

Minutes of a meeting of the PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE held on Monday 13th April 2026 at 6.30pm in the Parlour
Present: Councillors A. May, M. Beach, D. Chapman, Mrs S. Crump, Mrs J. Jones, B. Jones and Mrs D. Lewis

In attendance:
 Planning Clerk Mrs Diane Cavey
 0 Members of the public

78. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

As the Chair of the Planning Committee, I would like to make a statement for the benefit of all Councillors present at this meeting and for members of the public.

The applications before you and indeed any applications in the future must be considered on Planning merits only. It is essential that Councillors adhere to this principle and ensure that their decisions are based on the papers before you and any information provided to you during this meeting.

I must stress this is not a forum to discuss any ancillary issues relating to the planning application or indeed any other matters. Councillors must not bring up or discuss any matters not included on the agenda issued

79. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Pippa Harston Family Commitments

80. ABSENT

Cllr Ann Duncan
 Cllr Kim Rye

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors A. May declared an interest in item 6d) Planning Application 26/0379/FH.

82. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No members of the public present.

83. MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning meeting held on the 2nd March 2026 were signed by the Chairman as a true record.

Proposed by Cllr B. Jones and seconded by Cllr M. Beach

For: 6

Abstain: 1 (Cllr D. Chapman)

84. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

a) 26/0303/FH JOY 20 COAST DRIVE LYDD-ON-SEA KENT TN29 9NL

Proposal: Single storey flat roof extension with new window to the north elevation.

Cllr A. May commented the extension is overlooking the shingle at the back.

Cllr Mrs J. Jones said there were not any neighbour comments.

RESOLVED: To support the proposal for application 26/0303FH

Proposed by Cllr B. Jones and seconded by Cllr S. Crump

Voting in support of the proposal

For: 7

Unanimous

b) 26/0420/FH MULBERRY COTTAGE HIGH STREET LYDD TN29 9BB

Proposal: Work to tree subject to TPO No 03 of 2005 comprising of T1 Sycamore reduction of west facing lateral branches by up to 4 metres.

RESOLVED: To support the proposal for application 26/0420/FH

Proposed by Cllr D. Chapman and seconded by Cllr M. Beach

Voting in support of the proposal

For: 7

Unanimous

c) 26/0466/FH MULBERRY COTTAGE HIGH STREET LYDD TN29 9BB

Proposal: Variation to condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 20/1936/FH to amend the detail of the chimney to units 6 and 7.

Cllr D. Chapman commented the design has changed from the original plan which means it is not in-keeping with the other builds on the plot. They should keep to the original plan. There is also an objection from a resident regarding the look of the chimneys.

Councillors voted unanimously to object to the proposal for application 26/0466/FH which was not supported by the committee due to taking into consideration

Councillor comments:

1. Not in keeping with the other newbuilds in the original plan.
2. Support the neighbour objections.

Proposed by Cllr D. Chapman and seconded by Cllr J. Jones

The vote was unanimous to object to the proposal 26/0466/FH.

d) 26/0379/FH 9 LADE FORT CRESCENT LYDD-ON-SEA TN29 9YG

Proposal: Conversion of part garage to habitable room.

RESOLVED: To support the proposal for application 26/0379/FH

Proposed by Cllr Mrs J. Jones and seconded by Cllr Mrs D. Lewis

Voting in support of the proposal

For: 6

Abstain: 1 (Cllr A. May)

e) 26/0322/FH HAFOD DUNGENESS ROAD DUNGENESS TN29 9NDMULBERRY COTTAGE HIGH STREET LYDD TN29 9NB

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension.

Cllr A. May commented the build does seem intrusive and from the plan 5metres bigger.

Cllr D. Chapman commented the build should stay within the footprint.

Cllr B. Jones commented the build goes over the shingle which will impact the shingle.

Councillors voted unanimously to object to the proposal for application 26/0322/FH which was not supported by the committee due to taking into consideration

Councillor comments:

- 1.Larger than the original footprint.
- 2.Build on shingle which impacts the environment, flora and wildlife.

Proposed by Cllr B. Jones and seconded by Cllr M. Beach

The vote was unanimous to object to the proposal 26/0322/FH.

e) 26/0513/FH

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension.

RESOLVED: To support the proposal for application 26/0513/FH

Proposed by Cllr B. Jones and seconded by Cllr D. Chapman

Voting in support of the proposal

For: 7

Unanimous

85. DECISION NOTICE

a) **25/1502/FH DUNGENESS A POWER STATION DUNGENESS ROAD**

Proposal: Proposed demolition of boiler house complexes, central control block and ancillary plant, recladding the amended reactor buildings, installation of hardstanding and weather protection structure to facilitate storage of the removed boilers, boiler drums and associated ducting and pipework. Councillors to receive and note.

Received and noted by Councillors

86. PLANNING APPEAL

Planning Appeal - AP-6776

Folkestone & Hythe District Council write to inform you that the following case has been appealed: 25/2046/FH - To view the application online, use the following reference: AP-6776.

Site Address: 25 TAYLOR ROAD, LYDD ON SEA, ROMNEY MARSH, TN29 9PA

Appeal: Appeal against refusal of planning permission 25/0246/FH – rear extension, side extension and roof extension to provide habitable accommodation in the attic. Vehicular access including gates.

Planning Inspectorate Number: 6005860

Received and noted by Councillors

87. CONSULTATION Appendix A page 100

Dungeness B Decommissioning

Consultation on EDF Energy's EIADR scoping for Dungeness B decommissioning

Cllr D. Chapman commented the consultation was late and we should have been consulted three years ago. This has already been agreed by the powers that be although we understand this has got to happen.

The questionnaire to be completed online stating late consultation and the consultation should have been earlier in the decommissioning process, resulting in residents not being consulted in a timely manner.

Councillors agreed for the questionnaire to be completed stating the above.

Proposed by Cllr A. May and seconded by Cllr D. Lewis

For: 7

Unanimous

**88. CORRESPONDENCE Appendix B page 101 to 108
South Brooks Energy Park (Lydd)**

To receive and note the Community Consultation Survey Summary Briefing.

Received and noted by Councillors

Meeting closed at 18.59

Chairman _____

Date _____

DRAFT

Dear all,

The Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) has received a request for a Pre-Application Opinion under the Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations (EIADR) from EDF Energy for its proposed decommissioning project at Dungeness B nuclear power station in Kent.

To support the Pre-Application Opinion request, EDF Energy submitted a scoping report to ONR that provides a high-level description of the decommissioning project and describes the scope of the environmental impact assessment that will be carried out for the future application for consent under EIADR.

ONR is now inviting comments on the report from both stakeholders and members of the public to inform our Pre-Application Opinion. The consultation will close on 16 April.

To read the scoping report and find out how to respond, please visit our public consultation webpage

[ONR launches consultation on Dungeness B decommissioning plans | Office for Nuclear Regulation](#)

[Dungeness B Nuclear Power Station decommissioning plans | Office for Nuclear Regulation](#)

Following the Pre-Application Opinion stage, EDF Energy will be making an application for consent under EIADR by submitting an environmental statement to ONR in mid-2027; this will be consulted on in due course and you will have the opportunity to comment on this.

Further information on EIADR can be found on the ONR website: [Nuclear Reactors \(Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning\) Regulations \(EIADR\) | Office for Nuclear Regulation](#)

Kind regards,

Ash



Community Consultation Survey

Summary Briefing

South Brooks Energy Park (Lydd)

Romney Marsh, Kent — March 2026

109 South Brooks respondents | 298 total survey respondents

1. Purpose of this briefing

A community survey was conducted during February–March 2026 to understand local experience of developer-led consultation relating to proposed energy infrastructure projects affecting Romney Marsh. This briefing presents findings from the 109 respondents identified as South Brooks in the survey dataset, alongside a full comparison against all 298 survey respondents at the end of this document.

The survey explored:

- Attendance at developer consultation events
- Perceived quality of consultation
- Levels of trust in the consultation process
- How informed residents feel
- What forms of engagement the community consider effective
- What would improve consultation

This document is descriptive and analytical and does not represent a planning objection.

2. Overview of respondents

| | |
|--|------------|
| South Brooks respondents | 109 |
| Resident within the proposed project area | 96% |
| Resident in a neighbouring parish | 3% |
| Attended at least one developer consultation event | 39% |
| Completed online | 43% |
| Completed in person (event or door-to-door) | 57% |

96% of South Brooks respondents describe themselves as resident within the proposed project area. The high proportion of in-person completions (57%) reflects significant community organising effort and suggests these findings reach residents beyond those already engaged online.

3. Experience of consultation events

Among the 43 South Brooks respondents who attended at least one developer consultation event:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Rated the experience very negative | 40% |
| Rated the experience somewhat negative | 26% |
| Neutral | 28% |
| Somewhat positive | 5% |
| Very positive | 2% |

66% of South Brooks attendees rated the consultation experience negatively. Only 3 respondents (7%) rated it positively.

4. Trust in the consultation process

All 109 South Brooks respondents were asked how much they trust the consultation process used by energy developers.

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Not at all | 60% |
| Not very much | 39% |
| A fair amount | 2% |
| A great deal | 0% |

98% of South Brooks respondents report little or no trust in the developer consultation process.

5. How informed residents feel

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Not at all informed | 38% |
| Only a little informed | 48% |
| Informed | 12% |
| Very informed | 3% |

86% of South Brooks respondents feel poorly or not at all informed, despite consultation activity having taken place.

6. Preferred communication methods

% of South Brooks respondents selecting each method:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Letter by post | 58% |
| Community meetings | 45% |
| Email | 39% |
| Dedicated website updates | 30% |
| Social media | 28% |
| Parish council communications | 14% |
| Local newspaper | 14% |
| Door-to-door visits | 11% |

Post is the most preferred channel at 58%, notably higher than in the wider survey sample. This signals a community where a significant portion should not be expected to engage primarily through digital channels.

7. Information residents most want

% of South Brooks respondents selecting each type:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Environmental impacts | 71% |
| Clear maps of the site | 62% |
| Impact on farmland | 45% |
| Traffic and construction impacts | 41% |
| Noise and visual impact | 23% |
| Visual simulations | 13% |
| Alternatives considered | 12% |
| Grid connection details | 7% |

Environmental impacts are the standout priority at 71% — 11 percentage points higher than in the wider survey — reflecting the particular importance of ecological and landscape concerns for this community.

8. What would increase trust

% of South Brooks respondents selecting each factor:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Clear, honest information | 76% |
| Evidence feedback has changed the project | 42% |
| Independent facilitators | 41% |
| Written responses to concerns | 29% |
| Meetings at convenient times and locations | 21% |

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Visual materials and maps | 21% |
| Small local meetings | 12% |
| Involvement of local parishes | 11% |

Clear, honest information was selected by 76% of South Brooks respondents — 5 percentage points higher than the wider survey average and nearly double the next highest factor. Independent facilitation (41%) also scores higher here than in the overall sample.

9. Open-text responses

All 109 South Brooks respondents answered: “What is the single most important change developers should make?”

| | |
|--|-----|
| Honesty / be honest | 35% |
| Listen to / genuinely hear the community | 13% |
| Local engagement | 9% |
| Provide clearer information | 5% |
| Stop / withdraw the project | 1% |

Honesty features in 35% of South Brooks open-text responses — the highest of any group in the survey and 5 percentage points above the all-respondent average. This is the most consistent and emphatic single finding from this community.

10. Key observations

- 98% of South Brooks respondents report little or no trust in the developer consultation process
- 66% of those who attended events rated the experience negatively; only 7% positively
- 86% feel poorly or not at all informed despite consultation activity having taken place
- Environmental impacts are the top information need at 71% — the highest of any group in the survey
- 76% selected clear, honest information as the primary trust-building factor
- Independent facilitation is supported by 41% — higher than in the wider survey

- 57% of responses were collected in person, indicating strong grassroots engagement beyond online channels
- 74 respondents signed up for ongoing community updates and 60 wish to be contacted about future consultations — demonstrating clear willingness to engage where consultation is seen as meaningful

11. South Brooks vs all 298 respondents

The table below compares key findings from South Brooks respondents against the full survey sample of 298 respondents across Romney Marsh.

Headline metrics

| Metric | South Brooks (109) | All respondents (298) |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Total respondents | 109 | 298 |
| Attended a consultation event | 39% | 44% |
| Rated experience negative (of attendees) | 66% | 70% |
| Little or no trust in the process | 98% | 99% |
| Poorly or not at all informed | 86% | 74% |
| Resident within project area | 96% | 64% |
| Completed in person | 57% | 36% |

Information needs

| Information type | South Brooks (109) | All respondents (298) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Environmental impacts | 71% | 60% |
| Clear maps of the site | 62% | 54% |
| Impact on farmland | 45% | 52% |
| Traffic and construction impacts | 41% | 45% |
| Noise and visual impact | 23% | 23% |
| Alternatives considered | 12% | 13% |

What would increase trust

| Trust factor | South Brooks (109) | All respondents (298) |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Clear, honest information | 76% | 71% |
| Evidence feedback has changed the project | 42% | 45% |
| Independent facilitators | 41% | 38% |
| Written responses to concerns | 29% | 31% |
| Meetings at convenient times/locations | 21% | 19% |
| Visual materials and maps | 21% | 19% |
| Involvement of local parishes | 11% | 16% |

Preferred contact methods

| Contact method | South Brooks (109) | All respondents (298) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Letter by post | 58% | 50% |
| Community meetings | 45% | 48% |
| Email | 39% | 46% |
| Dedicated website updates | 30% | 34% |
| Social media | 28% | 27% |
| Parish council communications | 14% | 21% |
| Local newspaper | 14% | 19% |

Key differences

South Brooks respondents are more concentrated within the direct project area (96% vs 64%), which partly explains the stronger intensity of some findings. The most notable differences are:

- Environmental impacts as the top information need: 71% vs 60% — an 11-point gap, the largest difference across any information category
- Clear, honest information as a trust factor: 76% vs 71% — South Brooks respondents place even greater weight on this
- Independent facilitation: 41% vs 38% — marginally higher in South Brooks
- Poorly or not at all informed: 86% vs 74% — South Brooks respondents feel less informed despite similar consultation activity
- Honesty in open text: 35% vs 30% — the most emphatic single finding from South Brooks
- Post as preferred contact: 58% vs 50% — a more post-reliant community than the wider sample

Where the two groups are closely aligned — trust levels, negative experience rates, and open-text themes — this reinforces that the findings are not an artefact of sample composition but reflect a genuinely widespread and consistent pattern across the Marsh.

South Brooks respondents are the most directly affected group in the survey. Their findings are more intense than the wider average on almost every measure, and yet the wider survey confirms the same pattern. The evidence base is both deep and broad.