



Late Observations Sheet
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
24 May 2012 at 7.00 pm

Late Observations

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

24 MAY 2012

LATE OBSERVATION SHEET

Item 5.02 SE/12/00467/FUL Finchcocks, 5 Wildernesse Mount, Sevenoaks

Alteration to recommendation

An acceptable legal agreement has been provided with regards to a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision.

Therefore, Recommendation B is no longer required.

Item 5.04 SE/12/00444/FUL Woodland Chase, Blackhall Lane, Sevenoaks

I would advise Members that the S106 agreement securing the Affordable Housing contribution has been completed.

Recommendation – My recommendation to approve the application remains unchanged.

Item 5.03 SE/12/00379/VAR106 East Wing Paddock, East Wing, Knotley Hall, Tonbridge Road, Chiddingstone Causeway

Alteration to recommendation

That 'planning permission be refused for the following reason' is changed to:

That *variation of a S106 agreement is refused* for the following reason:

Officer's Recommendation

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

Item 5.05 SE/11/03230/FUL Bucklers, The Coppice, Bitchet Green

Representations

The report states that 5 letters of objection have been received. In fact 4 letters were received at the time of writing the report (1 letter had been duplicated), and 1 of these letters did not raise objection to the proposal. As such, I would confirm that 3 letters of objection have been received in response to the application.

Since the report was written, a letter from a local resident in support of the proposal has been received, stating the following:

Supplementary Information

- I would prefer to see a new dwelling such as this in preference to the existing dwelling being retained and extended
- The new dwelling will be unobtrusive with virtually no impact on its surroundings, and less obtrusive than the alternative

Conditions

Under normal circumstances, when dealing with applications for replacement dwellings it is common practice to impose a condition requiring existing buildings to be demolished. In this instance it is noted that the replacement dwelling would be built partially on the footprint of the existing dwelling and outbuilding. However to avoid any uncertainty and the possibility that part of an existing building could be retained on the site, I would recommend the following condition be added –

12) Within one month from first occupation or completion of the replacement dwelling hereby permitted (whichever is sooner), all existing buildings within the application site as shown on the submitted plans shall be demolished in their entirety and all resultant material shall be removed from the site.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and to control the extent of built form on site in order to protect the character, maintenance and functioning of the Metropolitan Green Belt, as supported by Policy H13 of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: My recommendation remains to approve the application, with the above additional condition.

Item 5.11 SE/12/01251/ARGNOT Winkhurst Grainstore, Faulkners Hill Farm, Ide Hill

Sundridge and Ide Hill Parish Council have sent in a response to the application stating that they raise no objection. However they have made further comment stating:

“Although the Parish Council do not wish to object as it is an agricultural site, they would like to comment that the size and scale is too big for the area and would be intrusive to the neighbouring property”

Officer Comment

It is duly noted that the Parish Council do not raise objection to this proposal. Members are reminded that this is an agricultural prior notification proposal whereby the development accords to Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995. As stated in the main papers the Agricultural Advisor does not raise an objection in terms of its size nor scale. The reasoning for its design is that it responds to its function for the use of storage of bulky materials, agricultural machinery/vehicles. In terms of its scale and form, it is considered that the building is sympathetic to the adjacent buildings and is not materially different to the building that was previously approved.

Members are advised that this proposal is approximately 60m² smaller when compared to the previously approved scheme under reference SE/09/01822.

Recommendation

That prior approval is not required, as per the main papers.