



MINUTES

Planning Committee - Thursday 24th March 9.30am

In attendance: Cllr Halliday, Cllr Brooker, Cllr Brown and Cllr Davenport

1. **Apologies and absences** - no
2. **Declarations of interest** – Cllr Halliday declared an interest in item 5c due to proximity to the application.
3. **Minutes** of previous meeting on 21st February 2022 were **approved**.
4. **Public Participation Session** - none
5. **Applications received to resolve a response:**

a. Land East of Dantryfair Sevenoaks Road

Ref. No: 22/00227/FUL

Formation of two vehicle accesses at North end side of the site

Halstead Parish Council object to this application.

This council concur with Kent Highways and wish to understand more about the application, why 2 access points are required and what the land will be used for. This council do not feel that 2 vehicular accesses are necessary in a field for horses.

This council also feel that the fences used are unnecessarily robust for horses and unsuitable for the purpose.

b. 30 Fort Road

Ref. No: 22/00632/HOUSE

Single storey rear extension with 2 roof lanterns, internal alterations and adjustments to fenestration

Halstead Parish Council have no objection to this application.

c. Cedar Meadow Church Road

Ref. No: 22/00333/HOUSE

Detached garage

Halstead Parish Council continue to object to this application. This application seems to be the same application as was submitted in January 2021 under a condition amendment. We continue to highlight the inaccuracies of the submitted proposed plans. The building stretches across the entirety of the plot, whereas the submitted plans show a significant space on the north side of the plot.

As per the original application, the Parish Council still would not wish the line of development along Church Road to move forward.

The Officers report the comment in the original application was made that “while garages forward of the main building are not normally encouraged, in this case it would be set away from the main house against the boundary thereby retaining existing views towards the main dwelling through the driveway and would not adversely impact the spatial relationship”. The current application proposes to move the garage to a position where it would be much further forward of the line of development and would restrict the view towards the main dwelling. Also, the previous application was for a two-car garage whereas the amendment proposes a three-car garage, which would be wider and further restrict the view.

Whilst the original plans have not been followed, the garage in situ which has planning permission, is perfectly adequate for the size of the house and should not be removed if a garage is required.