
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 24 September 2015 from 7.00 - 10.58 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Mark Ellen, Sue Gent, James Hall, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Lesley Ingham, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Ben Stokes.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Peter Bell, Amanda Berger-North, Philippa Davies, James Freeman, Andrew Jeffers, Ross McCardle, Alun Millard, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Monique Bonney, Bowles, Mick Galvin, Gerry Lewin, Padmini Nissanga, David Simmons, Ghlin Whelan and Councillor John Wright.

APOLOGY: Councillor Prescott.

240 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 September 2015 (Minute Nos. 188 - 191) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to deleting the word 'The' before the word 'She' on the third paragraph of page 186.

241 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Peter Marchington declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of the Planning Working Group item, 15/500819/FULL, Land adjoining Driftwood, Imperial Drive, Warden. Councillor Marchington left the room during consideration of this item.

Councillor Bryan Mulhern declared a pecuniary interest in respect of item 2.10, 14/504619/FULL, Macknade Garden Centre, Canterbury Road, Faversham as he worked for a competitive brewery. Councillor Mulhern left the Chair, and the room during consideration of this item. Following nomination and voting by Members Councillor Andy Booth took the Chair for the item.

242 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 September 2015 (Minute Nos. 211 - 214) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Andy Booth's apologies.

15/503738/FULL 9 Woodside, Dunkirk, ME13 9NY

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

Resolved: That application 15/503738/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.

The Minutes of the Reconvened Meeting held on 21 September 2015 (Minute Nos. 220 - 222) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Mike Baldock's and Councillor Andy Booth's apologies.

15/502716/FULL Breach Farm Paddocks, Land north-east of Breach Farm Bungalow, Breach Lane, Upchurch, ME9 7PE

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

The Senior Planner reported that Kent County Council (KCC) Biodiversity had no objection to the application, subject to information regarding any potential for reptiles on the site. He drew attention to the tabled report and specifically to condition (2) which sought to secure the required survey and any remediation works prior to occupation of the site. The report also provided details of recent changes to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

KCC Archaeology had no objection. KCC Highways had clarified that they had examined the right location, and still had no objection.

The Senior Planner reported that Newington Parish Council and Upchurch Parish Council objected to the application. The objection from Newington Parish Council had previously been sent to Members. The Senior Planner outlined the following comments from Upchurch Parish Council: this was a large plot of land which could lead to further applications; the access was very poor; concern over what the remaining container would be used for; and concern that there was a plan to erect an amenity building.

The Ward Members spoke in objection to the application and made the following comments: new gypsy and traveller policy stated that a person who leaves a nomadic life was not defined as a gypsy, but it appeared that the applicant wanted to live at the site; this should be a temporary permission, as noted in paragraph 5.04 in the report for 3 September 2015; if this was approved, conditions should stipulate that the dilapidated buildings on the site were removed; landscaping was not a 'cure all'; position of buildings on the site made them very visible to local residents and from Breach Lane; the container's orientation needed to be changed; landscaping on other sites had not addressed being able to see what was on the site; buildings would become more visible in winter months, evergreens were not native; acknowledged that the applicant had owned the site for many years; do not want to see the site expanded further to this application; this was harsh on the landscape; this application should have gone through the agricultural/farming route; inequality between what was permitted for gypsy and travellers compared to the

settled community; there were numerous sites now in rural areas around Newington, the rural aspect had changed; would prefer a temporary permission; different orientation of buildings was needed and needed to bear in mind that landscaping was not effective.

Members made the following comments: concerned with traffic on local roads near to the site, they were very narrow, and more traffic should not be encouraged; visual impact of the site from Breach Lane, and beyond; sloped site made the site visible; subtle landscaping was needed, so it was not obviously attempting to conceal the site; this had a visually detrimental impact on the surrounding area; this had scored highly on the methodology; this application was dated prior to the new policy, and the applicant did travel; the site needed to be as tidy as possible, with only one container on it, painted so that it blended with the landscape; an option to mitigate the site standing out so much would be to lower the high ground, rather than vice-versa if necessary; this was not an unreasonable site; other buildings were a long way from it; sites needed to be found, and this was a good one; and site was open, on raised ground.

Councillor Bryan Mulhern moved a motion to add a condition to alter the colour of the static caravan and container to blend in with the countryside. Councillor Bobbin supported the option of lowering the site, rather than raising it, if it needed to be flattened. These was agreed by Members.

In response to the comments above, the Senior Planner advised that the recent changes to the gypsy and traveller policy did not affect the determination of the application; it was a good site and it had met the required test.

Resolved: That application 15/502716/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report and additional conditions to alter the colour of the static caravan and container to blend in with the countryside, and the option of lowering the site, rather than raising it, if it needed to be flattened.

15/500819/FULL Land adjoining Driftwood, Imperial Drive, Warden, ME12 4SE

The Senior Planner advised, in response to a query raised at the site meeting, that the refused 1996 scheme included a significant part of the site that had been allocated as a play area. He explained that this bit of land did not form part of the current application site.

The Senior Planner reported that additional letters of objection had been received. Issues not already set out in the report included: the consultation process had not been carried out properly, the Senior Planner confirmed that it had; parking issues, and the impact on access for emergency vehicles; the highway network was inadequate; distances from neighbouring properties were lower than the standard 21 metre ruling; and measures to avoid overlooking did not seem to be applied on this application. The Senior Planner advised that the measurement was related to rear-to-rear distances and he stated that the proposed dwellings fronting Imperial Drive were more than 21 metres from the dwellings to the north. He further advised that the terrace was in excess of 20 metres from the dwellings fronting Cliff View Drive. The distance from Whitecaps to the proposed terrace was 10 metres. He

advised that due to the angle between the dwellings, overlooking was unlikely to occur, and this was also relevant between Driftwood and the proposed terrace.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

Ward Members made the following comments: this was overintensification and overlooking, particularly the terrace; this was unsuitable for the site; the plot was large enough for three houses, not five; this would have a negative impact on highways; overcrowding; access for emergency vehicles was at risk; insufficient parking; affect on residents' privacy; and it was large and unnecessary.

In response to a question, the KCC Highways Officer explained that as this was an application for only five dwellings, accessed from an unclassified road, this did not meet the criteria whereby KCC Highways would be consulted on the application. He added that he considered five additional dwellings was not likely to have a material impact on the volume of traffic on the highway network.

Members made the following comments: this was not a particularly large site, could not see how five properties would fit on it, three houses would fit better; the roads were already busy in the area; parking issues; insufficient parking, so cars would park on the road; the development was not in keeping with other houses in the area; and the area was poorly serviced by public transport.

In response to a question, the Development Manager confirmed that the 1996 application had a 'slither' extra of land in addition to the site for this application.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was lost.

The Head of Planning advised that any reasons for refusal needed to be specific planning reasons, that identified a demonstrable harm, such as impact on streetscene etc.

The Development Manager advised that the 1996 refusal was dismissed on appeal because of the impact on the land to the east of the site. He explained though that this application did not encroach on the play area. He suggested that the form of the development could be a reason for refusal, i.e. terracing was different to other development in the area.

Discussion ensued on the reasons for refusal.

A Member suggested that officers and the applicant negotiated further to get a resolution.

The Head of Planning advised that to reduce the amount of dwellings on the site would mean having a further planning application submitted; this one needed to be determined first.

Councillor Bryan Mulhern moved the following reason for refusal: That the application be refused on the grounds that it was overintensive compared to neighbouring properties; it gave rise to overlooking; it caused demonstrable harm to

the street scene; and it was not in keeping with neighbouring properties, and was out of character, with the surrounding area. This was seconded by Councillor Andy Booth and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 15/502716/FULL be refused on the grounds that it was overintensive compared to neighbouring plots giving rise to overlooking; demonstrable harm to the street scene; and it was not in keeping, and out of character, with the surrounding area.

243 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/504083/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of a single storey rear extension and detached garage to side as amended by drawings RVS-0515-02 Sheets 1 and 2 Revision C received 7 September 2015.			
ADDRESS Potters Corner, Dawes Road, Dunkirk Kent ME13 9TL			
WARD	PARISH/TOWN	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr
Boughton & Courtenay	Dunkirk		And Mrs C Reeves
			AGENT CJS
			Design Services

Councillor Peto, representing Dunkirk Parish Council, spoke against the application.

The Chairman moved the officer’s recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

A Ward Member objected to the application and considered as the roads were narrow, that KCC Highways should have commented. In response, the KCC Highways Officer confirmed that the application did not have the criteria for it to be considered by KCC Highways and that Planning Officers were considered competent enough to determine the effects of any highway issues on this size of development.

Another Ward Member considered there should be comments from Planning Officers on highway matters within the report. He sought clarification on the parking spaces. The Ward Member considered the road at this point to be busy and dangerous, and that the development was overintensive.

The Area Planning Officer explained that the width of the parking area was sufficient in this case where vehicles were likely to park more closely together than they would do if it was a public car park. He confirmed that it was likely that one car would park in the garage and two outside.

Resolved: That application 15/504083/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 15/502969/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Additional garaging with hobby workshop and domestic storage over		
ADDRESS Fairlea Warden Road Eastchurch Kent ME12 4EX		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr Malcolm Magenty AGENT Kent Design Partnership

This application was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 15/502729/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Retention of two replacement chalets, nos. 84 and 85 (retrospective)		
ADDRESS Seaview Holiday Park, Warden Bay Road, Leysdown Kent ME12 4NB		
WARD Leysdown & Warden	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Leysdown	APPLICANT Wickland (Holdings) Ltd AGENT Forward Planning And Development Ltd

A Ward Member spoke against 12 month occupancy at the site.

The Development Manager outlined the history of the site and explained that the previous Lawful Development Certificate established that there was no occupancy condition on chalet nos. 81-89, as reported in paragraph 8.04 in the report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

Resolved: That application 15/502729/FULL be approved (no conditions required).

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/505666/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing outbuilding. Proposed change of use of existing outbuildings to form two holiday lets with additional onsite parking provision, as amended by drawing 14/2520/2B received 7 September 2015		
ADDRESS Bourne Place Stockers Hill Rodmersham Kent ME9 0PJ		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr And Mrs

West Downs	Rodmersham	Tim Bishop AGENT Nigel Sands And Associates
------------	------------	---

Mr Matthew Pamplin, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Ward Member spoke against the application. She referred to paragraph 9.02 in the report and raised concern with highway issues and parking on the blind bend. The Ward Member read out a letter from Kent Police which also raised serious issues of parking on the road, pedestrians unable to use the footpath because of parked cars, and the road becoming a single carriageway because of parked cars on the blind bend. She considered this was not a suitable location for holiday lets due to access issues to the properties, and raised safety issues due to lack of accessibility to emergency vehicles. If the application was approved, the Ward Member requested that parking restrictions be put in place to stop parking to the front because of the dangerous access. She sought clarification of gating/access.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved a motion for a site meeting and this was seconded by Councillor Peter Marchington. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

A Member requested that more details be provided in terms of a full parking area drawing.

Resolved: That application 15/505666/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 15/505662/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of two storey side extension with light lantern, roof extension, creation of basement, insertion of lift, erection of porch, insertion of Hydrotherapy Pool and changes to fenestration and doors.		
ADDRESS Kennelling House Kennelling Road Stalisfield Kent ME13 0JQ		
WARD East Downs Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Stalisfield	APPLICANT Mr David Breaker AGENT Cyma Architects Ltd.

This application was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 15/504681/FULL
APPLICATION PROPOSAL
Erection of rear garden fence.

ADDRESS 13 Preston Park Faversham Kent ME13 8LH		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham	APPLICANT Mr Nigel Kay AGENT FDA Chartered Architects

This application was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 15/505252/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Variation of conditions 1 and 2 of APP/V2255/C/11/2167577 - to remove reference to "a limited period being the period of 4 years from the date of this decision" from condition 1; and "or at the end of 4 years" from condition 2.		
ADDRESS Horseshoe Farm Elverland Lane Ospringe Kent ME13 0SP		
WARD East Downs Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ospringe	APPLICANT Mr Alfred Willet AGENT Philip Brown Associates

This application was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

2.8 REFERENCE NO - 15/503291/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Construction of a 3-bedroom 2 1/2 storey house with detached single garage and laundry room and parking spaces		
ADDRESS 59 The Leas Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 2NL		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster	APPLICANT Mr Colin Overington AGENT Kent Design Partnership - Architect

This application was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

2.9 REFERENCE NO - 15/506681/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Removal of condition 39 (requirement to complete open space - linear park and waterside park, prior to occupation of residential units) of SW/11/0159 - outline planning application for leisure and community buildings, 150 residential units; and incorporating detailed planning permission for a retail food store and petrol filling station.		
ADDRESS Sittingbourne Mill & Wharf Sites, Land Adj Milton Road, Mill Way and Charlotte Street, Sittingbourne Kent ME10 3ET		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Essential Land

		(Sittingbourne) Ltd AGENT Winckworth Sherwood LLP
--	--	--

A Ward Member raised concern with various aspects of the application that the developers had, in his assessment, reneged on, and now specifically that there may not be any green areas on the site.

Resolved: That application 15/506681/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (56) in the report.

2.10 REFERENCE NO - 14/504619/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing structures and erection of a restaurant/public house, associated residential accommodation, car park, access, landscaping and ancillary works.		
ADDRESS Macknade Garden Centre Canterbury Road Faversham Kent ME13 8LX		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham	APPLICANT Marston's Plc AGENT Mr Alan Hughes

Councillor Bryan Mulhern left the Chair for this item. Councillor Andy Booth took the Chair.

The Area Planning Officer reported that following amended plans, Faversham Town Council, after initially raising no objection, now objected to the application. They considered it would have an adverse effect on the vitality of the town centre; it would be harmful to the listed building and garden wall at Macknade Manor; and it would result in a significant increase in traffic at the junction of Canterbury Road and Selling Road.

The Agent had responded to the new comments and had stated that the application was fully supported by national policy and had met all criteria on town centres, listed buildings and highways.

The Area Planning Officer reported that two further letters of objection had been received and he outlined their comments as follows: this was overdevelopment of the site; impact on Read's Restaurant from the noise; possible abuse of Macknade Farm Shop parking; traffic had limited visibility to the east at the junction of the A2; it should be within walking distance of the town centre; and it will only attract passing trade.

The Environmental Health Manager had no objection to the application and considered noise levels would not have a substantial impact on amenity, subject to the recommendations in the noise report being adhered to.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the Planning Consultant had suggested revised wording to some of the conditions as below:

Condition 11 - that the BREEAM certificate be submitted within 6 months of the opening of the premises for practical reasons, in order to finish the necessary report.

Condition 14 – that the condition be amended to require that the noise mitigation measures adhere to the recommendations of the report, not simply to prevent nuisance, which would be far easier to measure or prove, and be more enforceable.

Condition 25 – that the access be required to be finished before the premises open to the public to save construction traffic damaging the finished arrangements.

He recommended these conditions be changed under delegated powers.

Mr Ben Martin, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Pritchard, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr John McElholm, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He supported the site being developed but considered this was not the right development. He wanted the rural integrity of the site to be preserved and raised the following points: there were already traffic issues in the area, this would make them worse; parking problems; pubs in the town centre already supplied food, and had family facilities; impact on neighbouring listed buildings; noise issues late at night; and 1am was unacceptable as a closing time.

Members made the following comments: this should be located in the town centre so that customers could walk to it; pubs outside towns were closing down; and local objectors should be taken into consideration.

In response to a question, the Conservation Officer explained that Macknade Manor was a very important complex, and the walled garden was very special. He stated the development would have an impact on the listed building and wall and their setting, and would be visible from the complex and there would be a noise impact. He explained that it was important to determine harm versus regeneration and whether it was appropriate to this setting.

Further comments from Members included: there needed to be more information on the listed building; this application would cause substantial harm, and not much public benefit; concerned with impact on a listed building; 7.30am was too early for the start of construction work; apprentices should be employed on the site; the site had been a mess for years; this could provide something Faversham had not got, a passing-trade pub; this was a good use of the site; impact on listed building was important, but the wall was high so this could address that; this would have an impact on the guests staying at Reads; concerned that access to site was by vehicle only; additional traffic on Selling Road; outside noise in a pub was horrific; and this was sited in the wrong location.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer advised with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework guidance on substantial harm against public benefits, the site had been derelict for 10 years and there had been a struggle to find anything that could be sited there.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following amendment: That the opening times be amended to 10am to midnight throughout the week. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt and the amendment was agreed by the Committee.

A Member from an adjoining Ward spoke against the application. He considered the effect on the listed building would be dreadful; there was already a wide choice of pubs in Faversham; and passing trade was not needed, people should be encouraged into the town centre.

The Area Planning Officer confirmed that the noise report was related to outside noise such as extractor fans; delivery vehicle noise, etc.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was lost.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds that the development would give rise to substantial harm to heritage assets that were not outweighed by any benefit, and a detrimental impact on an area that was generally rural. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Dendor and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 14/504619/FULL be refused on the grounds that the development would give rise to substantial harm to heritage assets that were not outweighed by any benefit, and a detrimental impact on an area that was generally rural.

2.11 & 2.12 REFERENCE NO - 15/504978/FULL & 15/504979/LBC		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of rear extension with glass roof, erection of garage to side, conversion of loft with insertion of dormer window to front elevation and various internal alterations as amended by drawings received 25 August 2015.		
ADDRESS Wreights Cottage The Mall Faversham Kent ME13 8JL		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Heaven AGENT Primefolio Ltd.

The Area Planning Officer reported that amended drawings had been received, and these were different to the ones that had been consulted upon. He outlined the ownership set up and right of way issues.

Faversham Town Council did not object to the revised plans, subject to an amendment to the drawings to show no flat roof was shown between the ridges on the existing roof. The Area Planning Officer advised that the drawing had been amended and condition (2) would need to be changed to include the new plan, 10D

was now 10E. Faversham Town Council also wanted to see evidence that there was a Right of Way over the parking space of the neighbouring property; he reminded Members that this was not a planning consideration.

One further letter of concern had been received which included the following comments: never previously been a vehicular access to the north of Wreights Cottage; use of garage would require right of way across land used for parking by Wreights House; it would reduce parking available to Wreights House; existing workshop and proposed enlargement to garage would obstruct light to a window in the coach house to Wreights House; inaccuracy of plans in relation to size of parking areas and this scheme would make an existing difficult situation worse, this had been a source of contention since 1979 when Wreights Cottage was split from Wreights House; and granting permission might mean that a new right of way could be created, prejudicing on-going negotiations.

The Area Planning Officer stated that virtually no objections had been received since the amended plans had been submitted.

Mr Heaven, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Mr David Iron, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for approval and this was seconded.

Resolved: That application 15/504978/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report, with an amendment to condition (2) to replace plan 10D with plan 10E.

Resolved: That application 15/504979/LBC be approved subject to conditions (1) to (8) in the report, with an amendment to condition (2) to replace plan 10D with plan 10E.

<p>2.13 & 2.14 REFERENCE NUMBERS: SW/14/0257 and SW/14/0301</p> <p>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</p> <p><i>Planning permission for:</i></p> <p>A) Outline component: Residential development for 330 dwellings with all matters reserved other than the means of access and realignment of the Oare Road and Ham Road junction on land at Oare Mineral Works (North of Oare Road and west and south of Ham Road) Faversham, Kent.</p> <p>B) Detailed component: Change of use from storage and vacant uses of the former Gunpowder Works Listed buildings to provide 873 square metres of offices, workshop-studios, storage, and 714 square meters of community uses (with retention of the 2 existing dwellings) including minor internal alterations to form or and washroom facilities and the formation of associated parking areas, earth bund engineering works, country park, landscaping, demolition of plant & buildings, illustrative details of landscaped parking area; on land at Oare Mineral Works (north of Oare Road and west</p>
--

and south of Ham Road), Faversham, Kent.

Please note this is an Environmental Impact Assessment Development. (In accordance with EIA Regulations 2011).

Listed building consent for:

The restoration and repair of all the listed former Gunpowder Works Buildings including minor internal alterations to form toilet and washroom facilities.

ADDRESS Land At Oare Gravel Works, Ham Road, Faversham, Kent, ME13 7TS

WARD Davington Priory	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham	APPLICANT Aggregates Ltd AGENT Mr Mick Drury	Brett
------------------------------	---	--	-------

With reference to paragraph 9.32 in the report, the Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to determine when the mitigation measures for potential impact on the Swale Special Protected Area from the Section 106 monies should be spent and control what it was spent on.

KCC Highways had seen the amended plans relating to the cluster of listed buildings and had no further comments. An additional representation had been received; this covered issues already outlined in the report on page 143, and also highlighted the impact of the development on already busy train services.

The Major Projects Officer reported that funding had been sought by KCC Highways for the improvements to the junction of the A2/A251 as a result of increased use from this development. The Agent did not consider it would add substantially to the traffic in that area, but nevertheless was willing to negotiate an appropriate developer contribution in respect of this matter.

The Major Projects Officer also advised that the agent had indicated a willingness to negotiate an appropriate contribution for off-site formal sports provision.

The Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to add conditions to ensure that the dwellings had the facility for superfast broadband to be installed; to control hours of construction, and hours of piling. He drew Members' attention to the tabled paper from the Faversham Sea Scouts. The Agent had provided amended plans for the cluster of listed buildings, and advised that Building G would be converted for the Sea Scouts. The Major Projects Officer explained that the proposed areas for birds to use within the lake would be moved to another lake. The Agent was happy to work alongside the Sea Scouts. Delegated authority was sought for the three further conditions and to resolving the Sea Scouts' issues as set out in the tabled letter, and to fine-tune the conditions and the Section 106 agreement as required.

Mr Ben Martin, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Denis Batson, an objector, spoke with concern on some aspects of the application relating to the Sea Scouts use of the site.

Mr Mick Drury, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The KCC Highways Officer outlined the options for the best vehicular access to the site. It had been suggested that the main site access should be located at the end of the Western Link rather than using a single access point at Ham Road which some thought would encourage traffic into the town centre. He explained that the Western Link access was a complex junction, and it would be difficult to form a workable access to the site. He explained that the Ham Road junction would be re-aligned, away from the school, to form an acceptable junction complying with current design standards, and that the volume of traffic using Priory Row was not expected to be any different than if the access was opposite the Western Link.

The Ward Member spoke in support of the application. Councillor Mike Henderson moved a motion for the following amendments and addendums. These were seconded by Councillor Andy Booth. On being put to the vote, the motion was agreed.

1. Car park to provide minimum 40 spaces together with suitably designed drop-off point for school.
2. Management plan for country park was good. Structure and cost of management company needed to be agreed as part of Section 106 to ensure that the continuing management of the country park had suitable environmental expertise and managed objectively for the benefit of the whole of Faversham.
3. To assist traffic flow KCC should provide double yellow lines the full length of both sides of Oare Road.
4. At the reserved matters stage of the application must consider in detail the design of individual houses and the whole layout together with density in all areas and height of buildings. Should indicate now that 3-storey houses were not acceptable.
5. Phasing – initial making safe, secure and structural support of listed buildings must be carried out before first house was occupied. Then full structural restoration of listed buildings carried out before 75 houses occupied and completion of works to listed buildings except for internal finishing before 159 houses were occupied.
6. Footpath along Oare Road and tree screening for Windmill Lane should be completed before the first house was occupied and other general site landscaping carried out early in the development. This was to be delegated to officers.
7. Sports provision should be on site, not money provided for off-site provision and this should include a grass pitch area and a modest changing room/community centre.
8. Section 106 agreement to be delegated to officers with consultation with Chairman of Planning Committee and Ward Councillor.
9. Should include detail by condition to replace code for sustainable homes to include all the main requirements of good sustainability.
10. Condition the provision of fast broadband.
11. Insist in Section 106 agreement provision of local workforce and apprenticeships which developer was at present resisting.
12. Wording of landscaping conditions 7, 15, 36 to read... 'which shall be native species to encourage wildlife and improve biodiversity'.

13. Condition use of existing site entry for all construction traffic.

The Cabinet Member for Environmental and Rural Affairs spoke in support of the application and welcomed any mitigating actions to reduce the impact on the air quality management area in Ospringle. Members of the Committee agreed with this.

Resolved: That application SW/14/0257 be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (56) in the report, with the inclusion of the above amendments and addendums.

Resolved: That application SW/14/0301 be approved subject to conditions (1) to (12) in the report, with the inclusion of the above amendments and addendums, where appropriate.

2.15 REFERENCE NO - 14/505230/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Variation of conditions 2 and 4 of planning permission SW/11/0496 to provide one additional mobile home on the site (3 statics and one touring caravan in total), and security lighting to the front entrance of the site.			
ADDRESS Jack Russell Place Halstow Lane Upchurch Kent ME9 7AB			
WARD	Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mrs Georgina Beaney AGENT

This application was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/504839/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Removal of existing timber windows and installation of new brown UPVC windows			
ADDRESS Tannery Court Kings Mill Close Sittingbourne Kent ME10 2AZ			
WARD	Milton Regis	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Amicus Horizon AGENT

The Senior Planner reported that a further representation had been received in support, from the residents' association.

Mr Parks, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Conservation Officer considered the use of UPVC in this setting was unsustainable and would detract from the setting.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for refusal and this was seconded.

A Ward Member spoke in support of the officer recommendation.

In response to a question, it was advised that the alternative to UPVC with its benefits of keeping the inside of the building warm, was double-glazed wooden frames.

Resolved: That application 15/504839/FULL be refused for the reasons stated in the report.

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 15/503633/FULL					
APPLICATION PROPOSAL					
Change of use of holiday caravan park to residential caravan park					
ADDRESS Red Lion Caravan Park London Road Dunkirk Kent ME13 9LL					
WARD	PARISH/TOWN	COUNCIL	APPLICANT	Mr	Horace
Boughton & Courtenay	Dunkirk		Gaskin		
			AGENT RPS		

The Area Planning Officer reported that SBC's Tourism Officer was not aware of the site being registered for marketing purposes.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for refusal and this was seconded.

Councillor Tutt, representing Dunkirk Parish Council, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Guy Bailey, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Ward Members spoke in support of the application. They stated the site and quality of the buildings was good, and it was well shielded by surrounding trees, and was a sustainable site; it was not a holiday site, and there was a need for low cost accommodation.

Members made the following comments: these were park homes, not caravans; it was a well kept site; it was sustainable; this should have the same rights as gypsy and traveller sites; this was a housing development, and would set a precedent; and if we wanted a 5-year housing supply, then have a 12 month residency, but this was absurd, other requests would then come in.

The Area Planning Officer outlined the planning history of the site, and advised that it had never been used as a holiday site, but seemingly had been used wrongly for the last few years.

The Head of Planning explained that this situation was apparent in sites across the Borough, and involved a lot of reconnaissance by Enforcement Officers. He stressed the importance of being consistent with the Local Plan.

Resolved: That application 15/503633/FULL be refused for the reasons stated in the report.

PART 5

Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

- **Item 5.1 – Bowl Reed, Oad Street, Borden**

This was considered at the reconvened meeting on 29 September 2015.

244 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders in order that the Planning Committee could complete its business.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel