#### **FAVERSHAM TOWN COUNCIL**

## PLANNING SCHEDULE – 26th June 2023

#### THERE WERE NO DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Number: Location and Subject

23/502525/TPOA O/S 21 THE LEAS, FAVERSHAM

(WARD: ST. ANN'S)

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER APPLICATION: T2 – ALDER (TAG891) REDUCE CROWN BY 2-2.5 METRES THIS WILL LEAVE A SPREAD OF APPROX.. 4METRES AND HEIGHT OF 8METRES. COMPACTED UNION,

STABLE AT TIME OF INSPECTION Recommendation: No Objection

**Condition:** 

1) The Town Council has no objection to this application on condition that the Tree Officer is happy with the proposal

23/502592/TCA QUEEN ELIZABETH SCHOOL, ABBEY PLACE,

**FAVERSHAM** 

(Ward: Abbey)

Conservation area notification: Red Oak T1 – Fell and replant. Reasons include: the trees health is in deterioration, proposed work includes a pathway across the garden area and the tree and roots will interfere with the path in the future

**Recommendation: Objection** 

Reasons:

- 1) The diversion of a footpath is not a sufficient reason to fell a tree.
- 2) The application states that the trees health is in deterioration, but this statement is not quantified by an arborist report.

#### Comments:

1) There are other trees in the vicinity and members raised concerns about how they would be affected by the path.

- 2) Rather then excavating to lay the pathway it could be raised above the ground avoiding disturbance to the trees.
- 3) The construction of the path would be engineering works and a planning application should be submitted. It would have been helpful to have considered the application concurrently.

#### 23/502667/TCA

# **R/O 11 CHART CLOSE, FAVERSHAM**

(Ward: St. Ann's)

Conservation area notification: Medium sized ash tree on SBC land across the path form our front lawn and leaning towards the house. Reduce the tree by 30% to maintain its overall shape, but checking the growth towards the house.

**Recommendation: No Objection** 

## Condition:

1) The Town Council has no objection on condition that the Tree Officer is happy with the proposal.

## Comment:

1) Members noted that the tree is on SBC land. It was not apparent from the application that permission to undertake the work had been gained and the relevant officer should be notified.

#### 23/501965/FULL

# GARAGES ADJACENT TO ELLIOTTS HOUSE, ELLIOTTS PLACE, FAVERSHAM

(WARD: ABBEY)

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGES AND ERECTION OF 1NO. TOW BEDROOM CHALET BUNGALOW WITH DORMERS AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING

**Recommendation: Objection** 

#### Reasons:

- 1) The chalet bungalow design is not suitable for infill in the Conservation Area, any development here should enhance the CA and this does not.
- 2) Members shared the concerns raised by residents regarding the parking at the front of the proposed property. They agreed that there is not room for a car to turn round on the site.

## 23/502151/FULL

# REAR OF 39A THE MALL, FAVERSHAM

(WARD: WATLING)

ALTERATIONS TO SHOPFRONT TO ALLOW USE AS

ARTIST STUDIOS (CLASS E), INCLUDING

CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SHOPFRONTS BEHIND SHUTTERS TO THE NELSON STREET ELEVATION,

INSERTION OF DOUBLE DOORS TO THE

REPLACEMENT OF PROFILED SHEET ROOFING

**Recommendation: No Objection** 

## 23/502293/FULL

# 53 OSPRINGE STREET, FAVERSHAHM

(WARD: WATLING)

INSTALLATION OF A DROPPED KERB AND CREATION

OF A DRIVEWAY

**Recommendation: Objection** 

Reason:

1) There is not sufficient room to use the proposed driveway. Vehicles would need to be parked at a right angle to the property and then the three existing car parking spaces would not be usable.

#### Comment:

1) Members request explanation of where vehicles that park in the three existing spaces presently would be parked if this proposal was approved.

## 23/502519/FULL

## **2 HATCH STREET, FAVERSHAM**

(WARD: ST. ANN'S)

INSERTION OF FRONT AND REAR REPLACEMENT

**WINDOWS** 

**Recommendation: Objection** 

Reasons:

 The proposed replacement windows are of poor design. More appropriately designed windows are readily available. The UPVC is too thick for the window size.

## Comment:

1) The window detail on the elevation is not correct, it would be thicker as per the details submitted.

\*\*\*\*