

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON
6th OCTOBER 2005 AT 10.00 a.m. AT THE PAVILION, MANOR FIELD**

Present: Cllr Mr A Barnett
Cllr Mr M Harris
Cllr Mr J Gaywood (Arrived at 10.10p.m.)
Cllr Mr B Ramsay (Chairman)

In attendance: Mrs Gilder (Assistant Clerk)
7 members of the public

Before the start of the meeting, Members of the Committee inspected the application sites SE/05/02123/FUL, Kim Hawk, Gorsewood Road and SE/05/02354/FUL, 41, Springcroft.

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from Cllr Mr L Abraham, Cllr Mr C Alford, Cllr Mrs Y Coutts and Cllr Mrs M Solman.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: That,
the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22nd September 2005 be approved and signed as a correct record.

3. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Mr M Harris declared a personal interest in planning application SE/05/02334/FUL, Orchard-Lea, Church Road as he has been involved in the consultation process, and withdrew from the meeting during discussion and voting on the matter.

Before the Committee considered the planning applications, members of the public were asked by the Chairman whether any of them wished to make representations about any of the applications to be considered by the Committee. If so he would note their request and give them an opportunity to address the Committee at the appropriate time. 3 members of the public expressed a wish to make a representation and this was noted by the Chairman.

4. Planning applications

(a) SE/05/02123/FUL, Kim-Hawk, Gorsewood Road. Two storey extension of existing house to both sides and a single storey rear extension.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application SE/05/02123/FUL, Kim-Hawk, Gorsewood Road for a two storey extension of existing house to both sides and a single storey rear extension.

(b) SE/05/02300/FUL, The Clefts, Gorse Way. Garage extension to existing garage at side of house but detached.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application SE/05/02300/FUL, The Clefts, Gorse Way for a garage extension to existing garage at side of house but detached.

(c) SE/05/02334/FUL, Orchard-Lea, Church Road. Replacement dwelling

Cllr Harris had previously declared a personal interest in the above planning application and intended to withdraw from the meeting during discussion and voting on the matter.

In view of the fact that Cllr Gaywood had been delayed and as such a quorum would not be present it was

RESOLVED: That,
pursuant to Standing Order 26 (d) the order of business be varied and item 4 (c) on the agenda, planning application SE/05/02334/FUL, Orchard-Lea, Church Road be deferred until such time as Cllr Gaywood arrived at the meeting.

(d) SE/05/02354/FUL, 41, Springcroft. Proposed roof extension to the rear. Two side dormer windows. Insertion of velux window.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application SE/05/02354/FUL, 41, Springcroft, proposed roof extension to the rear, two side dormers and insertion of velux window.

5. SE/05/02224/CONVAR, 5 Culvey Close. Installation of door & attached window in west facing wall of single storey rear extension.

The above planning application was considered at the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22nd September 2005 and the following comments were submitted: 'Hartley Parish Council objects to the application on the grounds that the proposed door and window would be detrimental to neighbours amenities incurring loss of privacy.'

The Parish Office had received an email from the Planning Officer at the District Council advising that the proposed siting for the window and door is such that they look directly onto an existing 1.8m high fence on the shared boundary and as such only 20-30cm will be visible above this height. The Planning Officer does not consider that this will cause significant overlooking given the height of the fence and has been in contact with the applicant who has stated that they are willing to obscure glaze the door and window to mitigate any overlooking further.

In light of this information, the Committee was requested by the Planning Officer to reconsider its decision.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application SE/05/02224/CONVAR, 5, Culvey Close, for the installation of a door and attached window in the west facing wall of single storey rear extension provided that the door and window is obscure glazed.

Cllr Gaywood arrived at 10.10a.m.

6. Planning application SE/05/02334/FUL, Orchard-Lea, Church Road. Replacement dwelling.

The Committee noted that three written representations had been received from members of the public objecting to the application.

At the Chairman's invitation members of the public were invited to express their views on the application.

Mr Hollis spoke against the application.

Mrs Harris spoke against the application.

Mrs O'Connor spoke against the application.

RESOLVED: That,
an objection be raised to application SE/05/02334/FUL, Orchard-Lea, Church Road for a replacement dwelling on the following grounds:

- 1) The proposed development by way of its scale, height and bulk would result in harm to the character and amenities of the area.
- 2) The proposed application would result in overdevelopment of the site and would be inappropriate and detrimental to the location, adjacent to the Green Belt.
- 3) The height of the proposed dwelling would result in loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and would be detrimental to neighbours amenities.
- 4) The site is currently a wooded site but the proposed plans, whilst stating that no trees will be felled, do not show the existing trees on the new development.
- 5) The proposed dwelling would be out of character with neighbouring properties and would be detrimental to the street scene.
- 6) The proposed dwelling would be in front of the building line and 9 metres in front of Briar Rose and would therefore be very close to the road.

7. SE/04/03077/FUL, Orchard-Lea, Church Road. Revised application for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 detached dwellings, 2 garages and a new access. Amended plans received 21/02/2005 & 04/03/2005.

RESOLVED: That,
a letter from the District Council confirming that the above planning application has been treated as withdrawn and accordingly no further action will be taken on it be received and noted.

8. Planning decisions

RESOLVED: That, the following planning decisions be received and noted:

Application no	Site	Description and SDC decision	HPC comment
SE/05/00967/OUT	Hill Crest, Ash Road	Erection of 2 dwellings at rear of property (as amended by revised drawing received on 30th June 2005). REFUSED	HPC objects on the grounds that: 1) The proposed development would create back land development. 2) The proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring property to the south, resulting in loss of light and privacy. 3) The Council feels that the proposed parking facilities would be insufficient and there would be no turning area. The narrow access to the development is also considered inadequate. 4) The Council feels that the proposed development would be inappropriate and detrimental to the location, adjacent to the Green Belt. Amended consultation information only 27/07/05.

			HPC stands by previous comments
SE/05/01106/FUL	Kilndown, Gorsewood Road	Demolition of dwelling and erection of 1 detached dwelling. REFUSED	HPC objects on the following grounds: 1)Overdevelopment of the site, 2) The bulk of the proposed houses with the lack of space on either side would give the appearance of terracing and 3) the proposed roofline would overpower neighbouring properties. Amended consultation 02/08/05. HPC objects on the grounds that the proposed dwelling is not the original chalet bungalow detailed in the outline planning consent. The Council stands by its comments on the previous application at this site SE/04/00566/OUT in as much as it has no objection to the demolition of the existing bungalow and construction of two chalet bungalows with integral garages.
SE/05/01637/OUT	Chestnuts, Quakers Close	Erection of detached 3 bed house. REFUSED	No objection provided that it meets with the approval of the Highways Department.
SE/05/01717/CON VAR	Carill, Church Road	Variation of conditions 2 and 7 of permission SE/04/01915/FUL as previously varied under SE/05/00055 to allow a further period of 6 months until 04/04/06 to comply with requirements for hard and soft landscaping. GRANTED	No objection.
SE/05/01898/FUL	Cedars, Gorse Way	Single storey front extension and alterations. GRANTED	No objection

SE/05/01986/LDCE X	1, The Parade, Ash Road	Use of garage as storage Granted	HPC objects as it supports the District Council in its refusal of a previous application and subsequent appeal for change of use of the garage.
-----------------------	----------------------------	---	---

9. Planning Enforcements

Somerleyton, Merton Avenue

RESOLVED: That,
a letter received from the District Council regarding conditions 2 (materials), 6 (landscaping) and 7 (enclosures) imposed on the planning permission granted in respect of the above site be received and noted.

10. Planning Appeals

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/A/04/1168325

Site: Orchard-Lea, Church Road

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 detached dwellings with 2 single garages.

RESOLVED: That,
a letter received from the District Council advising that the above appeal has been withdrawn by the appellants and that therefore the Inspectorate will be taking no further action in the matter and that the Inquiry due to be heard on 1st November 2005 has been cancelled, be received and noted.

11. Planning for Minerals and Waste in Kent. Issues and Options Papers

The Committee considered the 'Minerals Issues and Options Paper' and the 'Waste Issues and Options Paper' and the questions contained therein.

RECOMMENDED: That,
the Clerk be requested to respond to the online consultation as follows:
a) Minerals Issues and Options Paper – Question 1 – 5b: No comment.
b) Waste Issues and Options Paper – Question 1 – 13: No comment
Questions 15a, b and c: Locations of waste management facilities – Green Belt:
Comments: Other - The locations of waste management facilities should be subject to the full planning process and very special circumstances need to be shown to justify the location in the Green Belt.
Questions 16a, b and c: Locations of waste management facilities – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs): Comments: Other – Waste management facilities should not be allowed in AONBs under any circumstances.

12. Kent Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) Supplementary Information: Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report.

RECOMMENDED: That,
the Kent Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) Supplementary Information: Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report be noted.

13. Date of Next Meeting

Friday 21st October 2005 commencing at 10.00a.m. Site inspections will commence at 9.15 or earlier depending on the number of visits required.

The meeting closed at 10.40.a.m.

Signed:.....
Chairman

Date:.....