



**Late Observations Sheet  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE  
23 July 2020 at 3.00 pm**

This page is intentionally left blank

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Thursday 23 July 2020

**LATE OBSERVATION SHEET**

**4.1 17/02594/FUL - 5 - 13 Lime Tree Walk Sevenoaks**

**Comments:**

1.1 Five additional representations have been received, including one representing multiple addresses. Some of these addresses have already provided comments. The objections highlight that a number of properties are rented or housing association and as such, owners of properties may not be aware of the proposal. Objections focus on:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Overbearing and dominating impact on outlook;
- Visual intrusion;
- Increase in noise and disturbance;
- Car parking and vehicle access;
- Loss of light/sunlight;
- Density;
- Lack of outside space;
- Impact on nesting birds;
- Impact on the character of the area, in particular the Conservation Area;
- Impact on the adjoining heritage assets (locally listed and statutorily listed buildings);
- Development would be too large and awkward building site;
- Birds are present on site.

These matters are addressed within the main body of the report.

1.2 Concern with regard to the consultation taking place during Covid-19 has also been reiterated.

1.3 Member's attention is drawn to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Officers Report. The paragraphs should read as:

“10 Block C would contain 3 flats comprised of: 2 two bed units and 1 three bed unit, with car parking at ground floor”.

“11 Block D would contain 4 flats comprised of 4 two bed units, with parking at ground floor”.

### 4.2 20/00847/LDCEX - Land Rear Of Little Buckhurst Barn Hever Lane Hever

Amendments to phrasing in some paragraphs of the report. Amendments are underlined for ease of reference.

Amend Paragraph 55 to read:

A Statutory Declaration has been submitted by Mr N Burke and Dr J Burke. This states that they have not met the applicant's at their property and that when they had concerns about the existing tenants in the main house at Little Buckhurst Barn in 2017 the applicants were not available to resolve the issue. It states that they received a request in January 2018 to install a broadband antenna onto their house to assist with a broadband connection to the stables. Again, whilst this is a Statutory Declaration, it holds limited weight in this case as it is not sufficient enough to show that on the balance of probability the use of the building located at the rear Of Little Buckhurst Barn was not being used as a separate residential dwelling.

Amend Paragraph 56 to read:

A Statutory Declaration has been submitted by Dr N A Brummitt and Dr A C Araujo. This states that they moved to their address in April 2012 and had no knowledge or contact with the applicants whom claim to have been in residence. They state that they met the applicants in July 2018 at Hever Golf Club at a party and that the applicant Mr R Barnett stated that he would not be seen at the property as he lived in London and only occasionally came to use the property for business purposes. They also explain that they had never seen them at Hever Railway station in the morning or evening commuting from the application property. They also reference anti-social behaviour from existing tenants at Little Buckhurst Barn and having problems being able to arrange to meet or contact the owners of the property (the applicants) as they did not live in the area. They state that they have only recently seen them in partial residence since 2019. Whilst this is a Statutory Declaration, and provides evidence that at certain time periods the applicants may have been in London and not necessarily contactable, it holds limited weight in this case as it is not sufficient enough to show that on the balance of probability the use of the building located at the rear Of Little Buckhurst Barn was not being used as a separate residential dwelling.

Amend Paragraph 57 to read:

Mr D M and Mrs W S Shapland have submitted a Statutory Declaration which states that they live directly next door to the application site and met the applicants in early 2012. They claim that they spoke to the applicants at the time and were advised by them that they would be moving back to London.

They also state that the applicant Mr Russell Barnett started building works at the stables in late 2014 and he spoke to them at this time to explain that he was doing building work to use the building as an office and storage space. They also state that they did hear Mr Barnett 'occasionally' at the property 'when he would cut the grass or ride his quadbike on the land'. They go on to explain that Little Buckhurst Barn (the main house) was rented out to tenants Marcus Winter and Mark Carter in the middle of 2015 whom they did meet. They explain that they had some concerns about their animals roaming around and had to contact the applicant Mr Barnett to discuss this matter. They state that they had trouble meeting them as they had to come from London. They then state that in 2017 the tenants moved out and that the applicants were then seen more frequently at Little Buckhurst Barn. They also state that if the applicants had been living in the area they would have realised that the tenants were not looking after the property and causing issues. This does to some extent corroborate the applicant's evidence that the main house at Little Buckhurst Barn was indeed being rented out to tenants and was subject to significant damage and needed complete refurbishment. It is not however sufficient enough to show that on the balance of probability the use of the building located at the rear Of Little Buckhurst Barn was not being used as a separate residential dwelling by the applicants during this time even if they were commuting or spending some time in London.

Amend Paragraph 60 to read:

With regards to the Declarations made by Mr and Mrs Cowell and John Adkins, whilst the applicants may or may not have owned a property in London and may have made verbal statements in 2018, it does not provide any further detailed evidence that the building at the rear of Little Buckhurst Barn was not an established residential use and the sworn Statutory Declarations are not sufficient enough to show that on the balance of probabilities the building was not being used as a separate residential dwelling.

This page is intentionally left blank