

	<p>2 Old Gaysham Cottages, Croydon Road, Westerham TN16 2DY Demolition of conservatory and part rear of property. Erection of a gable ended double storey extension to accommodate kitchen at ground floor and ensuite to first floor. Alterations to fenestration. Refer to SDC Officers.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Planning Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SE/17/01943/LDCPR 29 The Paddock, Westerham TN16 1ER Erection of a first floor rear extension. Alterations to fenestration. For information only. SE/17/01243/HOUSE Hosey Rigge Cottage, Hosey Hill, Westerham TN16 Erection of single storey rear extension, single storey side extension. Raising of existing first floor bedroom roof. Dormer windows in raised roof. Refused SE/17/01308/HOUSE Dunsdale House, Westerham Road, Westerham TN16 Opening up the rear kitchen/dining wall to insert sliding doors with a small canopy over. Granted SE/17/01389/HOUSE 2 Ash Road, Westerham TN16 Erection of a single storey conservatory extension at the side of the property. Granted SE/17/00589/FUL 2 South Bank, Westerham TN16 Demolition of existing single storey side element. Erection of two storey side extension with balcony and change of use from one dwelling to two. Works to driveway/ bank to create two additional parking spaces. Refused SE/17/01477/HOUSE Rosemary Cottage, Oakdale Lane, Crockham Hill TN8 Part demolition of lobby to facilitate single storey extension with new decking. Granted 	
7.	<p><u>Tree Work</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SE/17/01983/WTPO The Chalet, Hosey Hill, Westerham TN16 1TB Various works to trees (TPO) 	
8.	<p><u>Design Statement</u> Cllr Ashley reported that SDC were reviewing the Design Statement and he hoped it would be ready for consultation shortly.</p>	

9.	<u>Consultations</u> None	
10.	<u>Reports from Councillors</u> None	
11.	<u>Correspondence</u> 11.1 SDC Enforcement update was noted. 11.2 SDC Street naming – Farm Cottage, Oakdale Lane, Crockham Hill was noted.	
12.	<u>TN16 and web-site</u> Statement on Local Plan	
13.	<u>Matters for District and County Councillors</u> Covers Farm	
14.	<u>Further Matters for Consideration at the next meeting</u> None	
15.	<u>Date of next meeting</u> Thursday 20th July 2017 Cllrs Ashley and Le Breton gave their apologies	

The meeting was concluded at 10.30 am

Minutes confirmed as a correct record:

Chairman

Appendix One Planning Committee 06/07/17

Westerham Town Council maintains its support to KCC in requiring the leaseholders/owners of the site to reinstate and landscape the site from materials already on site and not to import any more. The extension of the timetable for restoration was considered robust by KCC year/18 months ago (Clifton). Similarly when Highways England extended use of the M25 hard shoulder they had no concerns over the stability of the ground including the Covers land. This should be enforced. It is very important to remember that this site is Green Belt, which is protected by the highest level of planning policy and should be restored to that standard.

There is a real concern that the remediation work proposed in the scoping report fails to meet this objective and is of such magnitude that it will effectively leave the land as Brownfield and then subsequently vulnerable to development, over which the local authority would lose all control. The report itself states that the land once recovered would only be suitable as rough pasture.

If KCC are satisfied that there is sufficient doubt as to the existing consent being sufficient to protect the integrity of the site then they should, with the Highways agency, appoint their own independent engineers to assess the ground stability and respond to Squerryes proposals. This should however be with the sole aim of protecting the integrity of the M25 embankment, with any remediation necessary from materials sourced on site. As stated in the Geotechnical Assessment 'The stability of the slopes can be increased by placement of a buttress of inert granular material to increase the factor of safety against stability. Typical dimensions of the required buttress can be show in Table 5. The details of the buttresses can be finalised I conjunction with any landscaping requirements.' This should not then extend to the remainder of the site, which should still be subject to the existing planning consent terms of landscaping.

If excavations have not been monitored or controlled then it should be the owners' responsibility to repair and reinforce any unstable ground in neighbouring property caused by the excavation works.

Having set out our objection to the acceptance of this scoping report we would like to make additional comments on the details.

There is inadequate information in the engineering report on the water discharge from the site and how and where this would be discharged so as not to prejudice or pollute adjacent land and property. The site was never included in the environmental Agency plans for the Darent Valley and their involvement in any drainage from the site is considered vital.

The necessity for a haul road is not adequately dealt with in an "Engineers" report and should have a full transport assessment. The short haul route runs across existing Green Belt land adjacent to a primary school with already poor air quality, which would be further exacerbated by the heavy vehicle movements.

The delivery of material to, and lorries returning from, the site is only briefly considered as "London" but this would undoubtedly be from all points in the road network causing severe

issues to neighbouring authorities.

The Council should refer to the planning refusal for the adjacent Moorhouse site due to levels of traffic entering and leaving the A25. Surrey CC Highways determined small van movements from a distribution centre was inappropriate. The fact that this would bring equal or larger numbers of tipper trucks would bring a similar response. I am sure Croydon and Bromley authorities would take similar views and should be consulted.

This report cannot be looked at in isolation given that Squerryes are also submitting outline development plans to SDC for significant residential development (650+ houses) on Green Belt land together with a by-pass in exactly the same point as the haul road, and across the Covers Farm site. Would it be their intension to infill Covers Farm with material from these developments if they win approval as well as opening up Covers farm to future development?

This element as part of a much larger scheme has the potential to change the very nature and character of the historic town of Westerham and cannot and should not be looked at in isolation.

Finally the County Council should be aware of how much regional opposition arose when Monier brought proposals forward to KCC under their waste management plans. It was subsequently confirmed by KCC that there was no requirement for this infill and the application was rejected.

In conclusion his proposal would generate a significant and substantial backlash from communities in the region if taken forward in its current form, and this Council strongly recommends that the scoping report be rejected for the reasons outlined above.