



Late Observations Sheet
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
31 October 2013 at 7.00 pm

Late Observations

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

31 October 2013

LATE OBSERVATION SHEET

Item 4.1 - SE/13/01635/FUL Mill House, Mill Lane, Sevenoaks TN14 5BX

Officer: A signed Unilateral Undertaking has now been completed.

Add recommendation – Add informative

2. Please be aware that this development is also the subject of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Item 4.2 – SE/13/01288/FUL 1 Holly Bush Lane, Sevenoaks TN13 3UJ

For information the density of the proposed development would be 45 dwellings per hectare.

In addition, the footprint of the existing garage is 45m², the footprint of the proposed house would be 69m², the footprint of the refused house was 81.5m² and the footprint of the detached garage at 2 Park Lane is 32.5m².

This information does not alter the overall conclusions and recommendation for approval held within the main papers.

Item 4.3 – SE/12/01665/FUL Stangrove Lodge, Manor House Gardens, Edenbridge TN8 5EG

The planning history of Mont St Aignan Way provides no indication that any restriction has previously be placed on the road preventing new vehicular accesses being created on to the road. The Highways Engineer has also confirmed that the Highways Authority has no knowledge of a restriction on the road.

Members should note that the site plan on page 80 of the agenda is incorrect but correct plans will be shown to the Committee during the officer's presentation.

This information does not alter the overall conclusions and recommendation for approval held within the main papers.

Item 4.5 – SE/13/02654/HOUSE 3 Hollybush Close, Sevenoaks TN13 3XW

Two further letters of objection have been received from the adjacent neighbours since the Committee Report was produced.

1. Number 2 Hollybush Close

Supplementary Information

This raised the same concerns in regards to bulk, that the extension is overbearing and oppressive and that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the amenity in relation to loss of light and privacy, as the neighbours original consultation response 2 October 2013.

2. Number 4 Hollybush Close

A further two submissions have been submitted by the occupiers of Number 4 Hollybush Close both of which stated:

Having considered the revised planning application, we remain of the view that it constitutes a significant enlargement of the existing structure which will adversely impact on both our light and our privacy. Our earlier suggestions apply:

- (i) The new structure should not be extended by more than 3m from the existing structure (i.e. 0.5m less than proposed). We would also prefer the terrace to extend by 3.5m and not the 4m proposed;*
- (ii) We feel very strongly that the proposed roof of the extension should not be gabled, but hipped so as to reduce the bulk of the new structure and to allow more natural light in. Gables have been proposed whilst a superior result could be achieved by having the roof hipped and thus considerably less obtrusive. Note that hipped roofs on the southerly side of the houses at Hollybush Close are to be found at No 1, 5 and 6.*
- (iii) A new (wooden boarding) fence should be erected (at the expense of the owner of No 3) at a height of 2m on our side of the property (and of sufficient length) to ensure adequate privacy from the extended terrace. 4) Suitable landscaping should be provided to ensure privacy.*

The above points will be addressed in turn

- (i) This point was highlighted in the neighbours original representation and is addressed in the main papers;
- (ii) This point was highlighted in the neighbours original representation and the appropriateness and acceptability of the proposed roof profile is addressed in the main papers;
- (iii) The main papers recommend a soft landscaping / screening / boundary treatment condition. Please refer to the main papers.

No further representations have been received.

Site Visit

At the Committee site visit a Councillor queried what the applicant could build under permitted development rights.

It is difficult to assess the available permitted development rights given the topography of the site and that a basement / terrace / balcony is proposed.

However, in principle a 3 metre deep two storey rear extension could be built under permitted development, subject to the following relevant conditions:

- Maximum eaves and ridge height of extension no higher than existing house. If extension is within two metres of a boundary maximum eaves height should be no higher than three metres to be permitted development;

- Roof pitch of extensions higher than one storey to match that of the existing house, as far as is practicable;
- No balconies or verandas are permitted development.

The Officers recommendation remains unchanged

Item 4.7 – SE/13/01825/FUL Land North West of the Mount, The Mount Wood, Sparepenny Lane, Farningham, Dartford DA4 OJH

- Email correspondence has been received by the applicant and Cllr McGarvey which has been copied to all members of the Committee regarding the application.

In addition to the information already contained in the application submission, this correspondence addresses issues relating to the conversion works to the existing Coach House which was granted planning permission in 2011. Below is a summary of the correspondence received:

Cllr McGarvey states that one of the main reasons why he asked to bring this application to committee is to have Members decide on what is permissible here because of the unusual circumstances. These unusual circumstances as referred to by Cllr McGarvey include the granting of planning permission under application reference 11/01468/FUL for the conversion of the existing Coach House. This application included the Alteration & conversion of the ground floor of the detached former Coach House to residential use, in association with alterations to the existing first floor residential annexe above, the application also included the construction of a new detached single storey outbuilding. It is suggested by Cllr McGarvey that at the time the application was submitted the applicants claimed they did not require any storage facilities and concern is therefore raised over the application to provide storage now.

Below is a summary of the applicant's response to the issue raised:

The applicant purchased The Mount in January 2010. Due to concerns relating to security and trespassing, the applicant approached the woodland trust about the purchase of the woodland, in addition to this, the applicant states that the woodland had been completely neglected for 25 years since planting and was clearly in need of maintenance and management. The purchase of the woodland proceeded in November 2010.

The applicant states that:

“such was the overgrown and neglected state of the woodland that it took me a few months to access it and to review its perimeter as it was so overgrown, particularly with bramble. At the beginning I employed contractors to come in on a regular basis for some clearance and the creation of small paths so that we could actually walk around it and through it. This was very expensive and certainly not sustainable for us, hence why we have invested in purchasing second hand equipment ourselves as maintenance needs to be done so regularly. At the moment most of our equipment is stored in the coach house with the largest three pieces of equipment being stored off site. But obviously once we commence works to the coach house this storage will go and we will need further space to house the larger items which are only required for the management of the woodland”.

Supplementary Information

“You will note that planning permission was granted in July 2011 for the conversion of the coach house. The upstairs area already had a long established residential status, but we needed the ground floor to be changed to ancillary residential use so that my parents could come to live with us rather than having to go into a warden home. We have held off from commencing works to the coach house for as long as possible as my parents want to keep their independence for as long as they possibly can, but I know that this will have to commence very shortly as unfortunately my fathers health is deteriorating. Obviously I am hopeful that once the works commence to the coach house I can build the woodland facility so as to move equipment from one area to the other with no further expense of housing off site”.

The applicant states that they did not claim that they did not require storage during the processing of the 2011 application. The applicant states that a small area of storage was required to house children's garden toys, bikes, bbq etc. and this was granted planning permission by way of a small garage totalling 23 sq meters, and that this is solely for personal use by the applicant. The applicant states that this is not large enough for housing equipment for the maintenance of the woodland. Finally the applicant states that *“when applying for the permission for the conversion of the Coach House, at no time did I ever think that we would need to have so much machinery to maintain this area”.*

- In addition to the above, an email has been received from the applicant's agent which includes a plan identifying how the equipment will be stored in the building. A copy of the plan is appended (Appendix 1). In addition to the plan the agent states the following in relation to the application:

“Your rural consultants suggested a larger building may be appropriate, certainly in terms of eaves height and roof. The size of building proposed has been kept to a minimum to meet its functional requirements (as evidenced by the attached plan) whilst respecting its position adjacent to a Conservation Area (heritage asset), the openness of the Green Belt and the landscape value of the AONB. It is not appropriate, given the site specifics, to use lower quality materials (to reduce ridge height) or promote a footprint that simply does not meet functional requirements. There is thus a very defined and justified need (quantative and qualitative) for the size of building proposed.

Notwithstanding the above, I would also refer back to paragraph 89 of the NPPF. This states that buildings for forestry are not inappropriate development and does not refer to any need to assess a building for such purposes in terms of impact on the openness of the Green Belt or indeed against any other issue (unlike, for example, buildings for outdoor sport). The proposed building for forestry purposes thus fully accords with the requirements of the NPPF”.

Group Planning Manager Comments

For clarification, having reviewed the 2011 planning application file the planning statement submitted with the application states the following in relation to the need for general storage facilities:

“The land requires a certain amount of storage space for garden equipment etc due to its size, and it is proposed to concentrate this into a new outbuilding, to allow a more attractive conversion and better use of the coach house as a whole”.

Recommendation

Late Observations
31 October 2013

That permission be granted, as per the main papers.

Appendix 1

