair of the Parish Council.

Cllr Buttery took the Chair. A Declaration of Acceptance of Office was signed and countersigned by the Clerk.

Cllr Warner requested that all decisions taken outside of meetings were reported in a timely manner.

**2. Election of a Vice Chairman of the Parish Council and Declaration of Acceptance of Office**

The Chairman requested nominations for Vice-Chair.

Cllr Buttery nominated Cllr Stout and this was seconded by Cllr Akenhead. There were no other nominations and Cllr Stout was therefore elected as Vice-Chair of the Parish Council.

A Declaration of Acceptance of Office was signed and countersigned by the Clerk.

**3. To accept apologies for absence**

None.

**4. To approve Minutes of the last meeting**

Minutes of the meeting of 4<sup>th</sup> April were considered, Cllr Warner commented that the text of the Council's comments on the Sandhole Cottage planning application (22/00115) were missing and should be added.

With the above amendment the Minutes were approved as an accurate record and would be signed by the Chair at the next opportunity.

**5. To record declarations of interest in any item on the Agenda**

None.

**6. To adjourn to allow public participation.**

Phil Skoyles, Patrick Manwaring, Andrew Peaple, Ian McEwen and Peter Coombes spoke to raise objections to planning application 22/00757/OUT.

Peter Coombes made further comments concerning this application in relation to the role and processes of the Parish Council.

Note to Minutes: In consideration that a large number of residents were in attendance who were interested in the OUT planning application, the matter was discussed at this point in the meeting, the minutes remain in the order of the Agenda.

## 7. Chairman's Announcements

- Cllr Buttery stated that Lynne Butler had resigned from the Council due to ill health. The Council agreed that Lynne had made a huge contribution to the Parish Council and in particular to the Neighbourhood Development Plan and that her expertise and commitment to the Parish Council had been outstanding. The Clerk was asked to send a letter of thanks to Lynne and Cllrs would send a personal bouquet of flowers.

The Chair outlined that this resignation would result in a Co-Option of the casual vacancy and the notice would be published tomorrow, 4<sup>th</sup> May. Should less than ten electors request a poll then the Council would advertise the Co-Option after 24<sup>th</sup> May.

- Cllr Buttery noted that Cllr McDermott, who had been the Borough Councillor for the ward for some years, was standing down, this would be the last meeting he attends before the elections on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> May. The Council thanked Alan for his commitment to local issues.
- The Chair commented that the dates of meetings had previously been set by Calendar year and the Council agreed that these would be set April to March to coincide with the Council year. It was also agreed that meetings would commence at 7.00pm henceforth.
- Cllr Buttery reminded all Cllrs that they should attend the Dynamic Councillor training provided by KALC as soon as possible. Councillors were also reminded that they must use the Council provided email address and include the text of the disclaimer in all responses.

It was agreed that Cllr Warner and Stout would liaise with Harry Salmon, the Webmaster, to ensure that they would be using the PC email address for all Council business, as directed by the Internal Auditor.

## 8. Allocation of responsibilities and Committee membership

The existing Committee membership and responsibilities were discussed. The following was agreed:

### Finance Committee:

Cllr Wells (Chair), Cllr Buttery, Cllr Stout, Cllr Spencer, Cllr Churchill

### Policy and Management Committee:

Cllr Buttery (Chair), Cllr Churchill, Cllr Wells, Cllr Miconnet

### Planning Committee:

Cllr Warner (Chair), Cllr Akenhead, Cllr Miconnet

### Employment Panel:

Cllr Buttery (Chair), Cllr Stout, Cllr Akenhead

### NDP Steering Group:

Cllr Akenhead

### Road Safety Initiative (Working Group):

Cllr Churchill, community representatives

### Christmas (Working Group):

Cllr Buttery, community representatives

### Cooksfield (Working Group):

Cllr Wells, community representatives

### Cinderhill and Bridleways (Working Group):

Cllr Akenhead, Cllr Miconnet, Cllr Warner, community representatives

Sustainability (Working Group):

Cllr Wells, community representatives

Data Protection Officer:

Cllr Buttery

Police Liaison Officer

Cllr Churchill

Allotments:

Cllr Miconnet

Matfield Green and Pond:

Cllr Stout

Footpaths:

Cllr Miconnet

Matfield Pavilion:

Cllr Buttery

Open Spaces and Street Furniture:

Cllr Spencer

Porters Wood:

Cllr Spencer

Recreation Ground and Playground:

Cllr Spencer

Health and Safety:

Cllr Buttery

It was agreed that the Council would outsource elements of the Health and Safety function, predominantly the regular inspection of the playground, and the Clerk was asked to obtain a quote from a suitable contractor for consideration.

## **9. Policies**

Cllr Buttery confirmed that the Code of Conduct and Standing Orders have no suggested amendments and will remain in place for another year. Amendments to the Financial Regulations, as recommended by the Finance Committee, will be tabled to the meeting of 6<sup>th</sup> June.

Policies relating to the NDPSG will be considered when the body is disbanding later this year.

### **1. Health and Safety Policy – to consider revisions**

An amended version was considered by the Council.

**RESOLVED to adopt the Health and Safety Policy as amended**

## **10. PWCAC – to receive report on use of PC grant 2021-22**

Fiona Pengelley gave a report on the activities of the Paddock Wood Community Advice Centre and thanked the Council for their support in providing the grant funding in recognition of the hard work in very difficult circumstances.

## 11. Planning

### 1. Development at Matfield Village Hall site

Cllr Akenhead briefly commented on engagement between the Parish Council, Matfield Village Hall Trustees, TWBC and James Chapman of Clarendon Homes, in progressing options and designs for a playground in the event that the development proceeds. She outlined the relevance of early engagement in these matters and that this should not be deemed as pre-determination of a position on the application. It was noted that reporting of outcomes would be beneficial so that residents were made aware of these details.

**RESOLVED to delegate the Planning Committee to engage with the developer on the design and detail of a proposed play area at Matfield Village Hall**

### 2. Hedge at Fernham Development

Cllr Akenhead outlined concerns regarding the hedges at the front of the Fernham Development. The Council agreed that provision for the long term maintenance of all hedges around the site should be clarified. It was agreed that Cllr Akenhead would provide the text of a complaint to the Enforcement Officer at TWBC, to be submitted by the Clerk on behalf of the Council.

It was agreed that contact would also be made with Fernham Homes in order to clarify the future management of all hedges around their housing site at Homebush Green, to include assurances about the frequency and extent of cutting hedges on the shared boundary with the PCs allotment site.

### 3. Paddock Wood NDP confirmation of BMPC response

The Council noted the text submitted on the above consultation.

### 4. Examination of TWBC Local Plan

The dates of the hearings for the TWBC Local Plan had been circulated and Cllrs Warner, Churchill and Akenhead would be attending various sessions on behalf of the Parish Council.

### 5. Examination of BMPC Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr Akenhead had drafted the Council's response to the Examiners' Fact Check queries and the Clerk would submit this by the deadline, requesting that the un-edited document was forwarded to the Examiner.

### 6. Planning Applications

Application	Detail
22/00678/FULL Kippings Cross Farm House Studio, Hastings Road, Matfield, Kent, TN12 7HB	<p><b>Confirmation of residential use with changes to the internal layout including the provision of a new staircase, ground floor windows and first floor rooflights; convert garages into habitable space; provide new driveway and access with two new parking bays; new boundary fencing</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: NEUTRAL</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The PC is concerned that the proposed converted Studio could become under separate ownership from Grade II Listed Kipping Cross Farmhouse. The PC requests that there is a condition attached for the Studio to remain ancillary to Kippings Cross Farmhouse.</b></li> <li><b>2. It is noted that the driveway to this property is in the yellow hatched area of the A21. The PC is concerned about the safety of the proposed new driveway with the sharp right turn immediately after exiting the A21. The PC notes the concerns</b></li> </ol>

	<p>from Highways England on retrospective planning application 19/02279, identifying that traffic slowing up on the A21 to turn left into Kippings Cross Farmhouse and Oast could result in other drivers assuming vehicle indication is to turn left onto the B2160 Maidstone Road.</p> <p>3. The PC is concerned about the removal of trees to make a new driveway at the Studio. The application states five fir trees will be removed together with another two trees which are not detailed. The PC requests a tree survey for the removal of trees for the proposed driveway – this proposed drive stands in the Listed curtilage of Kippings Cross Farmhouse.</p> <p>4. In the interest of a Listed building, the PC is concerned about the proposed 1.8m high boarded fence around the perimeter of the Studio and garage building.</p>
<p>22/00757/OUT OS Plot 6860 West Side Of, Maidstone Road, Matfield, Kent,</p>	<p>Outline Planning Permission (Access Not Reserved) - Erection of 15No. residential dwellings, including affordable housing provision, additional car parking for Matfield Village Hall, the provision of open and children's play space, sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs), new vehicular access and associated works</p> <p><b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: REFUSE</b></p> <p>The PC requests that this application is dealt with under 4.8 (d) category Y of the Tunbridge Wells Agreement 2020, noting also that part of the land concerned is the property of the Parish Council and some belongs to the Matfield Village Hall Charity.</p> <p>1. The application includes some land owned by the Parish Council and some owned by the Matfield Village Hall Charity. This was not shown in the application form when the application was validated on 14 March, but the Parish Council received the necessary formal notification on 31 March. An amended application form reflecting the correct land ownerships has now appeared on TWBC's website, though some of the writing on the amended form is garbled owing, presumably, to some sort of IT problem.</p> <p>2. Allocated site AL/BM2 in the Submission Local Plan does not include the PC's triangle of land that is included within this application. However, a presentation by Clarendon Homes' consultant James Chapman to the PC in September 2021 suggested using this triangle of land. Without prejudice to the PC's eventual response to any planning application that might be going to come forward, representatives of the PC agreed the attached plan for the possible community areas, including the PC's land, with the Trustees of Matfield Village Hall. This plan was sent to James Chapman on 20 January and to the Borough Council.</p> <p>3. While noting the efforts made to produce a scheme to comply with the draft Local Plan, the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and the High Weald AONB housing design guide (perhaps together with the covenants on the land), the PC also notes that the proposed layout of the housing has changed substantially from that envisaged in the Local Plan, to be much closer to the road, thereby losing most of the proposed landscape buffer. The PC notes the uncertainties and the apparent conflicts between some of the documents, especially as regards the proposed access and its effects on the trees along Maidstone Road. The PC agrees with TWBC and KCC officers that a</p>

considerable amount of further information is required. Therefore the application should not be approved as it currently stands.

4. The PC notes and agrees with the conservation officer and the heritage statement that the development would have little to no impact on the listed buildings within the area. However, the PC notes that the impact of this development on the eastern approach to the village has hardly been pointed out by the applicant and has not been adequately mitigated in the plans. The PC is especially concerned about the possible removal of hedging on the south-east corner of the boundary and lower east boundary – especially in views of proposed elevations for the two front plots (8 & 9) – without which the approach to the village will be drastically modified. The PC is also concerned that in the illustrative layout, house 8, the tallest building, is proposed to be at the front of the site, where it will be more dominant in the landscape than it would be if it were one of the buildings set further back.

5. With this in mind, the PC notes that the intentions stated in the planning statement and the pre-application advice might be conflicting. The planning statement references the intention to “secure a strong frontage along Maidstone Road” (para 5.32, page 29), while the pre-application advice advocated the “retention of the majority of frontage hedgerow and trees providing a good set-back for those dwellings fronting Maidstone road” (planning statement, 2.9, page 7).

6. Further to this, the PC notes the options presented in section 5.46 of the planning statement with regards to hedging:

- a) Remove vegetation to provide access but retain remainder of existing hedgerow; or
  - b) Remove entire hedgerow and replace with new low-level native hedging and fencing,
- neither of which is deemed satisfactory.

7. The PC appreciates that the planning statement acknowledges the need for a landscape buffer between the Village Hall and the proposed development (planning statement, section 3.9, page 11); however the PC is concerned about a possible lack of buffer with neighbouring properties along the site. The removal of the G006 group of trees which forms a buffer with the neighbouring property especially is a concern. While trees remain on the neighbouring property on the eastern side, some buffer should be retained on site rather than relying on the neighbouring properties to provide it. This group of trees has been referenced in the survey as needing to be partially removed for the purpose of development, while the site plans appear to show that none would be retained. The PC would like to point out that the following condition was also part of the pre-application advice: “the proposed treatment of the southern boundary should include a landscape buffer” (planning statement, page 8).

8. The PC notes and supports the comments of KCC Highways, particularly regarding visibility splays, the speed of traffic in the vicinity of the site, land drainage and the need for a safe pedestrian link from the site to the village. As regards public transport, KCC is currently consulting on cutting the no.6 Sunday service to Pembury. Traffic is already heavy on the Maidstone Road and is bound to increase further with the very large amount of new development taking place and

planned at Paddock Wood. The recent and current housing developments at the other end of the village are also adding to the traffic outside this site. Councillors are aware, from Community Speedwatch sessions and observation of the Speed Indicator Device that have sometimes been situated nearby, that a considerable proportion of the traffic exceeds the 30mph limit. Provision of a pavement area on the boundary with Maidstone Road should not come at the detriment of the hedges and trees which are deemed necessary as outlined above.

9. The PC notes and supports the conditions requested by KCC Flood and Water. It also notes and supports the comments made by neighbours concerning flooding of the road and sewage pipes backing up. It is essential that these concerns should be addressed before any outline permission is granted, since these issues could affect the access and whether an acceptable layout can be provided.

10. A full biodiversity net gain scheme will need to be provided and approved before full permission can be granted. While the documents supplied at this stage mention achieving biodiversity net gain on site easily several times throughout the application (tree survey, page 8; section 5.68 of the planning statement, page 34), no hard evidence has yet been supplied of this.

11. If TWBC is minded to approve this application, the PC would like to ensure not only that conditions requiring mitigation measures are put in place within this application to help restore the greenery and habitats possibly destroyed as part of this development, but also that strong enhancement measures are provided in order to achieve the 30-year biodiversity net gain, together with appropriate monitoring. The PC would like TWBC and the applicant to explore alternatives to the destruction of the mature and moderate BRP trees which have been labelled as needed to be removed to “facilitate the proposed development access” and “facilitate the proposed development” (tree survey page 5, bat scoping report, page 5). The preliminary ecological assessment survey report dated Jan 2022 (based on surveys conducted in December 2021) says that a desk study identified 6 species of bat within a 5 km zone over the past 20 years. However, the PC notes that the protected species report prepared for a site in Matfield on the Maidstone Road developed by Rydon Homes (17/01142/FULL) identified eight, and possibly nine, species of bat on that site in September 2016.

12. While understanding the intention to replicate a farmstead, the PC believes that the proposed post and rail fencing at the front of the houses and along the Maidstone Road would be inappropriate: this development adjacent to the Conservation Area will be seen as part of the village rather than as part of the rural area, and consequently low picket fencing for the gardens would be far more appropriate, and a hedgerow without post and rail along the Maidstone Road. The proposed flint panels in brick garden walls are also not typical of this parish and should be omitted or replaced with ragstone.

13. The PC supports the proposed materials for the houses and car barns but the quality and colour of the bricks and tiles will be important, so if TWBC are minded to approve, the PC would request a condition requiring prior approval of materials.

14. If development on this site is approved, a condition concerning external lighting will be required. The PC would be strongly opposed to overhead lighting of the roads and paths in the development as suggested by Kent Police: this would completely alter the character of the village which is generally unlit. Any provision of street lighting should also be evaluated as part of the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures, as hinted in section 5.66 of the planning statement.

15. Additionally, while the PC fully supports the move to green energy, we would like to understand the potential noise impact of the proposed air source heat pumps to be installed on site.

16. The PC agrees with the applicants that a playground in the area proposed for it in this application would be preferable to one within the main part of the housing development, since it would be more accessible to the public and as a community facility it would be better if it was sited close to the village hall. However, the PC is concerned that some of the application drawings do not appear to provide a large enough playground area, which in the Parish Council's view should cover the entire area shown for it on the plan attached to this response (paragraph 2 above). This would allow for a variety of play equipment to suit both older and younger children, together with a margin to include some seating for supervising adults and an area for buggy parking within the playground fence, and a verge between the playground fence and the parking area. The Parish Council opposes the proposed retention, that is shown on some of the plans (though not in the tree survey and impact assessment) of the poor quality self-sown sycamore trees T004 and T005 that are on/ immediately adjacent to the playground, as these would both restrict the equipment that could be provided and obscure the public visibility of the playground that is necessary for security. Suitable trees could, perhaps, be planted at the western end of the playground to replace them and the PC would be happy to discuss this with the applicant and TWBC.

17. The PC also notes that trees T006, T007, T008 and T009, three of which have been assessed as showing signs of possible early failure, would need to be removed in order to provide access to the proposed car parking on the PC's triangle of land (and indeed are shown in some of the plans as having been removed), yet are shown in the tree survey and impact assessment as to be retained.

18. While the proposed additional parking that would largely be on the Parish Council's land may provide some overspill parking for the village hall, the PC would not accept its being reserved for or given to the village hall because it is also needed to help to address the areas of parking stress within the village (see Policy AM 4 and Figure 31 on page 73 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan), and to provide some parking for visitors to the proposed public playground, especially if any of the playground users or their carers have mobility difficulties. Therefore the parking area should be owned and controlled by the PC in the interests of the community and the PC understands from James Chapman that this would be acceptable to the applicants. However, the suggestion that around the northwest of the site there could be a vehicular through road to the housing, past the playground and parish parking area, would in the Parish Council's view present a safety concern for the users of

	<p>those facilities and should be rejected, though a footpath and cycle route there might be desirable.</p> <p>19. If TWBC is eventually minded to approve the application, it is essential that in order to comply with the requirements of Policy AL/BM2 in the Submission Draft Local Plan, any outline permission is subject to a condition requiring a S106 agreement concerning the community facilities in the north of the site to be signed before full planning permission is granted. The S106 agreement should be between TWBC, the Parish Council, the Trustees of Matfield Village Hall, the applicants and the landowners of the main site &amp; the access driveway to the Village Hall. With the exception of the small number of additional parking spaces proposed to the south of the village hall, which would be for the village hall charity trustees to justify, the S106 agreement should provide the community areas and facilities as shown on the attached plan, including a fenced, surfaced and equipped playground and a parking area with a permeable surface.</p> <p>20. The PC understands from an email dated 22 April from James Chapman that estimates and designs from playground suppliers are being assessed. The PC will forward information on its preferred design and supplier to Mr Chapman and TWBC shortly, as per request.</p> <p><b>Note a plan of the proposed community area was attached to submission, this is available from the Clerk on request.</b></p>
<p>22/00627/ADV The Star Inn , Maidstone Road, Matfield, TN12 7JR</p>	<p>Advertisement Consent - Replacing the existing signage with new in the same locations but with a new design</p> <p><b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: APPROVE</b></p> <p><b>The PC notes that TWBC accepted an extension until 5th May on 22/00630/LBC but the delegated report granting permission is dated 21st April 2022.</b></p> <p><b>The PC notes that the advertisement changes for application 22/00627/ADV have already taken place. The PC requests a condition that the "A" frame boards belonging to The Star Inn do not encroach on the Maidstone Road pavement at any time.</b></p>
<p>22/00863/FULL and 22/00949/LBC Holmbush, Brenchley Road, Matfield, Kent, TN12 7PP</p>	<p>Proposed refurbishment of existing listed building, including erection of new side extension, Greenhouse and 3 Bay 2 storey garage with solar panels, associated landscaping</p> <p><b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: APPROVE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The PC is unable to identify the proposed shed 2.4m x 1.8m together with a 3.6m diameter circular oak framed gazebo with tiled roof on the submitted plan.</b></li> <li><b>2. The PC requests a condition on the 3-bay garage with storage above that this building will remain as storage and not become living accommodation. The PC notes the construction using staddle stones, Heritage velux windows, covered oak staircase with balcony and is concerned this building will be subject to a further planning application. The PC requests that TWBC reviews the dimensions of the proposed garage building together with the ridge height and considers the rising ground with any potential impact on AONB.</b></li> </ol>

22/00701/FULL 2 Southfield Cottages , Tibbs Court Lane, Matfield, Kent, TN12 7ND	Removal of front entrance from East elevation, Erection of new porch and entrance on South elevation, Demolition and extension of single storey lean to, second storey extension, Erection of outbuilding in garden <b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: APPROVE</b>
22/01064/FULL Roadways, Foxhole Lane, Matfield, Tonbridge, Kent, TN12 7EP	Erection of two storey rear extension <b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: APPROVE</b>
APPEAL 21/00563/OUT Pembrol Cryals Road Matfield	Outline planning permission (all matters reserved) for erection of 2 no. dwellings on land within the curtilage of existing dwelling; revision of shared access. <b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: REFUSE</b> <b>The Council's previous comments remain pertinent.</b>

## 12. Cinderhill

### 1. Fire Damage

Cllr Akenhead outlined the fire damage caused at Cinderhill to approximately one quarter of the heathland and three other smaller areas and the Council received a short report from Fire Service and KHWP attached and considered photographs. A meeting had been held on site with the police and measures were being considered to reduce these behaviours.

### 2. Meeting with Kent High Weald Partnership

Cllr Akenhead had provided notes from the meeting of 13<sup>th</sup> April with the Council's heathland managers, Kent High Weald Partnership, and a costed Service Level Agreement was being drafted which the Council would then review.

## 13. Closure of St Luke's Churchyard – to consider responsibility

The Council discussed the formal notice of closure which had been received from the Parochial Church Council and information on the cost of Treework which, despite being identified three years ago, had not completed.

It was agreed to inform the community, via information on noticeboards, the website and Facebook page, that the Council is planning to pass responsibility for the upkeep, maintenance and insurance to TWBC and, following this publicity a final decision will be made at the PC meeting on June 6<sup>th</sup>.

## 14. Jubilee Event, Lighting of Beacon on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2022 – update

Cllr Buttery advised that arrangements for the event were now all in place and the Clerk would request that the car park be made available at Matfield Village Hall for the evening to encourage visitors from around the parish to attend.

## 15. Matfield Pavilion – to consider quotes for burglar and personal safety alarms

The Council discussed two quotes, one from BeSure who provide the Council's Fire Alarm and one from ADT.

The Clerk and RFO had been consulted on their views on personal safety and lone working at the Pavilion and had expressed no major concerns.

No further action would be taken.

## 16. Jack Verrall Memorial Gardens – to consider quotes to repair fencing

The Council considered two quotes for replacing the fence at the memorial Gardens in Brenchley, part of which had been damaged in recent storms and part of which had been in disrepair for some time – along the boundary with the Old Palace. The Clerk was asked to check that the contractor has a waste carrier licence.

It was agreed that the Clerk would progress a reduction in the height of the hedge at the front so that the sign could be more easily read from the road, this would be done in August.

**RESOLVED to instruct Elm Fencing to install fencing along the full boundary (approximately 17m) between the Jack Verrall Gardens and The Old Palace**

**RESOLVED to instruct Elm Fencing to replace the oak post on the left hand gate**

## 17. Clerk's and RFO's Report

### 1. Oak tree on Matfield Green

The Council discussed a request from a resident that the Sassoon Oak be replaced. It was agreed that the Clerk would instruct work to preserve the current tree and this would be reviewed in the autumn.

### 2. Accounts payable

2218	HMRC	Tax and NI April 2022	£687.77
2219	C. Brooks	Mileage £55.50	
		Salary Balance £58.15	£113.98
2220	P. Horn	April Overtime	£69.10
2221	K.Twyman	April Cleaning of Pavilion (31/3, 14/4)	£30.00
2222	David Izzard	JV Gardening April	£25.00
2223	Ian Soady	Refund of Allotment Fee paid	£29.00
2224	Capital Cleaning	May 22-April 23 Fem. Hygiene bin	£132.04
2225	CVD	March phone calls and line rental	£61.14
2226	Wasteway	March Bin emptying Brenchley Rec	£38.40
2227	Paul Hurst 2062201	Balance for Jubilee Piper	£250.00
2228	Kalc	Annual Subscription	£1272.34
2229	Elm Fencing	Fencing Cooksfield	£1002.00
2230	Rialtas	Year End Shut Down	£446.40

### Payments Paid by exception

2231	CVD	Purchase of New Mobile Phone	£300.00
------	-----	------------------------------	---------

### Credit Card Payments made

2232	Lloyds Bank Fees	Monthly Fee March	£3.00
2233	Lights4fun	Pavilion Christmas Lights	£196.00
2234	TSO Host	SSL Certificate 22/23	£49.99
2235	TSO Host	Website Hosting	£57.46
2236	Eventbrite	Environmental calculator workshop Amanda Wells	£60.00
2237	B&Q	Sisal Twine for Allotments	£20.61

### Standing Orders and Direct Debits

2238	SO C. Brooks	Salary April 2022	£1806.47
2239	SO Panetta Horn	Salary April 2022	£519.82
2240	DD Smart Pension	April 2022 Pension Payment	£334.78
2241	DD EDF Energy	Pavilion Electricity 9/3-9/4 2022	£218.00
2242	DD Microshade	March 22 data and application service	£124.30
2243	DD Business Stream	March 22 Pavilion water and waste	£8.00
2244	DD Tower	Phone Equipment Leasing March 2022	
		36 month agreement ending December 2024	£30.02
2245	DD Smart Pension	March 2022 Pension admin fee	£18.00
2246	DD Npower	Streetlight electricity Jan 2022	£105.38
2247	DD Npower	Streetlight electricity Feb 2022	£77.23

2248 DD Npower

Streetlight electricity March 2022

£81.42

Invoices having been provided for scrutiny by the RFO, the accounts were approved for payment and would be authorised by Cllr Buttery and Cllr Wells.

**18. Meetings attended and reports by Councillors**

Cllr Wells noted that work on EV charging points at the car park in Brenchley (which belongs to KCC) had commenced but that the PC had not been made aware of this

Cllr Spencer commented on issues raised by residents about possible changes to the pedestrian accessway to Porters Wood. These appear to have been halted but information on potential for work in future had been recorded.

**19. To be advised of urgent business as may be previously notified**

None

**20. Date of next meeting:**

**Provisional Full Council Meeting, Monday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2022, 7.00pm, Matfield Pavilion**

**Full Meeting of the Council, Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022, 7.00pm, Matfield Pavilion**