

**Representation**

One representation has been received from Councillor Paine raising the following comments who is unable to attend the committee meeting.

*"I apologise for not being able to make it to the meeting to make my comments in person. I am a council representative for Action with Communities in Rural Kent and their AGM clashes with the date that this item comes to committee. Firstly, I wish to re-iterate that this item was called in by me, not Cllr Beerling. That said, I understand that the concerns I raised are shared by all three of Fant's members. Regarding these concerns - I am extremely grateful for all the work Kevin Hope has put in since I first called this application in. His negotiations have significantly improved the scheme, and I am particularly pleased with proposals for improved landscaping and a reduction of hard standing. It is unfortunate that there were no pre-application discussions with ward members on this site - I am sure we could have saved the neighbours a lot of grief. I agree that an acoustic noise assessment is not necessary for this site (whilst the A26 is busy, this estate is set back a fair distance). I think the comments about the character assessment are fair, but I still urge the Council to consider this area for a pilot 'Neighbourhood Plan'. I think the scheme being recommended for approval is better as a result of the work done by officers since the application came in, but I welcome any further improvements to reduce the impact this development may have on neighbours".*

**Officer Comment**

As stated above, the report states that this application was called in to planning committee by Councillor Beerling. This is incorrect and I would like to amend this to Councillor Paine.

On a separate matter, the report states in paragraphs 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 that the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings within plots B and C would be sited approximately 30m from the rear of the properties within Upper Fant Road. This distance is in fact approximately 40m and I would therefore like to amend this detail within paragraphs 5.6.1 and 5.6.2.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**My recommendation remains unchanged:**

**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions**