

Planning Advisory Committee

8th February 2019

| No | Application No | Proposal | Location |
|----|----------------|---|---|
| 99 | 18/03839/OUT | Outline Planning application for erection of up to 9 dwellings with access considered | Land north of Santer House, Red Oak, Hawkhurst Kent |

Background:

Land owned by TWBC. Proposal is for 3 x 3-bed houses; 3 x 2 bed flats; 3 x 1 bed flats plus parking. All market housing.

Houses are two-storey. Flats are 1 x 3-storey block, with the lower ground floor sunk into the slope.

14 parking spaces = 2 each for 3 bed houses & 1 each for flats, plus 2 visitor. 6 bike spaces for the flats.

Land is currently undeveloped and the proposed development is both within and outside LBD.

Development would require licence for badger sett to be closed and destroyed.

Comments from residents - 2 neither for or against, expressing concerns over parking and questioning the need for additional housing. 3 against - parking, badgers, suitability of road for access during construction, additional traffic etc.

Comments:

We are disappointed to note that despite this application having been submitted by TWBC for land owned by TWBC, the opportunity has not been taken to build social housing, which is much needed in Hawkhurst.

This application complies with Hawkhurst's NDP to the extent that the proposed development is for less than 10 houses, on a greenfield site contiguous with edge of existing developed parts of the parish (HD1a). However, this site is not within walking distance of local shops and facilities and does not appear to have addressed paragraph 7.15 of the NDP, which requires development on or near the edge of the built-up area to encourage public access to the countryside beyond. The proposal is for an extension to the present cul-de-sac, with the block of flats effectively being the end point.

We note that the proposed housing mix is in line with the requirement for smaller properties identified in HD2, and is fully compliant in terms of inclusive access as per HD3.

As an outline planning application, we appreciate that designs are only indicative, but we welcome the proposal to comply with HD4 by including vertical elements such as projecting bays/dormers. We have, however, noted the absence of chimneys, another requirement of HD4, which we would expect to be addressed at a later stage, were this outline application to be given approval.

We share residents concerns about parking. The proposed 14 spaces for parking for the new development is inadequate considering the location of this site - occupants will be reliant on cars to access local shops, schools etc. The current parking provision in this area is inadequate. Red Oak is already congested with cars parked along the road, blocking pavements etc. This situation would be exacerbated by additional development unless proper consideration is given to ensuring appropriate parking for both current and future residents.

We are also concerned by the proposal to close/destroy an active badger sett as part of this development. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF requires planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the local environment. According to paragraph 172 *“the conservation and enhancement of wildlife”* is an important consideration in the AONB. The requirement to destroy a well-used badger sett cannot be considered to conserving and certainly not enhancing our local wildlife. From the badger survey, it would appear that the badger sett is located in a fairly contained area of the development site. Therefore, surely it would be possible to limit development on the site to an area that would not impact on the badger sett?

Furthermore, we note the Conservation Officer’s concerns that the applicant has not given sufficient consideration to the impact on the historic environment.

Conclusion:

As it stands, we are **opposed** to this development for the reasons outlined above. However, we appreciate there are positive aspects to this application, namely a proposal for a limited number of dwellings of the size needed in the village. There will no doubt be further discussion between the planners and the applicant. We would like to be kept informed throughout this process as we would be minded to view more favourably an application that addressed our concerns with regard to social housing, the impact on the environment/wildlife and the importance of providing adequate car parking for all current and future residents of Red Oak.

We would like this application to be referred to the **Planning Committee**.

| | | | |
|-----|--------------|---|---|
| 100 | 18/03735/ADV | New fret cut painted timber lettering applied to existing timber grounds for main fascia sign. Refurbishment, re-painting and re-instating of existing lettering each side at low level | 4 Colonnade, Rye Rd, Hawkhurst TN18 4ES |
|-----|--------------|---|---|

Background:

This proposal is for a new fascia sign for the bakers with the correct business name. Overall, it is broadly similar in design to the current sign. It will not be illuminated. No comments from residents.

Comments and Recommendation:

Given that the sign is not illuminated and the proposal is in keeping with the existing, we would **support** this application.

| | | | |
|--|---------------|--|---|
| 101 | 18/03873/FULL | Erection of two storey / part one and half storey front/side extension, canopied open porch extension, and two storey side / rear extension with covered balcony | Lakeside, Stream Lane, Hawkhurst TN18 4RB |
| <p>Background: <i>Lakeside is outside the LBD. The property has previously been extended. The volume was of the building in May 2001 was 737m³ and has previously been extended to 1037m³. The proposed extension would result in a volume of 1617m³. H11 states that proposed development should be modest in scale. Figures given for guidance are approximately 50% increase in volume or 150m³ whichever is greater up to a maximum of 250m³. No comments from residents.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: The property is situated outside the LBD, in a quiet rural lane in the AONB. Given the volume figures provided by the agent, this cannot be considered a modest extension. Consequently, it does not comply with H11. Therefore, we object to this application.</p> | | | |
| 102 | 18/03980/FULL | Erection of single storey extension | Beacon House, Foxhole Lane, Hawkhurst Kent TN18 5DP |
| <p>Background: <i>The proposal is for a single-storey extension on an Edwardian style property built in the early 1900s. The supporting paperwork indicates that the total volume of all extensions to the property would be 35%. The proposal is for bricks to match existing brickwork, a zinc seamed roof and timber framed windows. Pre-application advice indicated the property was not listed and appears to have expressed concerns that the initial proposals were not sympathetic to the Edwardian house. The applicant is of the view that the inclusion of the parapet wall, zinc roof and traditional style roof lights address these issues. The pre-application advice is not available online, so we cannot ascertain whether this is the case. No comments from residents.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: The proposal appears to comply with H11. It does not appear to overlook neighbouring properties. The plans indicate that materials have been chosen to match existing. This is, therefore, in line with the requirement of HD4 of the NDP that extensions should be sympathetic to the host house.</p> <p>We are, however, concerned about the pitched roof resulting in water draining onto the flat roof, but appreciate that this is not a material consideration. Therefore, we support this application assuming that this is now in line with the pre-application advice.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|--|
| 103 | 18/03636/FULL | Add pitched roof to existing dormer window. Remove redundant brick chimney and roof over. Replace a three-unit window with a two-unit window to allow the installation of an en-suite in the dormer window. Fit a soil and vent pipe externally next to the dormer to then run internally through the kitchen and connect to the existing drainage via an inspection chamber. | The Coach House, Little Fowlers Rye Road Hawkhurst Kent TN18 5DA |
|-----|---------------|---|--|

Background:

The proposal is to replace a flat roof over a dormer with a pitched roof at the rear of the property. This does not appear to impact on neighbours. No comments from residents.

Comments and Recommendation:

We **support** this application. However, it seems a shame when so much care has been taken to create symmetry with the dormer roofs to lose the symmetry of the dormer windows.

| | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|--|
| 104 | 18/03865/FULL | Proposed replacement dwelling (revised scheme to 18/022289/FULL) | New Dwelling, Oylers Farm Cottage, Attwaters lane, Hawkhurst Kent TN18 5AR |
|-----|---------------|--|--|

Background:

This is a new application but is a revision to an application that we discussed in September. We objected to it but it was approved by TWBC. We objected because of the impact on the AONB. We felt that the proposal would be visually obtrusive and would have a negative impact on the AONB, therefore, not complying with LP1 of the NDP, which requires planning applications to demonstrate how proposals do not cause adverse visual impact on the landscape setting. We also felt that it did not comply with Paragraph 172 of the NPPF, which states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB. The case officer's view was that the proposed dwelling was of an appropriate scale and design for the locality and was not to be considered visually intrusive or highly prominent in the area. We still disagree with this assertion.

We also commented that it did not comply with HD2 future housing mix. The case officer's report indicated that a 2-bedroomed property was being replaced with a 3-bedroomed property, which was relatively modest in scale. And concluded that the proposal was not contrary to HD2. The changes will now make this a four-bedroomed property.

The changes in this application are all internal and there is no change to the mass or height of the proposed dwelling.

No comments from residents.

Comments and Recommendation:

Despite the decision on the previous application, we still stand by our prior objections. We feel that this application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the landscape setting as required by LP1. At present, there is a far-reaching view out across the AONB. The proposed building will be higher than the existing bungalow and will, therefore, impact on the view. It does not enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. The revisions in this application largely relate to internal layout and the proposed height and mass is staying the same. We **object** to this application.

| | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|---|
| 105 | 19/00025/FULL | Remove rear porch and erection of single storey rear extension | Pinewood, High Street, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 4JP |
|-----|---------------|--|---|

Background:
The proposal is for a single-storey extension at the rear of the property. This does not appear to impact on neighbours and will not be seen from the street. No comments from residents.

Comments and Recommendation:
 This is a modest extension within the LBD and the application indicates that materials have been chosen to match existing. This is, therefore, in line with the requirement of HD4 of the NDP that extensions should be sympathetic to the host house. We **support** this application.

| | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 106 | 18/03943/FULL | Removal of entrance porch; erection of a single storey front extension with pitched and tiled roof to enlarge kitchen area and provide utility room and extended hall area | 24, Fairview, Hawkhurst TN18 4AF |
|-----|---------------|--|----------------------------------|

Background:
The proposal is for a single-storey extension at the front of the house. At present, none of the other houses have front extensions and they share a broadly similar design. Therefore, this would impact on the street scene. In addition, the proposal is for the extension to extend further forward than the current porch. No comments from residents

One thing I noticed when I popped by to look at this was the houses are relatively narrow and the existing porches take up a significant proportion of the houses (perhaps, a third of the total frontage). I am worried about the neighbouring house on the left as their front window will be very close to the extension and will in effect be set back between their own porch and this extension. Having done a little further research, I note that the TWBC's Alterations and Extensions supplementary planning guidance states that "front extensions are rarely acceptable." It also says the visual integrity of a terrace should not be compromised and that even a modest extension, such as a porch, can obstruct the outlook from adjacent windows of terraced houses. Clare.

Comments and Recommendation:

The proposal is to use materials to match existing, which complies with the NDP in terms of the extension being sympathetic to the host house (HD4). However, we are concerned that the proposed extension will run the full width of the house and will extend further forward than the existing porch. This will change the street scene. We **object** to this application. However, we might view it more sympathetically if the proposed extension were not forward of the line of the porches on this terrace.

107 19/00191/TNOT56

Proposed base station installation

High Street, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 4JS

Background:

Apparently this is being moved at the school's request to allow for improved visibility splays for development. The box will be sited further back from the road and will be less obvious than it currently is.

Comments and Recommendation:

We **support** this application. However, we are disappointed to see the reference to HPC having been sent information about this application and not responding. This is the second time we did not receive the information in relation to this mast etc.

108 19/00038/FULL

Demolition of attached garage and erection of two storey side extension

Meadow Lodge, Talbot Road, Hawkhurst TN18 4LT

Background:

Planning permission for a two-storey extension was granted in 2017. However, this was based on a modification from the original application. The modification was made based on advice by the planning officer at the time. The applicants feel that the original application looked better in terms of the street scene and are, therefore, submitting another application based on their original design. At the time HPC objected as they felt it was too close to the boundary.

Comments and Recommendation:

We have **no comments** to make on this application. This was a decision made by the case officer and we don't see that there is sufficient difference between the two applications for us to comment.