

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2014 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr. Williamson (Chairman)

Cllr. Miss. Thornton

Cllrs. Mrs. Ayres, Brown, Clark, Cooke, Mrs. Davison, Dickins, Edwards-Winsler, Gaywood, Orridge, Mrs. Parkin, Piper, Miss. Stack and Walshe

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Brookbank, Mrs. Dawson, McGarvey and Underwood

Cllrs. Ayres, Fleming and Raikes were also present.

117. Declarations of Interest or Predetermination

There were none.

118. Declarations of Lobbying

All Members of the Committee declared that they had been lobbied in respect of Minute 119, SE/13/03559/HOUSE - 51a Mount Harry Road, Sevenoaks TN13 3jn; and Minute 121, SE/13/03017/HOUSE - 5 Woodside Road, Sundridge, Sevenoaks TN14 6DN.

All Members of the Committee except for Cllr. Piper declared that they had been lobbied in respect of Minute 120, SE/13/03357/FUL - Hillway, Pilgrims Way East, Otford, Sevenoaks TN14 5RX.

Reserved Planning Applications

The Committee considered the following planning applications:

117. SE/13/03559/HOUSE - 51A Mount Harry Road, Sevenoaks TN13 3JN

The application sought permission for demolition of garage and erection of part single storey, part two storey side extension. A loft conversion, involving raising the roof height of the property, with skylights at the front and dormer windows at the rear and replacement of the existing porch with a larger one. The application had been referred to Committee at the request of Councillor Raikes on the grounds that the extensions would lead to a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and concerns over the bulk of the proposal.

Members' attention was brought to the late observations sheet which proposed to delete Condition 7.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

Development Control Committee - 5 March 2014

Against the Application: Geoffrey Ockenden
For the Application: Sean Edwards
Parish Representative: Cllr. Raikes
Local Member: Cllr. Fleming

Members asked questions of clarification from the Speakers and Officers. The health of the current screening of Leylandii was raised as a possible issue. Officers advised that maintenance and height could not be conditioned as the Leylandii were in a neighbour's garden. Officers further advised that the suggested soft landscaping scheme could be bolstered. Officers clarified that the question of overlooking had not been a ground of refusal previously. However the Planning Inspector was likely to have considered overlooking in assessing the appeal, but did not cite this in his decision letter.

It was moved by the Chairman and duly seconded that the recommendation in the report to grant permission subject to conditions, be agreed.

It was acknowledged that the application was an improvement but some Members were still concerned by the impact of, the size and the need for the dormer windows to the rear which gave the impression of an additional floor, were overlooking the neighbouring properties and would impact on street scene. They were also concerned by the detailing of the soft landscaping and maintenance of future screening. The proposed development was considered to be an unneighbourly proposal despite being of reduced scale. There was still the fundamental issue of impact on the street scene as with the previous application. Members debated the possibility of adding more obscured glazing to the rear to mitigate impact and overlooking of neighbours by the rear dormers.

It was moved by the Chairman and duly seconded, that the first line of Condition 8 be amended to read 'and in agreement with the local Members,' and that the dormer windows for the landing be obscured glaze.

The motion including the above amendment was put to the vote and was lost.

It was moved by the Chairman and duly seconded that the application be refused on the same grounds as previously and that as the loft and roof space extension would extend above the existing ridge giving the appearance of another floor this would not comply with policy H6B and would be in contravention of NPPF paragraph 66.

The motion was put to the vote and it was

Resolved: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons

- 1) the proposed extension would appear cramped on this relatively restricted plot. The extended dwelling would form an incongruous feature that would erode the spaciousness of the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area contrary to Sevenoaks District Core Strategy Policy SP1, Sevenoaks District Local Plan Policy EN1, the Sevenoaks Residential Extension Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework;
- 2) due to the increase in built form and height as a result of the proposal along the boundary between the two properties (the site and No.49 Mount Harry

Development Control Committee - 5 March 2014

Road) the proposal is unacceptable as the development would have an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the private amenity space of the neighbouring property (No.49) and is therefore contrary to Policies EN1 and H6B of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan, the Sevenoaks Residential Extension Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework; and

- 3) the proposed increase in the height of the roof and insertion of dormers on the rear elevation will result in loss of privacy to Hawthornes and an unneighbourly form of development. As such the proposal is contrary to policies EN1 & H6B of the Sevenoaks Local Plan, SP1 of the Sevenoaks Core Strategy, the Sevenoaks Residential Extension Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

118. SE/13/03557/FUL - Hillway, Pilgrims Way East, Otford, Sevenoaks TN14 5RX

The application sought permission for the demolition of existing house and erection of new replacement dwelling. This application was referred to Development Control Committee by Councillor Edwards-Winsor on the grounds that: In comparison to the previously refused scheme approximately 20-30% of the roof has now disappeared and presumably a similar decrease in habitable floor area would occur as a result; if the floor areas of the existing Hillway, the already approved replacement, the recently refused application and this current application are compared, then it is fairly obvious that the habitable floor areas have been reduced each time, as has the visual impact - which is the main reason that OPC, the Village Society and many other residents welcome the efforts of the developer to reduce the impact and improve the openness of the MGB.

Members' attention was brought to the late observations sheet which did not propose any amendments or changes to the recommendations before the Committee.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

Against the Application:	-
For the Application:	Vic Drake
Parish Representative:	Martin Whitehead
Local Member:	Submission by Cllr Ms Lowe read by Cllr Miss Thornton

Members asked questions of clarification from the Speakers and Officers. Officers clarified that the over sailing was a built structure which created floorspace and would have an impact. It was a usable space even with a slatted roof and would be built in order to create the terraced area above.

It was moved by the Chairman and duly seconded that the recommendation in the report to refuse permission, be agreed.

Members noted that the application was materially larger than the application already approved. However some Members preferred the visual impact of the application over the already agreed one, despite this fact.

Development Control Committee - 5 March 2014

The motion was put to the vote and it was lost.

It was moved by the Vice Chairman and duly seconded that planning permission be granted in light of the special circumstances and the preferred impact of this design subject to no fenestrations in the subterranean/basement level; the removal of permitted development rights; and final wording of the conditions to be delegated to the case officer in consultation with the local members.

The motion was put to the vote and it was

Resolved: That planning permission be granted, and that the final wording of the conditions be delegated to the Case Officer in consultation with the Local Members to include conditions for removal of permitted development rights for alterations, openings and extensions, and removal of existing dwelling and protection of trees.

(Cllr. Mrs. Davison requested that her vote against this decision be recorded.)

119. SE/13/03017/HOUSE - 5 Woodside Road, Sundridge, Sevenoaks TN14 6DN

The application sought permission for erection of a part single storey side and two storey side/rear and single storey rear extension together with rear loft dormer. It had has been referred by Councillor Piper due to concerns about the size and bulk, overdevelopment, the impact on this pair of dwellings and on parking.

Members' attention was brought to the late observations sheet which did not propose any amendments or changes to the recommendations before the Committee.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

Against the Application:	-
For the Application:	Melissa De Vere-Loots
Parish Representative:	Michael Stokes
Local Member:	-

Members asked questions of clarification from the Speakers and Officers.

It was moved by the Chairman and duly seconded that the recommendation in the report to grant permission subject to conditions, be agreed. The Local Member speaking from the floor advised of his concerns with regards to size, bulk and parking issues. The Case Officer advised that the width space for parking beside the house was 2.9 m where the requirement was only 2.7 m.

The motion was put to the vote and it was

Resolved: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Development Control Committee - 5 March 2014

In pursuance of section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

To ensure that the appearance of the development is in harmony with the existing character of the house as supported by Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan.

- 3) No development shall take place until details of the layout and construction of areas for the parking of cars including garage spaces and means of access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The parking areas approved shall be provided and kept available for parking in connection with the use hereby permitted at all times.

To ensure a permanent retention of vehicle parking for the property as supported by EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan.

- 4) No window(s) or other opening(s) shall be inserted at any time in the first floor west and east flank elevation(s) of the 2 storey side extension hereby approved, despite the provisions of any Development Order.

To safeguard the privacy of residents as supported by Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan.

- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: MP003 and MP003 rev 04 A.

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 9.37 PM

CHAIRMAN

