

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr. Williamson (Chairman)

Cllr. Reay (Vice Chairman)

Cllrs. Ball, Barnett, Brown, Cheeseman, Perry Cole, Coleman, P. Darrington, Hogarth, Hudson, Hunter, Layland, McGarvey, Pett, Purves, Raikes, Reay and Roy

An apology for absence was received from Cllr. Osborne-Jackson

Cllrs. McArthur, McGregor and Thornton were also present.

### 143. Minutes

Resolved: That the Minutes of the Development Control Committee held on the 7 January 2021, be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 144. Declarations of Interest or Predetermination

Councillor Barnett declared for Minute 146 - 20/02846/HOUSE - Applewood, Swan Lane, Edenbridge Kent TN8 6AT, that he was the Ward Member for the application, but would remain open minded.

Councillor Layland declared for Minute 146 - 20/02846/HOUSE - Applewood, Swan Lane, Edenbridge Kent TN8 6AT, that he was the neighbouring Ward Member for the application, but would remain open minded.

### 145. Declarations of Lobbying

There were none.

## RESERVED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following planning application:

### 146. 20/02846/HOUSE - Applewood, Swan Lane, Edenbridge Kent TN8 6AT

The proposal sought planning permission for the erection of a double garage to the property. The application had been referred to Development Control Committee by Councillor McGregor on the grounds that the proposal affected the street scene on Swan Lane and was in contravention of the residential extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Members' attention was brought to the main agenda papers and late observation sheet.

## Development Control Committee - 28 January 2021

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

Against the Application: -  
For the Application: Nathan Farrar  
Parish Representative: Town Cllr John Scholey  
Local Member: Cllr McGregor

Members asked questions of clarification from the speakers and officers. The difference between the Applicant's measurements and the Officer's measurements was clarified. Advice was given that the recommended condition implied the existence of the hedge during the lifetime of the application, but that it may be possible to tighten this. Members noted that hedging was not a planning consideration and that the Kent Highways had legislative powers to require maintenance of any hedging obstructing a highway, and that it was an existing entrance. Clarification was sought on the current enforcement action on the current part build which was paused pending the outcome of the planning application. It was clarified that since the adoption of the residential extensions SPD on 7 September 2009, no garages had been built to the front of residential properties in that area.

It was moved by the Chairman and duly seconded that the recommendations within the report, be agreed.

Members discussed the application, in particular the size, bulk and impact of the application on the street scene; its distance from the residential dwelling; and proximity to the highway in contrast to neighbouring properties.

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

Councillor Reay proposed and it was duly seconded, that the application be refused as it was considered detrimental and overbearing on the street scene due to its bulk size shape and location, which was contrary to Policy EN1 of the Allocations and Development Management Plan (ADMP) and SP1 of the Core Strategy and the Residential Extensions SPD.

The motion was put to the vote and it was

Resolved: That planning permission be refused as it was considered harmful and overbearing to the street scene and contrary to Policy EN1 of the Allocations and Development Management Plan (ADMP) and SP1 of the Core Strategy and the Residential Extensions SPD.

THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 7.54 PM

CHAIRMAN