

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2013 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr. Williamson (Chairman)

Cllr. Miss. Thornton (Vice-Chairman)

Cllrs. Brookbank, Brown, Clark, Mrs. Davison, Dickins, Gaywood, McGarvey, Mrs. Parkin, Piper, Miss. Stack and Underwood

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Mrs. Ayres, Cooke, Orridge and Walshe

Cllrs. Mrs. Bracken and London were also present.

10. Minutes

It was accepted that apologies from Cllr. Mrs. Ayres would be added to the minutes. Under minute item 5 the name of the public speaker was corrected to Robert Wickham.

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 23 May 2013, as amended, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

11. Declarations of Interest or Predetermination

There were no declarations of interest or predetermination.

12. Declarations of Lobbying

Cllr. McGarvey declared that he had been lobbied in respect of item 4.2
SE/13/00135/FUL - Land to the rear of Alandene, Till Avenue, Farningham DA4 OBH.

The Committee declared that they had been lobbied in respect of item 4.4
SE/13/00139/HOUSE - 10 Springshaw Close, Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 2QE, which had previously been considered by the Committee.

Reserved Planning Applications

The Committee considered the following planning applications:

13. SE/13/00360/HOUSE - Moorcroft Place, Mapleton Road, Westerham TN16 1PS

The report concerned a retrospective application for permission to erect a 2.2m high metal fence, running 290m across site, and 8 CCTV cameras on posts ranging between 3.5m and 7.5m in height. There were small openings at ground level to enable wildlife to pass through at 5m intervals. The applicant proposed to plant a mixed native hedge on the outer side of the fence to screen it. The 4 CCTV cameras not in ancient woodland would be planted with western redcedar.

Development Control Committee - 13 June 2013

The site was situated in an area of archaeological potential, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Metropolitan Green Belt. Part of the site was ancient woodland. It was adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and 2 public rights of way.

Officers considered that the proposed development represented inappropriate development within the Green Belt however the fence did not materially undermine the openness of the Green Belt and the security measures represented very special circumstances that clearly outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Against the Application: | - |
| For the Application: | - |
| Parish Representative: | Cllr. Le Breton |
| Local Member: | Cllr. Mrs. Bracken |

In response to a question Officers confirmed the site extended 600m by 520m. The only point at which the metal fence was clearly visible from the footpath was at the southern intersect with the close boarded fence. It was possible that those using the footpath to the south of the site could be monitored by CCTV. Officers had not been supplied information on the specification of the CCTV, for example on whether it was static or where it pointed, but he confirmed the CCTV would be used once the alarm was triggered.

It was MOVED by the Chairman and was duly seconded that the recommendation in the report, as amended by the Late Observations Sheet, to grant permission subject to conditions be adopted.

It was suggested that the case for very special circumstances had not been made out. It was a low crime area, Chartwell next door had not been targeted and there was no greater reason to fear crime on that site than many other sites within the district. Such development was inappropriate in the Green Belt and it was not in the right setting.

It was noted there was some further explanation about the justification of very special circumstances in the Design and Access Statement, though much was confidential.

It was moved and duly seconded that the report be deferred to a future meeting so that the Officers may consider the Design and Access Statement further and provide Members with greater information from the applicant regarding the very special circumstances as to why the development should be allowed in the Green Belt in this case.

The motion was put to the vote and there voted –

8 votes in favour of the motion

4 votes against the motion

Resolved: That the report be deferred to a future meeting so that the Officers may consider the Design and Access Statement further and also provide Members with

Development Control Committee - 13 June 2013

greater information from the applicant regarding the very special circumstances as to why the development should be allowed in the Green Belt in this case. .

The meeting clarified that Officers should also seek further information on the CCTV cameras including the splay across public rights of way. A Member also requested more information on the security lights.

14. SE/13/00135/FUL - Land to the rear of Alandene, Till Avenue, Farningham DA4 OBH

The proposal was for the erection of a detached 2-bedroom bungalow with provision for two off street parking spaces and a refuse storage area to the front. The site currently formed part of the residential curtilage of Alandene.

The report advised that in July 2012 planning permission had been refused for a different 2-bedroom bungalow with new access. On balance the combination of revisions since then had overcome the reasons for refusal.

A Late Observations sheet had been tabled for the item. It was noted that a Members' Site Inspection had been held for this application. There were no public speakers.

It was MOVED by the Chairman and was duly seconded that the recommendation in the report, as amended by the Late Observations Sheet, to grant permission subject to conditions be adopted.

The local Member noted the comments of the Parish Council.

Members felt the application still had a detrimental effect on the residential amenity of future residents of Alandene. Although the total residential amenity area looked acceptable, the space was distributed and in an awkward shape.

It was suggested the proposal would be more prominent than the previously refused application, despite its smaller footprint, because of the increased height.

The access route was criticised, particularly as it would be serving as many as 8 properties. The turn onto the A225 could be difficult. The track was so narrow that vehicles could not pass each other.

Some Members considered the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the site, it would create a terracing effect and it would take the last of the open spaces on that road.

The motion was put to the vote and there voted –

4 votes in favour of the motion

8 votes against the motion

The Chairman declared the vote to have been LOST. It was MOVED by Cllr. McGarvey and was duly seconded that permission be refused. This would be on grounds of: loss of residential amenity to neighbours; lack of residential amenities to the site itself; the bulk,

Development Control Committee - 13 June 2013

height, scale of the building, as defined by the height of the dwelling, the infilling and terracing effect; and that the proposal would harm the distinctive character of the area.

It was agreed that the highway concerns, in particular the suitability of extra traffic using the junction with the A225, would be added for information. The local Member was aware that the Highways Authority had provided incorrect data concerning the number of properties served by the track and recalled accidents at the site to which Kent County Council had not referred.

The motion was put to the vote and it was –

Resolved: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site by virtue of its, size, bulk and roof height and would appear a cramped form of development, out of character with the established pattern of development in the locality. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Plan and SP1 of the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.
2. The proposal would not ensure a satisfactory environment for future occupants in terms of amenity space contrary to policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Plan and SP1 of the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.
3. As a result of the application proposal, the neighbouring property Alandene would appear as a cramped form of development within an insufficient plot and would not benefit from a satisfactory environment for future occupants in terms of amenity space. It would therefore be out of keeping with the established pattern of development in the locality contrary to policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Plan and SP1 of the Sevenoaks Core Strategy.

Informative:

Whilst Kent Highway Services raised no objection to the development as a Statutory Consultee, the Development Control Planning Committee and local members, due to their local knowledge of vehicular movements and highway issues in the area were concerned in regard to highway safety and the impact of the increase in traffic this development would cause using this narrow access onto the busy Eynsford Road (A225).

15. SE/13/00628/HOUSE - White Gables, High Street, Farningham, Dartford DA4 0DB

This item had been WITHDRAWN.

16. SE/13/00139/HOUSE - 10 Springshaw Close, Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 2QE

The proposal was for the erection of a two-storey side extension and ground floor front extension. There would be minor changes to windows on the ground floor.

The Committee was reminded that the matter was previously considered by them at its meeting on 23 May 2013. Officers had brought the matter back to the Committee following concerns that Members may have been misled. Although the development was

Development Control Committee - 13 June 2013

0.15m closer to the boundary than the permission granted in 2008 (and renewed in 2011), this was only because of the single-storey front element. The two-storey element was no closer to the boundary than what was previously approved.

Officers sought clarification from the Committee as to their reasons for refusal. Officers had therefore recommended that the refusal be reconfirmed without the first reason which concerned the terracing effect.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Against the Application: | Barry Cornell |
| For the Application: | Andy Hollins |
| Parish Representative: | - |
| Local Member: | - |

In response to a question Officers confirmed that the eaves as constructed were smaller than those approved under the extant permission.

It was MOVED by the Chairman and was duly seconded that the recommendation in the report to refuse permission be adopted.

An amendment was proposed by Cllr. Miss. Thornton the first reason for refusal be reinstated with the clarification that it was the single-storey front extension which was creating the additional impact on the terracing effect. She felt that there had been no confusion at the previous meeting. This amendment was duly seconded.

The amendments was put to the vote and it was AGREED.

The motion was put to the vote and it was -

Resolved: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed single-story front development by virtue of its height, design and proximity to the boundary would create a terracing effect between properties, which would have a detrimental impact on the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to the advice in The Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks Local Plan.
2. The proposed single storey front extension, by virtue of its height, bulk and proximity to the neighbouring property would have a detrimental impact on the outlook and residential amenity of the neighbouring property by way of loss of light and perception of overbearance. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks Local Plan.

Cllrs. Dickins, Gaywood and Underwood abstained from the vote as they had not been present when the matter was previously considered by the Committee.

THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 8.35 AM

CHAIRMAN

