



Late Observations Sheet
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
20 September 2012 at 7.00 pm

Late Observations

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

20 September 2012

LATE OBSERVATION SHEET

Item 4.1 SE/12/01031/HOUSE 51 Greenhill Road, Otford, Sevenoaks TN14 5RR

Email received by the applicant to confirm that they wish to remove the access and driveway from the description and apply for a Lawful Development Certificate for these proposed works in due course. For clarity – no longer forms part of the scheme.

Additional email and sketch received from neighbouring resident at 50 Greenhill Road, commenting upon the topographical survey, the two storey structure and the proposed additional access and driveway as follows:

- The bottom of the extension does not match up to the front elevation and north east elevation although this may be correct as levels in this area change.
- Assuming this to be correct the fall between the front of the new building and the road is approximately 1.68 metres in 17.3 metres or 1 in 10.
- Porous pavements, as proposed only work when laid in gradients of 1 in 20 or less.
- The applicant has stated there will be no engineering works but the section illustrates that there will need to be a significant cut in the garden for the drives with retaining walls of battening down to achieve useable gradients.
- Request a condition regarding surface water drainage.
- Sketch attached indicating a 1.9 metre person looking towards the development from the road. A sight line to the existing roof and a sight line to the proposed. The extension will appear as half as high as the existing house.

Email received from the application in response to the aforementioned email commenting as follows:

- Having regard to the following comment ‘the applicant has said there will be no engineering works..’ what was actually written was: ‘I can confirm we have no intention for any substantial engineering workshould the construction company have different ideas.....we will be in touch with you for your advice’.
- Having regard to comments in relation to the porous pavements the applicants state they have contacted the Technical Department of Marshalls who confirm that their porous paving works at up to gradients of 1 in 10 when installed with baffles to ensure adequate drainage. The existing driveway is currently tarmacked so any replacement with porous paving would represent a substantial improvement and the exit point of any in-out driveway would be located in the part of our garden which has a gradient significantly less than 1 in 10.
- The drawings provided are somewhat confusing. Firstly a person of 1.9 metres in height is used. This is 6 foot 3 inches tall when the mean height for a UK male is 5 foot 9 inches.

SDC Tree Officer has commented stating no comment.

Group Planning Manager Comments

Supplementary Information

The issues raised by the local resident and applicant above relating to the visual impact of the proposal are appraised in paragraphs 26 – 36 of the report.

The issues raised in relation to the drive way are no longer material to the consideration of this application, as, as stated above the applicant has confirmed that they wish to remove the access and driveway from the description and apply for a Lawful Development Certificate for these proposed works in due course.

Recommendation

That permission be refused, as per the main papers.

Inter alia

Item 4.2 SE/12/00875/FUL Little Grange, Duncans Yard, Fullers Hill, Westerham TN16 1AD

A further neighbour representation has been received. In summary the neighbour is concerned on the possible impact of construction vehicles to using access to the site from Grange Close that may cause damage to private property.

As per the papers, this issue relating to access and method of construction has already been discussed as cited at paragraph 63. By the imposition of a construction method condition, will allow the applicant to consider how access/egress can be established, loading/unloading of materials, parking of plant and construction vehicles in a safe and appropriate manner. Such a condition is considered to be appropriate and reasonable to mitigate against issues arising from the impact of construction upon the amenity of the area.

Recommendation

That permission be granted, as per the main papers.

Items 4.3 & 4.4- SE/12/01529/FUL & SE/12/015320/CAC Cavendish House, Clenches Farm Road, Sevenoaks TN13 2LU &

Update to report for Cavendish House SE/12/01529/FUL & SE/12/01530/CAC

For clarification

Paragraph 138 of the NPPF states that

Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

Given that the property is actively identified within the Kippington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPD as 'contributing to character', it is considered that the

demolition of the property would constitute substantial harm and therefore paragraph 134 is appropriate.

Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that:

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- *the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- *no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- *conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

In this instance, whilst it is suggested that there are some structural issues with the existing property, the proposal does not comply with the above criteria.

Officer's Recommendation

The Officer's Recommendation remains unchanged, other than stated above.

This page is intentionally left blank