PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held at the site listed below. on Monday, 7 August 2017 from 10.03am - 10.43am.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Bobbin, Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman), Prescott and Ghlin Whelan.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Gerry Lewin and John Wright (Ward Members).

OFFICERS PRESENT: Philippa Davies and Paul Gregory.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Cameron Beart, Andy Booth, James Hunt and Nigel Kay.

158 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

159 17/502213/FULL MILL FARM HOUSE, OTTERHAM QUAY LANE, UPCHURCH, SITTINGBOURNE, KENT, ME8 7XA

The Chairman welcomed the applicant, Parish Council representative, and members of the public to the meeting.

The Planner introduced the application which sought part retrospective planning permission for the erection of a two-storey outbuilding. He explained that the original building had been two-storey, but part of it had collapsed, leaving one-storey, which was unfinished. The eaves height of the original two-storey structure had been 0.8 metres in excess of the eaves height now proposed. The Planner reported that the outbuilding would be two-storeys high, with garages and storage at ground floor level and office space, a kitchen and a shower room at first floor level. There would be an external staircase and balcony on the northern elevation. The building would measure 16.5 metres by 6 metres, 4.3 metres to the eaves and 7metres in overall height with a pitched roof. There would be four garage doors and four rooflights on the western elevation. On the northern elevation, a pedestrian access door and window would be located on the first floor, accessed by the external staircase. At the southern elevation, a pedestrian access door and window would be located at ground floor level with a large window and Juliet balcony at first floor level.

Miss Jane Bastow, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application. She explained that the original application, commenced in 2001, had been for a larger L-shaped building. Building had commenced, but due to personal reasons had then halted. She stated that she had been given contradictory advice as to whether that application was still 'active' and had considered that, as the current application was for a smaller building, she was allowed to proceed with the construction. Miss

Bastow stated that the trees on the adjoining border, which would have helped to shield the building, had been removed.

Parish Councillor Rosewell, representing Upchurch Parish Council, spoke against the application. He raised points which included: this was excessive, compared to the rest of the site; it was obtrusive due to it being the highest point in the area, and could be seen for miles; it was not in-keeping with the village and was too large. He also questioned the use of the building, and considered it to be excessive for a home office. In response to a question, the Planner explained that the application should be considered as a completely new application.

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He explained that the application needed to be sensitive as the application site was positioned on top of a hill, and could be seen from many directions, including a nearby footpath. The Ward Member considered the two-storey aspect was inappropriate, especially in relation to Mill House. He queried the exact use for the building, and suggested that a one-storey building would be preferable. The Ward Member explained that after considering design and visual impact; privacy; access; and landscape impact, the application showed demonstrable harm. If a two-storey building was granted, careful thought needed to be given to the materials used on the building.

A second Ward Member spoke against the application and explained that prior to the two-storey building collapsing, it had been visible from a distance, however, he acknowledged that the building had not yet been clad.

Local residents spoke against the application and explained that the two-storey building had been visible to them; and there were concerns of over-looking, traffic entering/leaving the property onto a dangerous road, and what the building would be used for.

In response to a question, Miss Bastow explained that the intended use was for a home office/hobby use upstairs, with garage use downstairs. She further added that the facilities had not been specifically designed for disabled use, but she preferred the larger design of the shower/kitchen areas.

In response to questions, Members were advised that the height of the building, in both the 2002 application and the current application was seven metres, and the finish would be rendered blockwork, with UPVC grey horizontal cladding under grey concrete roof tiles.

A Member asked whether the application could revert to a one-storey building. Miss Bastow explained that this would mean that the L-shape design would need to be re-visited, and this would take up more space on the ground and make it difficult to turn into the garages. She emphasised that the building would not be used for manufacturing. In response to further questions, Miss Bastow advised that services to the new building would feed off the present house.

The Planner agreed to report back at the Planning Committee on 17 August 2017 as to whether the consent in 2002 had expired or not. He re-iterated that this was a completely separate application to the 2002 application.

Members toured the site and looked at it from the adjoining property with the Planning Officer.

<u>Chairman</u>

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