

Planning Committee

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford on the **2nd October 2019**.

Present:

Cllr. Burgess (Chairman);

Cllr. Blanford (Vice-Chairman);

Cllrs. Anckorn, Chilton, Clarkson (ex officio), Clokie, Forest, Harman, B Heyes, Howard, Krause, Michael, Mulholland, Shorter, Spain, Sparks, Wright.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2(c) Councillors Anckorn, Michael and Mulholland attended as Substitute Members for Councillors Ward, N Ovenden and Howard-Smith respectively.

Apologies:

Cllrs. Howard-Smith, N Ovenden, Smith, Ward.

Also Present:

Cllrs. Bell, Wedgbury.

Development Management Manager, Senior Planning Officer (CM), Senior Planning Officer (MD), Senior Urban Designer, Principal Solicitor (Strategic Development); Head of Planning and Development, Member Services Manager (Operational).

153 Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Interest	Minute No.
Bell	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	
Blanford	Made a Voluntary Announcements as she was a Member of the Campaign to Protect Rural England.	
	Declared that she had in the past been involved in discussions with the Weald of Kent Protection Society regarding this application. She may participate in the debate but would refrain from voting on this application.	156 – 18/01273/AS

Burgess	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	
Clarkson	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	
Clokie	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	
Harman	Made a Voluntary Announcement as she was a Member of the Campaign to Protect Rural England.	
	Declared that prior to her election as a Councillor she had expressed a view on this application. She would speak as Ward Member but would refrain from voting on this application.	156 – 19/00064/AS
Howard	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he knew one of the public speakers.	156 – 19/00064/AS
Michael	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Member of the Weald of Kent Protection Society.	

154 Minutes

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of this Committee held on the 4th September 2019 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

155 Requests for Deferral/Withdrawal

19/00871/AS – 61 Bryony Drive, Kingsnorth, Ashford – this application had been withdrawn by the Applicant as they did not want to continue with the development as proposed.

156 Schedule of Applications

Resolved:

That following consideration of (a), (b) and (c) below,

- (a) Private representations (number of consultation letters sent/number of representations received)**
- (b) The indication of the Parish Council's/Town Council's views**
- (c) The views of Statutory Consultees and Amenity Societies (abbreviation for consultee/society stated)**

Supports 'S', objects 'R', no objections/no comments 'X', still awaited '+', not applicable/none received '-'

decisions be made in respect of Planning Applications as follows: -

Application Number	19/00702/AS	
Location	Highmead House, Hythe Road, Willesborough, Ashford, Kent	
Grid Reference	04265/41498	
Parish Council	None	
Ward	Willesborough Ward	
Application Description	Reserved matters application for the construction of 28 dwellings, including details of layout, appearance, scale, landscaping and access within the site pursuant to outline approval 15/01550/AS	
Applicant	Bellway Homes Ltd, c/o Agent	
Agent	Barton Willmore Castle Hill, Drive, Castle Hill, Ebbsfleet Valley	
Site Area	1.6 hectares	
(a) 112/1X	(b) X	(c) EHM (EP) X, EA X, FIRE X, KCC (heritage), KCC drainage X, KHS X, HE X, HM X, NE X, SW X, SE X, SSOT X UP X.
1/-		KHS S, KCC drainage X, SSOT S, SW X

The Senior Planning Officer (MD) drew Members' attention to the Update Report which contained details of a minor change to proposed Condition 2.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Ms Wilford, the Agent, spoke in support of the application. She said that Councillors would be aware that Bellway Homes achieved full planning permission for the adjacent Hinxhill site for 192 dwellings in 2018 - this site was currently under construction. This reserved matters application was for 28 dwellings at Highmead House and was a complementary addition which dovetailed with that development. The Hinxhill site was to be accessed by a new signalised junction on the A20 and the whole Highmead development would connect with that as established by the outline consent. This new access arrangement would facilitate the closure of the Highmead House access which would be downgraded to a pedestrian route providing a connection to this site from the A20 and in to the

Hinxhill development. The layout for the site had been informed by pre-application discussions with the Council's Officers and had evolved since the outline's illustrative layout, responding to a more detailed understanding of the site's opportunities and constraints. In particular, the road layout had evolved to minimise impact on TPO tree Root Protection Areas as acknowledged in the report. The form and arrangement of development had also responded to site levels which generally sloped towards the A20. The layout of the development continued to retain Highmead House as the centrepiece of the proposals, fronting a central area of open space with housing set around it. The well-established boundary vegetation at the site would also be retained with development set back from these boundaries so that the proposals remained screened and did not adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent development. Set within a verdant landscape, the proposals had an informal character with building heights not exceeding two storeys. The small block of apartments on the north-east corner of the site was also only two storey and was positioned where it responded to the scale and massing of the apartments immediately adjacent on the Hinxhill site. In accordance with the outline consent, six of the dwellings were affordable and all dwellings met national space standards. The proposals had also responded to the Council's updated parking standards. She concluded by stating that overall the proposals would secure a high quality residential environment that responded to adjacent development, the site's characteristics and its sensitive retention of Highmead House. She asked the Committee to support the Officer's recommendation to approve.

Resolved:

Subject to an amendment first being made to the application to increase the parking provision for the affordable housing units from 1.5 to 2 spaces per unit, and any other amendments consequential thereto, to the satisfaction of the Strategic Development Delivery Manager or the Development Management Manager, unless the Strategic Development Delivery Manager or the Development Management Manager is satisfied that such amendment is not feasible, ”.

Approve the matters reserved

This approval discharges condition 1 attached to outline planning permission reference ref 15/01550/AS insofar as details of the proposed development are required to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any variation to the approved details will, however, need to be submitted for further approval before the relevant work is carried out.

The applicant is reminded of the outstanding requirement for details to be submitted and approved under condition 4,5,6,8,9,11,12,13,16,18,20,23,24,28,30,31,32,34 of outline planning permission reference 15/01550/AS, as well as the continuing obligations imposed by some conditions as the development progresses and is completed.

Subject to the following Conditions and Notes:

(with delegated authority to either the Development Management Manager or the Strategic Development and Delivery Manager to make or approve changes to the planning conditions (for the avoidance of doubt including additions, amendments and deletions) as she/he sees fit)

1. Highmead House and the northern boundary wall that is not shown removed on drawing number FD18-1563-51 shall be retained

Reason. In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans

FD 18-1653-250

FD 18-1653-251A

FD 18-1653-55 B

FD-18 -1653 -100

FD-18 -1653 -105

FD-18 -1653 -110

FD-18 -1653 -115

FD-18 -1653 -120

FD-18 -1653 -125

FD-18 -1653 -130

FD-18 -1653 -135

FD-18 -1653 -140

FD-18 -1653 -145

FD-18 -1653 -150

FD-18 -1653 -155

FD-18 -1653 -160

FD-18 -1653 -165

FD-18 -1653 -170

FD-18 -1653 -175

FD-18 -1653 -180

FD-18 -1653 -185

FD-18 -1653 -190

FD-18 -1653 -61

FD-18-1653-195

Reason: Specifying the application drawings and other details which form part of the permission is best practice under government guidance and in the interests of visual amenity

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) or any other Order or any subsequent Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, the carports shall be provided in accordance with the detailing shown on the approved plans and shall not be further altered through the addition of further alterations/ doors without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: To ensure the covered space is retained available for the storage of a vehicle when not in use in order to prevent the displacement of car parking and subsequent inappropriate car parking

Note to Applicant

1. An indemnity agreement will be required to allow refuse vehicles to access non adopted areas. The applicant should contact Ashford Borough Council to discuss this matter

Working with the Applicant

In accordance with paragraphs 38 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service,
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application
- where possible suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome,

- informing applicants/agents of any likely recommendation of refusal prior to a decision and,
- by adhering to the requirements of the Development Management Customer Charter.

In this instance

- the applicant/agent was updated of any issues after the initial site visit,
- was provided with pre-application advice,
- The applicant was provided the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme/ address issues.
- The application was dealt with/approved without delay.

Application Number	18/00321/AS
Location	Phase 2 Old Clockhouse Green, Canterbury Road, Challock, Kent
Grid Reference	03875 02374
Parish Council	Challock
Ward	Downs West Ward
Application Description	Change of use of land from agricultural to residential for the provision of 19 no. new dwellings, with associated, parking, landscaping and infrastructure.
Applicant	Cox Developments Charing Limited c/o agent
Agent	Steve Davies, Hobbs Parker Property Consultants LLP, Romney House, Monument Way, Orbital Park, Ashford, Kent, TN24 0HB
Site Area	1.38 hectares

(a) 36 6 R, 2 X (b) Parish Council R (c) POS X, EMS X, SS X, ABC (Housing) X, KCC(FWM) X, KCC H&T X, KCC (Ecology), KCC (PRoW) X, KCC (Contributions) X, Ramblers X, EA X, AONB X NHS -, SW X, FC -, WT -

(a) 46 10 R, 2 X (b) Parish Council R (c) POS -, EMS X, SS X, ABC (Housing) X, KCC(FWM) X, KCC H&T X, KCC (Ecology), KCC (PRoW) -, KCC (Contributions) X, Ramblers -, EA X, AONB - NHS -, SW X, FC -, WT -

The Senior Planning Officer (CM) directed Members' attention to the Update Report which included details of an amended layout plan, some minor editing changes and an amendment to Table 1 – Planning Obligations.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Davies, the Agent, spoke in support of the application. He said that the Officer report comprehensively set out the merits of the scheme. The application was originally submitted in a form that unfortunately failed to provide an appropriate layout to accommodate the houses proposed or to enhance the character of the new development within the village. Since being brought in to assist with this application, Hobbs Parker had sought to work closely with the Planning Officers to revise the scheme and had responded positively to their suggestions. This was with the intention of creating a development that enhanced the siting of the proposed houses and created a significantly less urban form of development that reflected the traditional form, scale and character of the village and that best integrated itself within the surrounding area. The report identified no significant shortcomings of the scheme. Access, ecological and drainage matters had all been thoroughly assessed and addressed. The houses had been designed with traditional materials, each house had off-road parking to a satisfactory standard and the development had generous amenity space within its layout. The scheme also incorporated visitor parking and overall in excess of 40% affordable housing. Numbers on the site had increased but this was as a result of achieving the Council's requirements for an enhanced layout as well as providing a mix of house types and increasing the amount of affordable housing units. Despite that the scheme only equated to a density of 13 dwellings per hectare. He hoped that the Committee considered the proposals appropriate and followed the Officers advice to support the scheme.

Resolved:

The consideration of the application be DEFERRED for Officers to seek more information regarding the projects to be funded by the Primary and Secondary Education contributions to be required under the S106 agreement undertaking, as well as regarding drainage provision.

Application Number	18/01273/AS		
Location	Land rear of 17 Townland Close, Biddenden		
Grid Reference	85369/12625		
Parish Council	Biddenden		
Ward	Biddenden		
Application Description	Erection of 12 dwellings with associated access and parking		
Applicant	Leath Park Developments Ltd		
Agent	Rachael Dickson, The JTS Partnership, 44 St Peter's Street, Canterbury CT21 2BG		
Site Area	1.17 ha		
(a) 80/39R	(b) R	(c)	HE - KCC H&T X KCC (Econ) X KCC Bio X KCC F&WM X EP X StreetScene X

The Development Management Manager directed Members' attention to the Update Report which detailed an updated consultation response and the receipt of an additional representation.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Ms Dickson, the Agent, spoke in support of the application. She said that Members would be aware that this was not an allocated site in the adopted Local Plan, however there were a number of material considerations where the benefits arising weighed in favour of the scheme. The Officer's report acknowledged that Biddenden was one of the more sustainable

village settlements and the site's location was sustainable. The site had been assessed by the Council as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and listed as a "reasonable alternative". Policy HOU5 permitted windfall residential development close to, or adjoining settlements subject to certain criteria and it was considered that this scheme met all of the criteria listed. The site was within easy walking distance of basic day to day services and the Officer accepted that this was the case. This was a medium scale development of 12 houses and the village had the ability to absorb this level of housing given the services and facilities available. The Officer's report also considered that the scale of development proposed was appropriate to the size of the settlement. Detailed consideration had been given to the landscape setting and a robust landscaping proposal plan and management plan had been prepared. It would be possible to obtain views of the development from the Public Right of Way that ran near the south eastern boundary, however the retention of existing boundary planting and the provision of additional planting within the site would soften the impact of the development. She considered that the Officer's criticisms of the layout were unfounded when the detached houses were to be set in spacious plots with ample garden areas. The appreciation of the character of Biddenden had always indicated a loose grain on the periphery of the village and the scheme had been sensitively designed. The specification treatment for the side elevations of the affordable housing had only recently been highlighted as a concern by Officers and her client would be willing to revisit this and it could be dealt with by condition. Members would appreciate that when the application was lodged last year the scheme had been fully compliant with the previous affordable housing policy requirement of 35% where four of the twelve houses would be affordable. The scheme now fell just below the new requirement of 40% and her client was also willing to revisit this and include a detached four bedroomed house to address the objection to the housing mix. The delivery of affordable homes represented a significant social benefit of the scheme given the acknowledged pressures for affordable housing that existed. Her client was fully committed to providing the necessary planning obligations sought and would enter into a suitable legal agreement to assure that these were delivered. There were no technical objections to the scheme and a development subject to conditions could ensure there was no material harm to matters of highway safety, ecological interest or flood risk. The benefits associated with the scheme included additional housing, the provision of affordable housing, a sustainable location and other social and economic benefits including the generation of job opportunities during construction. She believed the proposals were appropriate and the benefits arising should weigh in favour of the scheme.

The Ward Member attended and spoke in objection to the application.

Resolved:

REFUSE to grant permission on the following grounds:

- (1) The proposal would be contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, SP6, HOU1, HOU5, HOU10, HOU14, HOU18, ENV3a, ENV5, COM1, COM2, COM3, COM4, IMP1 and IMP2 of the Ashford Local Plan 2030 and the National Planning Policy Framework and would therefore represent development contrary to

interests of acknowledged planning importance which are not considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the development cited by the applicant, for the following reasons:-

- (a) The proposed development would have a significant adverse visual impact on land forming part of the Low Weald National Landscape Character Area and the Biddenden and High Halden Farmlands Landscape Character Area (LCA), impacting upon its rural character that forms an important component of the setting of Biddenden and views of the village from the public rights of way. This is due both to the extent of encroachment into open countryside and the way the site slopes down towards open countryside which increases its prominence in the wider landscape, and to its undeveloped state. The erection of dwellings and infrastructure on the site would unacceptably urbanise and domesticate this important undeveloped area to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. The proposal would also be highly visible from the public rights of way thereby exacerbating the visual harm. The proposal represents unsustainable development which would detract from the character and appearance of the countryside and visual amenity of the area.
- (b) The proposed development would extend the existing looped cul-de-sac known as Townlands Close resulting in a poorly connected and sprawling form of development which would be inconsistent with local character and built form in this part of the village which is characterised by 'tight' modern cul-de-sac development off North Street. This would be at odds with the prevailing form and grain of this part of the village and would further exacerbate the visual harm identified in reason a) above.
- (c) The proposed development fails to provide a range and mix of dwelling types and sizes with all units for private sale being large detached units with either four or five bedrooms and the affordable housing confined to smaller units. This mix results in a non-tenure blind development which is exacerbated by the poorer elevational treatment to the affordable homes where the quality materials/treatment do not extend to all elevations unlike in the homes for private sale. This would be socially and environmentally unsustainable causing harm to the area.
- (d) The proposal fails to provide an acceptable level of affordable housing contrary to the development plan and resulting in a socially unsustainable form of development by failing to meet the housing needs of the borough

(e) The necessary planning obligation identified in Table 1 has not been entered into so that the proposed development is unacceptable by virtue of failing to mitigate its impact and failing to meet demand for services and facilities that would be generated and the reasonable costs of monitoring the performance of the necessary obligations:

- i. 40% Affordable housing
- ii. Libraries
- iii. Sports - outdoors
- iv. Informal/natural space
- v. Play space
- vi. Strategic Parks
- vii. Health care infrastructure
- viii. Community learning
- ix. Youth services
- x. Social care

Working with the Applicant

In accordance with paragraphs 38 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and creative manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service,
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application
- where possible suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome,
- informing applicants/agents of any likely recommendation of refusal prior to a decision and,
- by adhering to the requirements of the Development Management Customer Charter.

In this instance

- the applicant/agent was updated of any issues after the initial site visit,
- was provided with pre-application advice,
- The applicant was provided the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme/ address issues.
- The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

Application Number	19/00064/AS		
Location	Tudor Cottage, Calleywell Lane, Aldington, Ashford, Kent, TN25 7DU		
Grid Reference	606336.9/137352.3		
Parish Council	Aldington		
Ward	Saxon Shore		
Application Description	Construction of new dwelling with revised access and detached garage		
Applicant	Mr Skinner, Tudor Cottage, Calleywell Lane, Aldington, Ashford, Kent, TN25 7DU		
Agent	JPD Architecture Ltd, Tower farm House, Faversham Road, Ashford, Kent, TN25 4HT		
Site Area	0.24 ha		
<u>1st Consultation</u>			
(a) 4/14R; 1/S; 1+	(b) Parish Council R	(c) KCC (PROW) x; KH&T +; KCC (Bio) +	
<u>2nd Consultation</u>			
(a) 22/14R	(b) Parish Council R	(c) KH&T +; KCC (Bio) +	
<u>3rd Consultation</u>			
(a) 22/10R	(b) Parish Council R	(c) KH&T +	

The Development Management Manager directed Members' attention to the Update Report which included photographs to be referred to by one the speakers Mr Rix, details of an additional representation and a statement from the Applicant which was read out in full.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Rix, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He said he had three main points that he wanted to raise. Firstly, this site was not within safe walking distance of Aldington. His first photograph showed the application site and road side TPO trees adjacent to Tudor Cottage. The rural location was in the hamlet of Stonestreet Green on OS maps, not in Aldington. Photographs 2, 3 and 4 showed the high verges on both sides of Calleywell Lane with no pedestrian footways making walking unsafe and in fact dangerous at the brow of the hill. The proposed development was contrary to Policy HOU5 of the Local Plan and to NPPF Paragraph 79. The second point was that there was limited visibility looking north from the proposed access as shown in photograph 5. In view of a recent report by a chartered transport planner, there was clearly no robust justification within the Applicant's submitted report to reduce the sightlines from those required for a 60 mph road. Thirdly, the size of the proposed house did not in his view, despite assurances given in writing in January, take in to account that the adjacent garden of Symnel Cottage immediately to the north was the only garden in Kent, Surrey or Sussex to host a national rose collection designated as an historic national plant collection by Plant Heritage – a charity fronted by the Prince of Wales to maintain plant biodiversity. The garden was mentioned in several books from 1993 onwards and was illustrated on the tourism pages of the Council's website. Visitors in recent years had included those from Europe and the United States as they were able to view the largest collection of Alba Roses in the world. Because the proposed main building would be eight metres high, due south and the site was within 35m of several ancient roses, it would block the important late Autumn sun which was essential to harden off the fresh growth of the historic roses before the winter frost and many would not survive if this went ahead. Photograph 9 showed the proposal to scale and he considered the problem was made worse by the amended position now being in front of a line drawn between the two adjacent properties (shown at photograph 10). He said that the amended position of the proposed new house did not take into account the impact on, and harm to, an adjacent national asset and he therefore urged the Committee to reject this application.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Fowler of Aldington and Bonnington Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. He advised that the Parish Council believed this application did not comply with Policy HOU10 in that the siting of the proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the visual aspect, separation and existing pattern of development which was made up of older style properties, whilst this was a new design that would detract from the small number of very well separated older style properties. The Parish Council was also deeply concerned that giving permission to this application would set a precedent for other householders with similar large gardens in close proximity to follow suit and destroy the character of the location. He also did not believe the application corresponded with NPPF Paragraph 78 as it would not enhance or maintain the vitality of a rural community, nor would it be an affordable property. It would also not comply with Paragraph 79 in any respect. In terms of distances and Policy HOU5, as mentioned by the previous speaker, the dwelling was some 1200m walking distance to the local school and 860m from the nearest bus stop – the first nearly 400m of which were up hill and along a road with a national speed limit and verges that were very difficult to walk on, so this journey would be extremely hazardous. Volumes of traffic as high as 90 movements (morning) and 173 movements (afternoon) had

been recorded at peak school periods on the Parish Council's own device as well as an average speed of 40mph within the 30mph zone, and a maximum speed of 80mph. Mentions of the proposed entrance in the application were considered misleading at best as this was a gateway with no made up surface and partially obstructed by a tree. To achieve a road access would entail crossing a KCC owned verge plus permission for destruction of at least one TPO tree plus other hedgerows and potentially damage the root system of other protected trees. The site was also close to a bend, so vehicles travelling at speed up Calleywell Lane towards Aldington would be difficult if not impossible to spot in time to enable a safe exit, particularly larger vehicles with a longer stopping distance. In conclusion he wanted to add that Aldington was not opposed to all development and was already actively working towards its contribution towards the Ashford Local Plan 2030 with a first site already submitted.

Resolved:

REFUSE to grant permission on the following grounds:

- (1) The proposal is contrary to Policies SP1, SP6 and HOU5 of the Ashford Local Plan 2030 and Central Government guidance contained in the NPPF and would therefore be contrary to interests of acknowledged planning importance for the following reasons: -
 - (a) The proposed dwelling by virtue of its location outside the built up confines of Aldington, the absence of a footpath and rising topography would result in the inability of future occupants to easily access basic day-to-day services within the village and would therefore give rise to an unnecessary and unsustainable new home in the countryside which would result in over-reliance on the private motor car to access these everyday services, contrary to the core principles of the Local Plan and the NPPF which seek to promote sustainable development in rural areas and avoid isolated homes in the countryside.
 - (b) The proposed development by virtue of its siting, design, form, bulk and scale would represent a visually incongruous form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape.

Note to Applicant

1. Working with the Applicant

In accordance with paragraphs 38 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service,

- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application
- where possible suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome,
- informing applicants/agents of any likely recommendation of refusal prior to a decision and,
- by adhering to the requirements of the Development Management Customer Charter.

In this instance:

1. The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.
-

Application Number	19/00871/AS	
Location	61 Bryony Drive, Kingsnorth, Ashford, Kent, TN23 3RF	
Grid Reference	01444/39140	
Parish Council	Kingsnorth	
Ward	Park Farm South Ward	
Application Description	Single storey rear extension; first floor & front extension over garage.	
Applicant	Mr W Munyemweri	
Agent	Mr C McMullon, Sevenscroft Ltd, 277 Canterbury Road, Kennington, TN24 9QW	
Site Area	0.03 ha	
(a) 5/-	(b) S	(c) -

Withdrawn at the request of the Applicant.

Queries concerning these Minutes?

Please contact membersservices@ashford.gov.uk

Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: www.ashford.moderngov.co.uk

This page is intentionally left blank