

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2014 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr. Williamson (Chairman)

Cllrs. Mrs. Ayres, Brookbank, Clark, Cooke, Mrs. Davison, Mrs. Dawson, Edwards-Winsor, Gaywood, McGarvey, Orridge, Mrs. Parkin, Piper, Miss. Stack and Underwood

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Brown, Dickins, Miss. Thornton and Walshe

Cllrs. Mrs. Cook, Firth, Grint, Ayres and Bosley were also present.

### 103. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 7 January 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 104. Declarations of Interest or Predetermination

There were none.

### 105. Declarations of Lobbying

All Members of the Committee declared that they had been lobbied in respect of Minute 107, SE/13/03178/FUL - Land North of Oak Tree Farm, London Road, Badgers Mount, Halstead TN14 7AB.

All Members of the Committee except for Cllr. Piper also declared that they had been lobbied in respect of Minute 108, SE/13/03353/FUL - Watercrofts Wood, Old London Road, Badgers Mount, Kent.

### Reserved Planning Applications

The Committee considered the following planning applications:

### 106. SE/13/03178/FUL - Land North of Oak Tree Farm, London Road, Badgers Mount, Halstead TN14 7AB

The Legal Services Manager directed Members of the Committee to the Late Observations sheet. The Officer's recommendation for SE/13/03178/FUL - Land North of Oak Tree Farm, London Road, Badgers Mount, Halstead TN14 7AB and SE/13/03353/FUL - Watercrofts Wood, Old London Road, Badgers Mount, Kent had changed. The recommendation was now that the items be deferred without debate.

In each case Planning Obligations had been submitted with enhanced planning benefits but these had been submitted only shortly before the meeting. Each represented a

## Development Control Committee - 30 January 2014

material change to the merits of the case and deferral was recommended to allow Officers to discuss and clarify the terms of the proposed Planning Obligations. The Legal Services Manager strongly recommended deferral without debate.

Officers responded to Members questions. Officers advised the Committee that they would not have the full information before them to consider the impact on the Greenbelt, landscape issues or woodland (in the case of Watercrofts Wood only). Following concerns raised, Officers suggested that the applications be reported back to the Committee no later than the meeting scheduled on 27 March 2014. Members were unhappy that information had been submitted at such a late stage.

A Member enquired whether, if deferred, the applicants would appeal for non-determination. The agent on Land North of Oak Tree Farm confirmed the applicants would not appeal for non-determination. The agent on Watercrofts Wood stated the applicant had no intention to appeal for non-determination. Both agents were content for the applications to be deferred.

It was moved that each application be deferred to allow Officers to discuss and clarify the terms of the proposed Legal Agreement and report back to the Committee no later than the meeting scheduled on 27 March 2014.

The motion was put to the vote and there voted –

10 votes in favour of the motion

3 votes against the motion

Resolved: That consideration of planning applications SE/13/03178/FUL - Land North of Oak Tree Farm, London Road, Badgers Mount, Halstead TN14 7AB and SE/13/03353/FUL - Watercrofts Wood, Old London Road, Badgers Mount, Kent be deferred to allow Officers to discuss and clarify the terms of the proposed Planning Obligations. The applications to be reported back to the Committee no later than the meeting of the Committee scheduled on 27 March 2014.

107. SE/13/03353/FUL - Watercrofts Wood, Old London Road, Badgers Mount, Kent

This was considered at Minute 106.

108. SE/13/03085/FUL - Oak Tree Cottage , Powder Mill Lane, Leigh, Tonbridge TN11 8QD

The proposal was for the demolition of the existing two-storey dwelling, and erection of two detached dwellings with a joint access. There would be hardstanding to the front and a 0.6m high garden fence and hedge on the front boundary.

The site was within the rural settlement confines of Leigh and the Leigh Conservation Area abutted the north-west corner of the site. The existing dwelling was situated to the east of the plot leaving the amenity space to the west.

Officers considered that the proposal was in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no other material considerations to justify refusing permission.

## Development Control Committee - 30 January 2014

Members' attention was drawn to the tabled Late Observations sheet. It was noted that a Members' Site Inspection had been held for this application.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

Against the Application:	-
For the Application:	Rob Ranson
Parish Representative:	Cllr. Doherty
Local Member:	Cllr. Mrs. Cook

The local Member confirmed to the Committee that the local housing need was for small family houses.

In response to a question Officers confirmed that the housing density of the development at 37 dwellings per hectare (dph) was higher than Garden Cottages to the south (at 33.3dph). It also exceeded the figure in Core Strategy Policy SP7 of 30 dph and the figure in the draft Allocations and Development management Plan for the former GSK site of 25 dph.

Officers had not tested the ability for vehicles to enter and exit the proposed development in forward gear by turning on site. The applicant's agent confirmed that each plot accommodated 2 larger Kent County Council compliant spaces and the intention was that vehicles could turn by reversing into the hardstanding in front of the other dwelling. Some Members were concerned the size of the proposed dwellings meant the occupants may have more than 2 cars each. Additional cars could cause further congestion on Powder Mill Lane.

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

Members considered the development to be too large. Although there was potential for development on site, it would need to be much smaller. The amenity space for each plot would be unacceptably small if children lived there.

Some Members were concerned that the proposal was not in keeping with the Leigh Village Design Statement and that more weight should have been given to it. They would be the only dwellings in the area which would appear as 3-story buildings. The proposal also failed to respond to the distinctive local character of the area and was not compatible in scale, height, density and site coverage with other buildings in the locality.

The street was characterised by spacious plots. The development would be cramped and overdevelopment.

The motion was amended to include an additional condition that the parking spaces to the front of the proposed dwellings be marked and used for that purpose for perpetuity and for the cars to be able to leave in forward gear.

A Member noted that there were some other properties in the locality with hard surfaces to the front of the dwelling and that there was a mixture of building types in Leigh.

## **Development Control Committee - 30 January 2014**

The motion, as amended, was put to the vote and it was LOST.

It was moved by Cllr. Miss. Stack and was duly seconded that planning permission be refused. This was on grounds of conflict with Saved Policy EN1 due to the bulk, height, the urbanising effect and form of the development of the plot. The development would appear out of character with the village street scene contrary to Core Strategy Policy SP1 and the Leigh Village Design Statement.

Members added that the overdevelopment of the site meant that the rear of the properties would have inadequate residential amenities for future occupants.

The motion was put to the vote and there voted –

12 votes in favour of the motion

2 votes against the motion

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

The proposal due to its bulk, height and form would result in an over development of the plot contrary to Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Local Plan and the development would also appear out of character with the village street scene and is contrary to Sevenoaks District Core Strategy Policies LO7, SP1 and SP7 and the Leigh Village Design Statement.

THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 8.30 PM

CHAIRMAN