

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON
13TH MARCH 2007 AT 10.00 a.m. AT THE PAVILION, MANOR FIELD**

Present: Cllr Mr C Alford
Cllr Mr L Abraham
Cllr Mrs Y Coutts (Arrived at 10.05a.m.)
Cllr Mr M Harris
Cllr Mrs A Oxtoby
Cllr Mr B Ramsay (Chairman)

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

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr Mr J Gaywood and Cllr Mrs M Solman.

2. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Mr Harris declared a personal interest in minute item 4 in respect of planning application SE/07/00585/FUL, 16, Old Downs, as the applicant is an acquaintance.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: That,
the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27th February 2007, be approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following corrections, page 3, minute item 6 (b), delete the application no "SE/06/01093/FUL" and replace with "SE/06/00351/FUL, delete the words "Mark House, Ash Road" and replace with "Prospect Lodge, Gorse Way", delete the words "erection of split level bungalow with detached garage" and replace with " Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new building comprising 7 no 2 bedroom flats with 12 parking spaces and new access arrangements".

Before the Committee considered the planning applications, members of the public were asked by the Chairman whether they 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. One member of the public expressed a wish to make a representation and this was noted by the Chairman.

4. Planning applications

(a) SE/07/00471/FUL, 17, Green Way. Erection of single storey rear extension. Erection of pitched roof over existing single storey rear extension with room-in-the-roof. Loft conversion. Recladding of external elevations to existing rear dormer. Conversion of integral garage. Alterations to existing underground drainage.

The Committee noted that no letters of representation had been received from members of the public.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application SE/07/00471/FUL, 17, Green Way for the erection of a single storey rear extension. Erection of pitched roof over existing single storey rear extension with room-in-the-roof. Loft conversion. Recladding of external elevations to existing rear dormer. Conversion of integral garage and alterations to existing underground drainage but the Committee would like the District Council to ensure that there will be adequate off road parking available.

(b) SE/07/00545/FUL, Radio House, Church Road. Single storey extensions to both sides, infill extension to rear with associated alterations to front including new roof, demolition of existing conservatory, workshop and garage.

Mrs Sharp spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee noted that no letters of representation had been received from members of the public.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application SE/07/00545/FUL, Radio House, Church Road for single storey extensions to both sides, infill extension to rear with associated alterations to front including new roof, demolition of existing conservatory, workshop and garage provided that it complies with Green Belt regulations.

(c) SE/07/00585/FUL, 16, Old Downs. Side two storey extension.

The Committee noted that no representations had been received from members of the public.

RESOLVED: That,
an objection be raised to application SE/07/00585/FUL, 16, Old Downs for a side two storey extension as the proposed development appears to be less than one metre from the boundary.

(d) 07/00552/WTPO, Forge House, Manor Drive. Prune tree

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application 07/00552/WTPO, Forge House, Manor Drive for the trimming of the tree in accordance with Sevenoaks District Council's Tree Officer's recommendations but the Committee would object to heavy pruning.

(e) 07/00608/WTPO, Heort-Lea, Simmonds Drive. Remove three Horn Beams.

RESOLVED: That,
no objection be raised to application 07/00608/WTPO, Heort-Lea, Simmonds Drive to remove any of the three Horn Beams that are dead or dangerous in accordance with Sevenoaks District Council's Tree Officer's approval, but the Committee would prefer the trees to remain and be pruned.

5. Planning decisions

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

Application no	Site	Description and SDC decision	HPC comment
SE/06/03325/FUL	Fairhaven, Manor Drive	2 storey annex extension. REFUSED	HPC objects on the grounds that the proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties resulting in overshadowing, loss of privacy and loss of light.

6. Regional Housing Strategy Review

The Committee considered the Regional Housing Strategy Review Consultation.

RECOMMENDED: That, the Response form and Questionnaire as set out in Appendix 1 attached to these minutes be submitted to the South East Regional Assembly.

7. Planning Enforcements

a) The Laurels, Manor Drive

The Committee noted that retrospective planning application SE/06/03188/FUL, The Laurels, Manor Drive, to raise the existing close board fence to maximum 2400mm between points A and B had been refused by the District Council.

RESOLVED: That, confirmation from the Senior Investigation Officer at the District Council that an enforcement notice is in the process of being issued requesting the owner to remove the raised fence, be noted.

b) Treetops, Ash Road

RESOLVED: That, a letter dated 2nd March 2007 from the Senior Investigation Officer at Sevenoaks District Council to the owner/occupier of Treetops, Ash Road advising that the recently constructed conservatory is permitted development and does not require the benefit of planning permission be received and noted.

8. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 3rd April 2007 commencing at 10.00a.m. Site inspections will commence at 9.15a.m. or earlier depending on the number of visits required.

The meeting closed at 11.10 a.m.

Signed:
Chairman

Date:

Section 1 - About You

In what capacity are you responding to this questionnaire? *

Town or Parish Council Representative

If other, please specify:

Please provide your name and address. We cannot accept anonymous or confidential consultation responses or submissions.

Name:*

Organisation:

Address:*

Postcode:*

Email address:

Section 2 - Overall allocation of funds

Question 1: In selecting areas for investment in affordable housing, should the Regional Housing Board (*para 5.3*)?

- Measure homelessness, overcrowding and affordability, as it does now?
- Focus on areas that deliver sustainable development by supporting the regional priorities in the South East Plan ([see map](#))?

Any additional comments / reasons for choice: (max 600 characters)

600 characters left

Question 2: Should the Regional Housing Board allocate funds based on (*para 5.3*):

- A percentage of the total funding available?

- The number of homes to be delivered?

Any additional comments / reasons for choice: (max 600 characters)

600 characters left

Section 3: Funding for different types of project

Question 3: How much affordable housing funding should the Regional Housing Board invest in large strategic sites (*para 2.8.1, 5.7*)?

- 5% (around £22m a year)?
- 10% (around £44m a year)?
- Other (please state):

Question 4: The Regional Housing Board plans to spend 1% of its budget (around £5m a year) on providing and refurbishing Gypsy and Traveller sites (*para 11.1-11.3*). Is this:

- Too low?
- About right?
- Too high?

Question 5: How much should the Regional Housing Board invest in improving the condition of private sector housing (*para 12.1-12.5*)?

- 3% (around £12m a year, below the current level)?
- 5% (around £20m a year, the current level)?
- 7% (around £30m a year)?
- 9% (around £40m a year)?
- Other (please state):

Question 6: What should be the criteria for funding to improve private sector homes (*para 12.3 - 12.4*)? (max 900 characters)

Funding spread equally between urban and rural areas.

900 characters left

Question 7: Do you support the Regional Housing Board using funds for loans or equity release schemes as a way to improve the condition of private sector housing (*para 12.5*)?

- Yes
- No

Question 8: What should be the Regional Housing Board's minimum target for rural affordable housing in small settlements (*para 4.10 and 15*)?

- 360 homes per year (the current level)?
- 500 homes per year?
- Other (please state):

Question 9: The evidence base for the draft South East Plan suggests that 70% of new affordable housing should be social rented. A proportion of this is likely to be achieved without public subsidy. How many of the Regional Housing Board's affordable homes should be social rented accommodation (*para 3.2, 16*)?

- 70%
- 60%
- 50%
- Other (please state):

Question 10: To emphasise the need for large, family-sized affordable housing, should the Regional Housing Board adopt (*para 16.3 - 16.6*):

- A single regional target applied to the total of all affordable housing?
- Separate regional targets for social rented and shared ownership housing?
- Other suggestion (please state and add reasons below)

Any additional comments / reasons for recommending an alternative approach: (max

600 characters)



600 characters left

Question 11: Should the Regional Housing Board fund low cost home ownership for 'essential' local workers (*para 17*)?

- Yes
- No

Question 12: If the Regional Housing Board decided to fund shared ownership homes for essential workers, what type of workers at what income levels should be eligible (*para 17*)?

Comments: (max 900 characters)



Not able to comment

900 characters left

Section 4: Infrastructure and land

Question 13: How important is infrastructure to support new affordable homes (*para 14*)?

- Very important?
- Important?
- Not at all important?

Question 14: Do you support the Regional Housing Board's intention to use a proportion of its funds (approximately 2%), on a recyclable basis, towards creating a Regional Infrastructure Fund that will ensure infrastructure is delivered alongside development (*para 14*)?

- Yes
- No

Question 15: Do you support the Regional Housing Board's aim to buy surplus public

sector brownfield land for affordable housing developments (*para 13*)?

- Yes
- No

Section 5: Additional general comments

If you have any further comments, please add them below (max 900 characters)

900 characters left