



Late Observations Sheet
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
18 December 2014 at 7.00 pm

Late Observations

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

18 December 2014

LATE OBSERVATION SHEET

4.1 SE/14/02527/OUT – Former Unigate Dairies Ltd and Devonia, Main Road, Edenbridge TN8 6HZ

Further Representations

Two further letters have been received from local residents. Both had previously submitted comments on the development. One resident has sought confirmation that his comments will be considered by the Planning Committee. Another resident has invited Members to view the proposal from their property, should a Members site visit be arranged.

I can confirm that the objections received from local residents have been summarised in my main report. Members will also be aware that they have the opportunity to view all representations in full on the Council's website prior to committee.

I can also confirm that a site meeting was held this morning and that this included a visit to the neighbouring property to view the development.

Archaeology

The site is in an Area of Archaeological Potential and as such a watching brief condition should be applied.

Parking

Kent Highways have clarified that the development would accommodate sufficient parking for each unit, plus one visitor parking space. The Kent parking standards, if applied strictly, would require 1.4 visitor spaces, however no objection is raised by Kent Highways over the shortfall of 0.4 spaces.

Notwithstanding this, if Members remain concerned about car parking, then they should note that the parking standards allow for a reduction in visitor parking spaces where main provision is not allocated. Therefore Members may wish to consider whether a condition would be reasonable and necessary to require some or all of the parking spaces to be unallocated.

Recommendation

My recommendation remains unchanged, although I would recommend that the following condition is added –

18) No development shall be carried out on the land until the applicant, or their agents or successor in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

Agenda Item

Reason: To investigate and record archaeological features as supported by Policy EN25A of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan.

4.2 SE/14/02630/FUL – 1 & 2 Cross Cottages, Valley Road, Fawkham DA3 8LX

For clarification purposes the table below sets out the difference in floor area between the existing dwelling, existing residential outbuildings (garage and workshop) and former agricultural buildings (stable and pig sty) and the proposed dwellings.

	Existing dwellings vs. proposed dwellings	Existing dwellings and residential outbuildings vs. proposed dwellings	Existing dwellings, residential outbuildings and former agricultural buildings vs. proposed dwellings
Floor area (GIA) (sqm)	+226.6 (+77%)	+127.86 (+32.5%)	-26.26 (-4.8%)

As set out in paragraphs 43 and 49 of the committee report, for proposed development to be considered appropriate under the NPPF, the replacement buildings must not be materially larger and must be in the same use as the existing or must constitute previously developed land. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 43 and 54 of the committee report, the existing buildings are not all in the same use as the proposed buildings and the site does not constitute previously developed land. The development is therefore inappropriate.

The fact that the proposed floor area would represent a 4.8% reduction in total floor area on the site falls to be considered under any very special circumstances and for the reasons set out in paragraph 78 of the committee report would not outweigh the substantial harm identified.

No amendments or changes to the recommendation to refuse planning permission are proposed in light of the above.

4.3 SE/14/02526/FUL – 16 Egerton Avenue, Hextable BR8 7LQ

One letter of objection has been received since the publication of the committee report. The objection is summarised below:

- Overshadowing of garden;
- Loss of light to kitchen;
- Increase in parking demand and congestion;
- Implication of demolition of garage on adjoining (attached) garage.

The committee report contains an assessment of the potential impact of the proposed development on the residential amenities of 2 New Road, and by reason of the separation distances and orientation it has been found that the development would not be harmful.

It is also noted that an extant planning permission (reference 13/02622/HOUSE) exists for a two storey side extension to 16 Egerton Avenue. The proposed development would be the

same width as the approved extension (4.2m) and 1m deeper (incorporating 0.5m set backs from the front and rear building lines as opposed to the 1m set backs previously approved). The eaves height of the proposed development would match the eaves height of the approved extension; however the ridge would be 0.55m higher and set 0.35m below the ridge height of the existing building. The proposed development would have no materially greater impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining property than the extant planning permission.

Subject to appropriate conditions the development would provide adequate off-street parking in compliance with relevant policies and guidance.

Concerns regarding the implications of the demolition of the existing garage on the attached garage (within the curtilage of 2 New Road) is not a material planning consideration but would be subject to relevant building regulations.

Further to a Member request, the table below sets out the existing and proposed plot sizes.

	Existing plot area (16 Egerton Avenue)	Proposed plot area (retained 16 Egerton Avenue)	Proposed plot area (new plot)
Plot size (sqm)	352sqm	164sqm	188sqm

The drawing below shows the proposed and retained plots within the context of surrounding plots of land. Although the retained and proposed plots would be smaller than surrounding plots the area is characterised by a variety of plot sizes and frontage widths. It is considered that the proposed development would make efficient use of the land without compromising the character of the area.

No amendments or changes to the recommendation to grant planning permission subject to conditions are proposed in light of the above.

4.4 - SE/14/03165/FUL – Rosebay, 44 Cherry Tree Grove, Knatts Valley, Kent TN15 6YG

Additional information from the applicant following discussion at Chairman's Briefing:

'What percentage decrease in efficiency would occur if the panels were located within the curtilage of the property rather than the proposed siting?'

The agents response was to provide the following,

The Effects of Shading on Solar Photovoltaic Panels

The Problems of Shading on Solar Photovoltaic Panels

Shading can have a huge impact on the performance of your solar photovoltaic panels. It is obvious that the best solution is to avoid shading altogether, but what many people don't realise is that even if a small section of the solar photovoltaic panel is in shade, the performance of the whole solar photovoltaic panel will significantly reduce. This is because solar photovoltaic panels actually consist of a number of solar photovoltaic cells that are

Agenda Item

wired together into a series circuit. This means that when the power output of a single cell is significantly reduced, the power output for the whole series is reduced to the level of current passing through the weakest cell. Therefore, a small amount of shading can significantly reduce the performance of your entire solar photovoltaic panels system.

Another problem that can occur in solar photovoltaic panels due to partial shading is that, because one cell (or group of cells) is generating a significantly smaller amount of power than the rest of the cells in the series, the weaker cell can suffer from thermal stress (i.e. over heating) and thereby reduce the power output of the solar photovoltaic panel even further. ‘