

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING** Committee held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday 22 July 2010 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor S G Leith

Councillors: T A Bond
M S Furnival
C E Kirby
C J Meredith
J C Record
A F Richardson
R J Thompson

Officers: Development Control Manager
Senior Development Engineer, KCC
Principal Solicitor
Democratic Support Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S S Chandler, J M Munt and R S Walkden.

The following person was also in attendance and spoke in connection with the item indicated:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/07/0802	Mr B Holmes	–

139 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillor C E Kirby had been appointed as substitute for Councillor S S Chandler.

140 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2010 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

141 UPDATE ON SOUTH EAST PLAN

The Development Control Manager updated the Committee on developments concerning the South East Plan. With effect from 6 July 2010, the South East Plan had been revoked, no longer forming an integral part of the Development Plan, and was of no relevance to decisions on planning applications. Members would need to continue to have regard to the Development Plan which consisted of the Core Strategy and saved Dover District Local Plan policies, and other material considerations, including those set out in Planning Policy Statements.

RESOLVED: That the revocation of the South East Plan be noted.

(In accordance with the provisions of Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chairman agreed that this item, which was not detailed on the agenda, should be considered as a matter of urgency.)

The Development Control Manager recommended that consideration of Application No DOV/10/0325 remain deferred for a new report, given that a number of letters had been received since the application was considered by the Planning Committee on 24 June 2010, and in the light of policy changes following the revocation of the South East Plan. It was clarified that further public speaking would be allowed.

The views were reported of those Members who had visited the sites in respect of Application Nos DOV/10/0202 (55 Westcourt Lane, Shepherdswell) and DOV/10/0292 (40 Sandwich Road, Eythorne).

In respect of Application No DOV/10/0292, the Development Control Manager confirmed the Fire Safety Officer was aware of the correct width of the drive and had raised no objection. The Committee was advised that an existing back land property in the same road had been built before the properties fronting the street.

RESOLVED: (a) That consideration of Application No DOV/10/0325 remain deferred.

(b) That Application No DOV/10/0202 be approved in accordance with the recommendation of the Development Control Manager as set out on pages 36 and 37 of the report to Committee on 24 June 2010.

(c) That Application No DOV/10/0292 be refused for the following reasons:

(i) The proposed development would result in an undesirable form of back land development out of keeping with, and unrelated to, the established spatial character and pattern of development, detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality and the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding properties. It would therefore be inappropriate in its context and not an effective use of land and would be contrary to the provisions of Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development and Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing; and

(ii) The proposed development would result in noise and disturbance to adjoining properties from the increased use of the existing driveway by pedestrians and vehicles and the introduction of car parking spaces in close proximity to private rear garden areas. The proposal would therefore be damaging to the residential amenities of these properties and contrary to Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development.

(Councillor T A Bond declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Application No DOV/10/0325 for the reason that his employer operated in the tourist accommodation industry and left the Chamber during consideration of the item.)

(Councillor S G Leith declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Application No DOV/10/0292 for the reason that two of the objectors were known to him and left the Chamber during consideration of the item. The Chair was taken by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Richardson, for this item.)

143 APPLICATIONS WHICH MAY BE SUBJECT TO PUBLIC SPEAKING

- (1) Application No DOV/07/0802 – Erection of non-food retail warehouse units (5,573.6 sqm floor area), 1 restaurant unit (255.5 sqm floor area), construction of vehicular access, together with associated highway works, parking and landscaping – Land off Honeywood Parkway, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield

The Development Control Manager summarised the application, the important material issues and the changes in planning policy since the application was last considered in December 2009, and explained why the recommendation included seeking the further views of the Council's consultants.

County Highways still required a satisfactory explanation of the level of parking proposed and their further views were awaited on the Travel Plan. There was now no requirement for a financial contribution to works at the Guston (A2/A258) roundabout as these had been carried out.

The Head of Regeneration had commented that whether the proposal was likely to harm the town centre depended importantly on whether a condition could be successfully imposed to restrict the goods sold. A bulky goods development at DTIZ would not meet wider objectives. The proposed town centre financial contribution would be used for public realm enhancement.

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that the withdrawal of ASDA from the DTIZ scheme had no bearing on the report or recommendation, and that it was immaterial to the decision to be made.

The applicants' agent had written to welcome the report but stated that, in their view, the conclusions could have been clearer, and it was not necessary for the Council to seek the further views of its consultants. A conclusive decision was needed now.

RESOLVED: That the application be granted in accordance with the recommendation of the Development Control Manager.

(Councillor A F Richardson declared a personal interest in the application for the reason that he was employed by the Canterbury Archaeological Trust and the County Archaeologist had recommended a condition.)

- (2) Application No DOV/10/00315 – Erection of detached garage and pitched roof over existing kitchen – Church View, Well Lane, St Margaret's-at-Cliffe

The Development Control Manager reported that a further letter had been received from a local resident which referred to construction on the kitchen roof being

underway. This was permitted development and of no consequence to the recommendation.

RESOLVED: That the application be granted in accordance with the recommendation of the Development Control Manager.

- (3) Application No DOV/10/00383 – Change of use of annexe to self-contained holiday let – 9 Citadel Heights, Western Heights

The Development Control Manager reported that an e-mail had been received from two local residents which reiterated concerns raised previously about overlooking and the relocation of a bedroom door. These concerns had been addressed in paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12 of the report.

RESOLVED: That the application be granted in accordance with the recommendation of the Development Control Manager.

- (4) Application No DOV/10/00399 – Erection of 36 flats and 4 houses together with associated landscaped areas and surface car parking – 70 Maison Dieu Road, Dover

The Development Control Manager informed Members that all concerns raised by Kent Highway Services had been resolved, albeit that a plan showing pedestrian sight lines was awaited, and Southern Water no longer had any objections. Most of the issues outlined at paragraph 3.30 of the report had been resolved or were close to resolution. The issue of contamination raised by the Environment Agency required further investigation, and satisfactory evidence relating to marketing was still awaited. Contributions sought by Mouchel and the Council's Leisure Services section had been agreed by the applicant who had offered to enter into a Unilateral Understanding. In addition, the applicant had agreed to fund the relocation of the bus-stop. The Committee was advised that the 1.8 metre close-boarded fence referred to on page 55 of the report would now be a brick wall. In respect of parking, the Senior Development Engineer, KCC, advised that the development complied with the Kent Design Guide's Residential Parking Standards which stipulated a minimum of 1 parking space per unit for town centre developments.

RESOLVED: That the application be granted in accordance with the recommendation of the Development Control Manager, subject to the inclusion of 'or unilateral undertaking' after 'legal agreement' and 'or informatives' after 'amendments'.

(Councillor A F Richardson declared a personal interest in the application for the reason that he was employed by the Canterbury Archaeological Trust and the County Archaeologist had recommended a condition.)

The meeting ended at 8.12 pm.