
PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the See details below on Tuesday, 21 October 2014 from 9.30 - 10.00 am.

PRESENT: Councillors Barnicott (Chairman), Sylvia Bennett, Adrian Crowther, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Vice-Chairman), Prescott, Ben Stokes, Ghlin Whelan and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Philippa Davies and Andrew Spiers.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Andy Booth and Sue Gent.

292 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

293 SW/14/501632 (2.2) - LAND BETWEEN 25-27 WELLS WAY, FAVERSHAM ME13 7QP

The Chairman welcomed the applicant's agent, a representative from Faversham Town Council and 34 members of the public, the majority in objection to the application, to the meeting.

The Planner reported that the application was for the erection of a new bungalow between 25 and 27 Wells Way, Faversham, on land sold at auction. The Planner advised that the floor area would be 65.7 square metres and two bedrooms, a toilet and wet room and a combined living/kitchen area would be provided. There would be two off-road car parking spaces and a private garden. The Planner explained that one of the trees in the garden would be retained and an additional two would be planted. The site was within the built-up area, and was not subject to specific planning restraints.

The Planner advised that a previous application for a larger, L-shaped bungalow, with a 1.8 metre high boundary wall close to the public footpath had been withdrawn by the agent. He acknowledged that local residents had considered that the proposal would set a precedent, and explained that there were nine green spaces in total, six were in front of properties, and the others were too small for development.

The Planner reported that 12 representations had been received, objecting to the proposal. He outlined the objections which included: loss of green open space; it would change the character of the area; pressure of parking; safety issues, as children played in this area; the proposed hipped roof was not in-keeping with other bungalows; tandem parking was unsuitable; the trees should be protected; loss of amenity space; low lying area with problem of drainage; and it was too close to the boundaries.

The Planner advised that Faversham Town Council objected to the proposal due to the loss of green space. Kent County Council Highways and the Tree Officer raised no objection.

The Planner summarised that this was the largest of the plots that had been sold and that the others were too small to be built on. He further advised that it would be difficult to defend on appeal.

The Agent acknowledged the concerns of local residents. He considered the plot of land had no recreational value, and was the only one of the ones sold that was large enough to be built upon, which he considered would not raise any precedent issues. The Agent

explained that the site was larger than many plots considered for development, it was just that this one was a different shape to those normally considered. The design of the bungalow would be similar to the existing bungalows, and would be open at the front. The development did not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Local residents raised the following points: worried about setting a precedent as other plots had also been sold; this would be a change in amenity on the housing estate; this was an open-plan estate, the proposal was against the original developer's principles; children did play on this plot of land; appeal of the estate was the openness, this would be over-intensification; the bungalow design may not fit in with the existing bungalows; concern that the 20 foot area in front of bungalows on the estate would be lost; this was not the largest of the plots, so others could be built on; if original developer wanted this type of estate, he would have built the bungalow at the same time as the original estate was constructed; this parcel of land was used by young children and dog walkers; purchased property because of the open spaces; the development would de-value the area; the open spaces should stay; this was a safe place for very young children to play; there would be a loss of visual amenity; the open spaces allowed water to drain away; the openness allowed for more field of vision for vehicles; it was a very attractive garden estate and this would be infill housing; do not want to lose the open spaces; thought the plots would not be allowed to be built upon; this would change the character of the estate; parking issues; pressure on schools, doctors etc.; hipped roof would not fit in; fences were not allowed, why was this development permitted?; and this was not left-over land, it was part of an open-plan development.

In response to a question from a Member, the Planner advised that, apart from domestic extensions, the estate had remained the same since the 1960s. Members were advised that areas of land like this were prevented from being given village green status.

A Member asked what was the precise number of plots of land that had been auctioned. The Planner agreed to provide this information at the Planning Committee meeting on 30 October 2014.

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