
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 20 July 2017 from 7.00 pm - 9.50 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth (Vice-Chairman), Tina Booth (Substitute for Councillor Nigel Kay), Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman), Prescott and Ghlin Whelan.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Andy Byrne, James Freeman, Andrew Jeffers, Kellie MacKenzie, Andrew Spiers, Adrian Truss, Steve Wilcock and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Gerry Lewin and John Wright.

APOLOGY: Councillor Nigel Kay.

111 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman ensured that those present were aware of the emergency evacuation procedure.

112 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 June 2017 (Minute Nos. 56 – 64) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Minute No. 61:

Item 3.2 15/505069/FULL “The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to **refuse** the application and this was seconded”, not “approve” as stated.

Item 3.3 17/500313/OUT the last comment on paragraph six should read “this was the largest area of ancient woodland in the **county**” not “country” as stated.

113 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

114 DEFERRED ITEMS

Def Item 1 REFERENCE NO - 17/500397/FULL
APPLICATION PROPOSAL
Conversion of existing 3 bedroom dwelling into 1no one bedroom flat and 1no. two bedroom flat, including the erection of a two storey and single storey rear extension.
ADDRESS The Laurels, Darlington Drive, Minster-on-Sea, ME12 3LF

WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN Minster-On-Sea	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Lambkin AGENT Woodstock Associates
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	---

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

A Ward Member considered that the Kent County Council (KCC) parking policy only worked if the development was within a town, as public transport was not so accessible within a village. He considered that two reduced size parking spaces would be better than one space.

Some Members considered it not unreasonable for two parking spaces to be provided.

Resolved: That application 17/500397/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (4) in the report.

Def Item 2 REFERENCE NO - 16/508117/OUT			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Outline application (with access being sought) for up to 62 dwellings including details of vehicular access.			
ADDRESS The Slips, Scocles Road, Minster-on-sea, Kent, ME12 3SN.			
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN Minster-On-Sea	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Parker AGENT BDB Design LLP

The Major Projects Officer reported that contrary to the recommendation on page 13 of the Committee report, the further comments from KCC Highways and Transportation had been received, as set out on page 14 of the Committee report. They raised no objection, subject to the relevant conditions and Section 106 clauses also as set out in the Committee report.

Parish Councillor John Stanford, representing Minster Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr Michael Blee, an objector, spoke against the application.

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

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Ward Members raised comments which included: the Local Plan Inspector had approved so had to concede defeat, but considered that 62 properties was too many; there were already traffic issues along Scocles Road with vehicles not being able to pass buses; and hoped that the number of properties proposed could be reduced to 50.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following addendum: "That the further condition outlined in paragraph 3.05, on page 15 of the Committee report, be imposed." This is outlined below:

The development shall be carried out in accordance with an agreed phasing plan detailing the delivery of the housing so that occupation of no more than 22 dwellings takes place prior to the Lower Road/Barton Hill Drive roundabout becoming operational.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring that the necessary highway infrastructure is in place prior to the full traffic impact of the housing development.

This was seconded by Councillor Mike Dendor. On being put to the vote the addendum was agreed.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: considered the application was acceptable; concerned that if we approved the application now, we would not have grounds to reduce the number of dwellings provided at the Reserved Matters stage; inappropriate density of dwellings for the area; the proposed roundabout on Lower Road [at the junction with Barton Hill Drive] would not “free-up” traffic along Scocles Road; and further development to this already over-developed area would cause further issues for local residents.

In response to questions from a Member, the Major Projects Officer explained that when the Reserved Matters application was received, it would be sent out for consultation and subject to any objections it may need to be considered by the Planning Committee. If Members considered 62 dwellings was too many they would need to provide substantive planning reasons to support a potential refusal of planning permission and to allow a good case to be made at a possible appeal.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(5) a recorded vote was taken on the motion and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Bobbin, Roger Clark, Mike Dendor, Nicholas Hampshire, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern and Ghlin Whelan. Total equals 9.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Andy Booth, Richard Darby, James Hall, Tina Booth and Peter Marchington. Total equals 7.

Abstain: Councillor Prescott. Total equals one.

The motion to approve the application was won.

Resolved: That application 16/508117/OUT be approved subject to conditions (1) to (30) in the report, and the phasing condition set out at paragraph 3.05 of the agenda and the signing of a suitably worded Section 106 Agreement. With authority to amend condition wording and Section 106 Agreement clauses as required.

Def Item 3 REFERENCE NO - 16/501266/FULL

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Erection on land to the north of 99 High Street of 124 No. dwellings in total including two storey 2, 3, and 4 bedroom dwellings and 1 and 2 bedroom apartments (2 no. 3 storey blocks) with a new access road from the High Street, pedestrian and cycle link to

Church Lane, formal and informal areas of open space and landscaping, car parking and amenity space.			
ADDRESS 99 High Street And Land To The North Of High Street Newington Kent ME9 7JJ			
WARD	Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Persimmon Homes South East Ltd AGENT
		Newington	

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to the tabled papers, which had previously been emailed to Members, and which included reference to an additional letter from a local resident raising concerns about the increase in traffic on local roads, and also responses from the Council’s Environmental Protection Team Leader to Professor Peckham’s and Councillor John Wright’s comments in respect of air quality.

The Major Projects Officer reported that just prior to the meeting they had received a request from the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) to defer the application as they did not consider Members had received all the information in respect of air quality. The Major Projects Officer stated that officers were of the view that Members had sufficient information to enable them to make a decision. Members were asked to approve the application, subject to minor amendments to the Section 106 Agreement, as required, and wording of the planning conditions.

Parish Councillor Stephen Harvey, representing Newington Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr Richard Knox-Johnston, an objector, spoke against the application.

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

The Environmental Protection Team Leader reiterated his response to Professor Peckham as outlined in the tabled paper.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

A Ward Member spoke against the application and raised points which included: there was a lack of mitigation measures with regard to air quality for the High Street; Medway Council objected to the proposal on air pollution grounds and they considered it would have a detrimental impact on the Rainham Air Quality Management Area (AQMA); residents should be made aware to avoid the High Street during the brick earth extraction period as the Council’s Environmental Protection Team Leader was concerned air pollution levels would be elevated during that period; it had been agreed that the windows for the properties at the former Newington Men’s Club should not open out into the High Street due to air quality concerns; a suggestion had been made at the air quality meeting held in February 2017 that reducing the speed limit to 20 mph would reduce air pollution by 80%; other mitigation measures such as funding for buses should be explored; there would be some harm to human health as a consequence of this development; if Members were minded to approve the application, please put mitigation measures

in to safeguard the health of local residents. Another Ward Member considered that it was not within the “gift” of this application to deal with all of the air quality issues raised.

In response to concerns raised by a Ward Member, the Environmental Protection Team Leader stated that whilst he sympathised with his concerns and would like to include his suggested mitigation measures in the Modified Action Plan, he had little powers with regard to proposed changes to the highway.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: the alterations proposed to the pavements (which would reduce their width) were unsatisfactory and would be unsafe for pedestrians; “reckless” to put in three lanes for vehicles as the pavement was in regular use by pedestrians; the Pond Farm application was refused at appeal on air quality concerns; we do not have full knowledge of the effect the application would have on air quality; “flabbergasted” that we are being asked to approve an application which may have some harm to human health; needed to consider whether this was an appropriate location; needed to seriously consider pollution levels; strong evidence that reducing the speed limit to 20mph would help to reduce pollution and it would not be difficult to introduce this along this section of the A2; in London numerous roads were within 20 mph zones; it was not speeding that caused pollution issues, but the “stop-start” of queuing traffic; and need to ask KCC to consider using Section 106 money from the developer to implement measures to reduce pollution.

Councillor Nicholas Hampshire moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow the Swale Joint Transportation Board to consider whether the speed limit along the High Street could be reduced to 20 mph. This was not seconded.

Discussion ensued and it was noted that the Swale Joint Transportation Board was not a decision-making body.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following motion: That KCC Highways and Transportation be asked to look at whether a 20mph limit can be implemented along the High Street, Newington in order to reduce pollution. This was seconded by Councillor Andy Booth. This was not agreed by Members.

The Major Projects read out the informal views of the Highway Officer, KCC Highways and Transportation in relation to the 20mph limit. In the view of the KCC officer the implementation of the 20mph limit would not be supported as signs on their own were not always effective and it would not be desirable for a principal distributor road.

In response to a comment from a Member, the Senior Planning Solicitor (Locum) stated that there was a clear distinction for allowing 20mph zones in London compared with other areas, and that they could only be imposed in residential areas that did not go anywhere.

The Head of Planning suggested that the Chairman write on behalf of the Planning Committee to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Highways, Transport and Waste

(KCC), asking that they look into implementing a 20mph zone along this part of the A2 to reduce pollution. This was agreed by Members.

The Chairman stated that copies of the letter would also be sent to the Leader of KCC, and the Leader of Swale Borough Council. He agreed to send a copy of the letter to all Members of the Planning Committee.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(5) a recorded vote was taken on the motion and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Roger Clark, Mike Dendor, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Tina Booth, Mike Henderson, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern, Prescott, and Ghlin Whelan. Total equals 13.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock, Richard Darby, James Hall and Nicholas Hampshire. Total Equals four.

Abstain: Total equals nil.

The motion to approve the application was won.

Resolved: *That application 16/501266/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (39) in the report, minor amendments to the Section 106 Agreement as required and to the wording of the conditions as may be required. The Chairman of the Committee to write to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Highways, Transport and Waste (KCC), with copies to the Leader of KCC and the Leader of Swale Borough Council, in respect of possible provision of a 20 mph limit in Newington.*

115 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO – 17/501750/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of a two storey side and rear extension, including new front and rear porches and two bay windows to front elevation, erection of a quad garage with access point through existing garage, and the filling in of sunken front garden area, as confirmed by email dated 30 June 2017.			
ADDRESS Bramble House, Highsted Valley, Rodmersham, ME9 0AB.			
WARD	PARISH/TOWN	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Dan Finch
West Downs	Rodmersham		

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Mr Dan Finch, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

A Member was disappointed that no representative from Rodmersham Parish Council was present.

Resolved: That application 17/501750/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 17/502213/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a detached outbuilding to provide garages with storage facilities at ground floor level and home office with ancillary accommodation at first floor level. (Part retrospective).		
ADDRESS Mill Farm House, Otterham Quay Lane, Upchurch, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME8 7XA		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Miss Jane Bastow AGENT LRD Simmons

The Development Manager advised that officers had sought and received clarification from the applicant regarding size and need for first floor accommodation as proposed, due to appropriate size for wheelchair access and other mobility aids and business needs of application as an Local Exhaust Ventilation engineer.

The Chairman moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Miss Jane Bastow, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Parish Councillor Gary Rosewell, representing Upchurch Parish Council and Mr Brian Evans, an objector, did not speak.

Resolved: That application 17/502213/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.3 REFERENCE NO – 17/501981/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of eight two bedroom bungalows with associated access and car parking.		
ADDRESS Land Adj To No. 4 Eastern Road, Leysdown, Sheerness, Kent ME12 4QA.		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Leysdown	APPLICANT South Leas Development Ltd AGENT Michael Gittings Associates

The Senior Planner reported that KCC Ecology raised no objection following submission of an ecological scoping survey provided that two conditions were

added relating to clearance of the vegetation on site and measures for doing that, and measures for ecological enhancements.

The Senior Planner further reported that KCC Highways and Transportation raised no objection. The Senior Planner considered that condition (10) would cover the points they had previously made on the upgrading works proposed to Eastern Road.

The Senior Planner advised that the scheme had been amended during the course of the application, and the siting of units 5-8 had been pulled back into the site slightly (by around two metres). This amended layout was the scheme that the main report was based upon. The Parish Council and neighbouring properties should have been notified of this amendment, but due to an administrative error this was not carried out until earlier that week. As a result, the recommendation was amended to give officers delegated powers to approve the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the Committee report, no fresh issues or objections arising from the re-consultation process, and to the two additional conditions as requested by KCC Ecology.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Mr Andrew Street, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and raised points which included; the Isle of Sheppey needed more bungalows; was a nice windfall site that would fit in well; disappointed that the Parish Council were not present; applaud the applicants for negotiating with officers; in-keeping with the local area; demonstrable benefit for the area; good design; needed to add a condition to ensure it was for local residents; concern that off-site mitigation would not be sought due to the practicalities of securing payment, and officers should look at a more appropriate way of providing this.

Resolved: That application 17/501981/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (15) in the report, no fresh issues or objections arising from the re-consultation process, and to the imposition of the two additional conditions as requested by KCC Ecology.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 17/501702/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Construction of a four bedroom detached dwelling with detached double garage/store and associated parking, access and landscaping works on the land to the south of Callaways Lane, Newington.		
ADDRESS Land at Callaways Lane, Newington, Kent, ME9 7LU.		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newington	APPLICANT Mr J Lane AGENT DHA Planning

The Development Manager referred to the tabled item, which had previously been emailed to Members, and set-out Newington Parish Council's reasons for withdrawing their objection to the application.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Resolved: *That application 17/501702/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (18) in the report.*

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 15/502694/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Conversion and extension of former public house with existing first floor flat to provide nine additional one and two bedroom flats.		
ADDRESS Elm Tree Inn, Lower Road, Minster-on-Sea, Kent, ME12 3ST.		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr P Miller AGENT Woodstock Associates

The Development Manager reported that the plan reference number stated in conditions (3), (8), (9), (10) and (11) of the Committee report was incorrect, it should read MI/09/132.03 (and not 0.2).

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

The Ward Members raised comments which included: was not the best use of the building; was not in a sustainable location; would improve the site; visibly better than the Greyhound Road site; and this was a windfall site.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: site was currently an “eye-sore”; proximity to the road was a concern; would provide a balance between the settled community and the gypsy and traveller community; need to ensure consistency in relation to sustainability as we have refused other applications not so far from services as this application; the site had been subject to much enforcement action and fully support the application.

In response to a query from a Member, the Development Manager advised that this was a brownfield site and that this scheme was similar in size to the one approved in 2006.

Resolved: *That application 15/502694/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (15) in the report, and the amendment to the plan reference number for conditions (3), (8), (9), (10) and (11) to read MI/09/132.03 (and not 0.2).*

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 17/501888/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Variation of condition 19 (garage roof) to previous application: 15/501604/FULL (Erection of 1 four bedroom house (detached) and garage/storage building).		
ADDRESS R/o 95 Borden Lane, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1BX		

WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Guy Mills AGENT A N Ghosh Architects
--------------------------	----------------------------	---

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Following a query from a Member, the Senior Planner showed photographs of the site and stated that the footprint for the garage was the same as that already approved.

In response to further queries from Members, the Senior Planner confirmed that the approved garage measured 3.5 metres tall, the proposed garage would be 5.1 metres tall, but as the base of the garage had been set 600mm down from the original site level of the site, it was effectively only a metre taller than the approved garage. Condition (11) restricted the insertion of windows or roof lights in the garage, and related to the roof in its entirety.

Resolved: That application 17/501888/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (12) in the report.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 17/500104/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a front and rear first floor extension.		
ADDRESS 49 Drake Avenue Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 3SA		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Craig Brown AGENT Cre8room Limited

Mr Craig Brawn, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded.

Ward Members raised points which included: would look better from the front; did not consider it would have a big impact on the area; there was a whole variety of property styles along Drake Avenue; and noted that the neighbours had not submitted any objections.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: considered it would have no major impact; was not a policy issue; and did no harm.

The motion to refuse the application was lost.

Councillor Andy Booth moved the following motion: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the imposition of suitable conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 17/500104/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 17/501505/OUT			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Outline application (some matters reserved) for residential development comprising of nine 2 bed retirement bungalows, together with provision of a community orchard - Access and layout being sought.			
ADDRESS Land To The South Of School Lane Lower Halstow Kent ME9 7ES			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade and Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN Lower Halstow	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Geoffery Crabtree AGENT BDB Design LLP

The Senior Planner reported that two further letters of objection had been received, mainly raising points already covered in the Committee report. One further issue that had been raised was that the proposed age restriction of 55 would apply to persons who may still be working for another 11 or 12 years prior to state retirement. The Senior Planner stated that he did not disagree with that point.

The Senior Planner further reported that another issue raised was that units should be designed to lifetime homes standards.

Mrs Allyson Beerstcher, an objector, spoke against the application

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

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: was a small scale development and satisfied that there was a demand; the Parish Council were in support; was a well thought-out scheme; hope the community orchard was not just a “sweetener”; should impose a condition that local residents had first refusal; these type of homes were needed; would be against our policy; need to see the 2009 rural housing survey for the village mentioned in the Committee report to be able to make a decision; wrong location; Parish Council had previously objected; could produce a more up-to-date rural housing survey; would significantly alter the countryside gap; need more windfall sites like this; would not do demonstrable harm; should increase the age limit to 60 years as the retirement age was increasing; need to find a way via the Section 106 Agreement to ensure first refusal for local residents; need a “rock solid” commitment to provide the community orchard; outside the settlement boundary; contrary to the emerging Local Plan; failed to comply with Policy ST3 of the emerging Local Plan; and if we ignore our

own policies then the development would “creep out”, we need to protect these boundaries.

The Senior Planner stated that the 2009 rural housing survey referred to in the Committee report related to a planning application for affordable homes in Breach Lane in 2008. He had seen the survey but there was nothing within it that suggested a need for retirement housing in Lower Halstow and the information was out-of-date as it was prepared in 2008.

The Head of Planning stated that it was clear that the application was not in accordance with local planning policy. If Members were minded to approve the application, then clear exceptional reasons would need to be given. However, Members needed to be mindful that these reasons would set a precedent for other similar developments.

Resolved: That application 17/501505/OUT be refused for the reason stated in the report.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – Land at Homestall Road, Newnham**

ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEAL ALLOWED IN PART

- **Item 5.2 – Land adj 1 Fairview Cottages, Frinstead Rd, Milstead**

APPEAL ALLOWED

- **Item 5.3 – Hope Cottage, Oad Street, Borden**

APPEAL ALLOWED

- **Item 5.4 – Evaluna, Plumpudding Lane, Dargate**

APPEAL DISMISSED

116 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:

(1) That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 2, 3 and 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act:

1. Information relating to any individual.

2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

- 4. Information relating to any consultation or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and any employees of, or office holders under, the authority.**
- 5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.**
- 6. Information which reveals that the authority proposes:**
 - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or**
 - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.**
- 7. Information relating to any action taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.**

117 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

6.1 17/500498/FULL – Fencing and conservatory at 43 Hugh Price Close, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3AS

Resolved: That an Enforcement Notice be issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, requiring the removal of the fencing and conservatory within 3 months of the Notice taking effect.

That the Head of Planning Services and Head of Legal Partnership of the Council be authorised to prepare and serve the necessary documentation, including the precise wording thereof to give effect to this decision.

6.2 17/501661/FULL – Fencing at 11 Hustlings Drive, Eastchurch, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 4JX

Resolved: That an Enforcement Notice be issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, requiring the removal of the fencing within 3 months of the Notice taking effect.

That the Head of Planning Services and Head of Legal Partnership of the Council be authorised to prepare and serve the necessary documentation, including the precise wording thereof to give effect to this decision.

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