

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 13 August 2015 from 7.00 - 9.55 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Tina Booth (substitute for Councillor James Hunt), Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Mark Ellen, Sue Gent, James Hall, Mike Henderson, Gerry Lewin (substitute for Councillor Prescott), Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Ben Stokes.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Rob Bailey, Peter Bell, Amanda Berger-North, Tracy Day, Andrew Jeffers, Kellie MacKenzie and Jim Wilson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Mick Galvin and Councillor John Wright.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors James Hunt, Lesley Ingham and Prescott.

### 147 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 July 2015 (Minute Nos. 128 – 133) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 148 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Tina Booth, as being a member of Eastchurch Parish Council, declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of items 2.6 (15/501978/FULL) and 6.1 (APP/V2255/W/15/3014371). Councillor Tina Booth left the room during consideration of these items.

### 149 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 August 2015 (Minute Nos. 142 – 143) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Andy Booth's apologies.

2.4 15/503484/FULL – Chapel Farm, Hillside Road, Stalisfield, Kent, ME13 0JE

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

**Resolved: That application 15/503484/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.**

### 150 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

#### PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/503828/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of single storey front extension and part conversion of integral garage with door to side.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 38 Berkeley Close Dunkirk Kent ME13 9TR		
<b>WARD</b> Boughton and Courtenay	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Dunkirk	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr and Mrs Masters <b>AGENT</b> LT Drawing Services Ltd

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

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He considered that the application would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene and the design was poor.

In response to a query from the Ward Member, the Planning Officer stated that since the report had been written no further letters of objection from local residents had been received. She was aware of a similarly designed extension in the Close and considered the design was appropriate for the area.

In response to a query from a Member, the Planning Officer stated that there were no parking restrictions and on-street parking was available.

A Member considered the proposal would enhance the area.

**Resolved: That 15/503828/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.**

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO - 15/503997/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Construction of part single and part two storey rear extension and loft conversion with dormer windows to the rear.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 13 Graineey Field Hartlip Kent ME9 7SR		
<b>WARD</b> Newington & Upchurch	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Hartlip	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr R Smith <b>AGENT</b> Insight Architects

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

A Ward Member raised concern about the loss of affordable housing in Hartlip and loss of light to the property north of the proposed extension, but noted that the occupier of that property had raised no objection.

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

Members raised the following points: consider the design to be acceptable; affordable housing was at a premium and the loss of properties such as this should not be approved lightly, the Council needed to look at the issue; and appreciate that the applicant has taken time to discuss his proposals with his neighbours.

**Resolved: That 15/503997/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.**

<b>2.3 REFERENCE NO - 15/502738/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>			
Relocation and winter storage of 44 seasonal workers caravans and 4 mobile communal facilities.			
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land Behind Tinbridge Cottages London Road Boughton Under Blean Kent ME13 8YN			
<b>WARD</b> Watling	<b>PARISH/TOWN</b> Faversham	<b>COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Edward <b>Vinson Ltd</b> <b>AGENT</b> The Vinson Trust

The Planning Officer confirmed that following recent parish boundary changes the application was within Watling ward. She also clarified that the application was for the storage of the caravans during the winter season only; the caravans would be unoccupied during this period. The Planning Officer further stated that the caravans must have been occupied by an agricultural worker in the preceding agricultural season which meant that the caravans could not just be stored all-year-round. She added that it was for the farmer to comply with permitted development rights regarding the seasonal temporary use of the agricultural workers caravans in line with legislation. The use of the caravans, including highways/noise concerns during the agricultural season, were not a material consideration under this application and the application was to determine whether the site was suitable for the storage of the caravans when not occupied.

The Planning Officer reported that the Kent County Council (KCC) Archaeological Officer had confirmed that the site was an archaeologically sensitive area and any grounds excavations may have an impact. They suggested a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work be included in any decision.

The Planning Officer reported that KCC Highways raised no objection as it was unlikely that the proposal would generate highway concerns during the winter period. Faversham Town Council made no comment on the application.

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

A Member raised concern that no representative from KCC Highways was present at the meeting to respond to highway queries. The Chairman noted the concerns and agreed to take the point up with officers.

Members raised the following points: trust that the planning enforcement team would be vigilant and ensure enforcement action was taken if any of the conditions were breached; do not know the impact the 50 mph speed limit would have and the report does not contain all the information required to be able to make a decision.

In response to a query, the Planning Officer explained that the delay in receiving comments from the Archaeological Officer was due to an administrative error.

**Resolved: That 15/502738/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report and the imposition of a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work as requested by the KCC Archaeological Officer.**

<b>2.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/505023/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>			
Erection of a detached 1 ½ storey three bedroom barn style dwelling (revised scheme).			
<b>ADDRESS</b> 1 Wheelwrights Cottages Lewson Street Road Norton Kent ME9 9JN			
<b>WARD</b>	Teynham &	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Ian Mynott
Lynsted		Norton and Buckland	<b>AGENT</b>

The Planning Officer drew attention to an error in the description of the proposal and that the application was for a two bedroom barn-style dwelling, not three as stated in the report.

The Planning Officer reported that one further letter of objection had been received raising the following concerns: the character of the area should be protected as the site fell within the conservation area and was adjacent to a listed building; detrimental to the heritage status of the area; precedent would be set, this would change the character of Lewson Street; and safety concerns as this was a popular walking and cycling area.

The Planning Officer further reported that she had received further information regarding the health of the applicant's daughter, along with a letter from her Specialist Case Manager who confirmed the diagnosis. This information was to remain confidential.

The Planning Officer stated that condition (5) could be removed as drawing P267/PL/314 had been received showing that site levels were acceptable. The Planning Officer sought delegation to approve the application subject to receipt of acceptable amended drawings being received to show a hedge along the roadside boundary, rather than a fence and a revised drawing removing the side elevation

ground floor windows facing Norton Lane and to amend condition (8) to include the submission of details of the conservation rooflights.

Parish Councillor Trimm, representing Norton Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr Rubinstein, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mrs Mynott, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Conservation Officer stated that Lewson Street was a mix of building designs and that he had worked closely with the applicant and considered the proposal was sympathetic to the appearance of Lewson Street Conservation Area.

Members raised the following points: considered the application was appropriately sited; consider that the Conservation Officer's comments should be included within the report; and suggested Members visit the site to enable Members to envisage the impact the proposal would have.

Councillor Mike Baldock moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Darby. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

**Resolved: That application 14/505023/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (13) in the report, the removal of condition (5), the receipt of acceptable amended drawings showing a hedge along the roadside boundary rather than a fence and a revised drawing removing the side elevation ground floor windows facing Norton Lane and to amend condition (8) to include the submission of details of the conservation rooflights.**

<b>2.5 REFERENCE NO - 15/503706/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>			
Single-storey side extension and two-storey rear extension.			
<b>ADDRESS</b> 19 Hartlip Hill, Hartlip, Kent, ME9 7NZ.			
<b>WARD</b>	Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	Hartlip
		<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr And Mrs Kevin And Claire Fisher
		<b>AGENT</b>	Robert Lewis Thornton

The Area Planning Officer reported that the KCC Archaeological Officer had requested a condition requiring a watching brief to be provided and that the applicant had provided a brief. Further comments from the Archeological Officer were awaited. The Area Planning Officer sought delegation to approve the application subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the imposition of

either a condition requiring the submitted archaeological brief to be implemented, or a condition requiring a further watching brief to be submitted.

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

A Ward Member raised no objection.

**Resolved:** *That application 15/503706/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report and the imposition of a suitably worded condition, either requiring a watching brief to be provided or to require the submitted watching brief to be implemented.*

<b>2.6 REFERENCE NO - 15/501978/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Change of use from A4 (Drinking Establishment) to C3 (dwellinghouse) use		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Wheatsheaf Inn, Warden Road, Eastchurch, Kent, ME12 4HA		
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey Central	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Eastchurch	<b>APPLICANT</b> The Wheatsheaf Inn <b>AGENT</b>

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

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

Members raised the following concerns: had been wholly supported by local residents as a public house and would be a significant loss to local residents; and concern about the level of building work that had taken place at the site.

On being put to the vote the motion to approve the application was lost.

Councillor Andy Booth moved the following motion: That the application be refused as it would result in the loss of amenity to the local area and cause demonstrable harm to the local area. This was seconded by Councillor Mark Ellen.

Councillor Mike Henderson proposed the following addendum to the proposal: the applicant had not provided adequate details and financial information on the viability of the property as a public house and also what had been undertaken to improve the viability of the property. This was agreed by the proposer and seconder of the original motion.

Another Member referred to policies SP3, SP7 and E1 of the Local Plan.

In response to queries from a Member, the Area Planning Officer reported that the applicant had submitted confidential financial information about the viability of the site as a public house. He suggested that Members could defer the application to

allow discussions with the applicant about whether he would be happy for that information to be made public.

The Area Planning Officer reported that if Members were minded to refuse the application, Policies E1, C1 and SP7 could be used.

A Member raised concern that officers had not considered employment at the site. Discussions ensued about whether to defer the application. A Member considered that deferral to allow for further financial viability to be sought would give Members time to look at specific policy reasons for refusing the application.

A Member considered that it was for the applicant to prove that it had not been viable as a public house. He considered that on the evidence provided there was no alternative but to raise objection to the application.

The Area Planning Officer considered it unwise to refuse the application on viability grounds in view of the information already submitted. The officer read out Policy C1 which referred to the harmful loss of and change of use of a valuable community facility.

Councillor Andy Booth requested the following addendum to the original motion: contrary to Policies C1 and SP3 of the Swale Borough Local Plan. This was seconded by Councillor Mark Ellen.

On being put to the vote the motion to refuse the application with the addendums outlined above was agreed.

***Resolved: That application 15/501978/FULL be refused as it would result in the loss of amenity and cause demonstrable harm to the local area, on the basis of loss of employment, loss of a valuable community facility, the applicant had not provided adequate details and financial information on the viability of the property as a public house and also what had been undertaken to improve the viability of the property as a public house, and was contrary to, inter alia, Policies C1 and SP3 of the Local Plan.***

<b>2.7 REFERENCE NO - 15/502716/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>			
Change of use of land to single gypsy pitch and associated development			
<b>ADDRESS</b> Breach Farm, Paddocks Land North-east of Breach Farm Bungalow, Breach Lane, Upchurch, Kent ME9 7PE			
<b>WARD</b>	Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr M Love <b>AGENT</b> Patrick Durr
		Newington	

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

<b>2.8 REFERENCE NO 15/505010/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Minor Material Amendment for: Development of an up to 18MW ground mounted solar farm on land at Orchard Farm, Iwade, Kent, ME9 8QE to include solar arrays, transformer enclosures; substation and control room, access tracks; perimeter fence and small-scale CCTV cameras (14/502072). Amendments: Removal of the northern parcel of land from development to reduce capacity from 18MW to 10MW, change in the design from a single substation to separate DNO and customer substations including auxiliary transformer, and decrease in the number of modules, weather stations, CCTV poles, fences and roads.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land West Of Orchard Farm, School Lane, Iwade, Kent ME9 8QG		
<b>WARD</b> Bobbing, Iwade & Lower Halstow	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Iwade	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Alejandro Alvarez <b>AGENT</b> Mr Mark Westcott

The Major Projects Officer outlined the application.

Mr Doubleday, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member supported the application.

Members raised the following points: would urge Iwade Parish Council to enter into negotiations with the applicant given that funding streams were available to them with this type of development; and were logical financial reasons to amend the application.

**Resolved: That application 15/505010/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (20) in the report.**

<b>2.9 REFERENCE NO 14/506167/OUT</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Demolition of existing buildings. Outline application for the erection of 42 dwellings, with all matters reserved for future consideration.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Floplast Ltd, Howt Green, Sheppey Way, Bobbing, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME9 8QX.		
<b>WARD</b> Grove	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Bobbing	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Bryan Lynch <b>AGENT</b> Harrison Mutch

The Major Projects Officer reported that the comments of KCC Sustainable Drainage Team had been received. They recommended that the Council requests further information on the nature, sizing, management and maintenance of the



Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS). The Major Projects Officer stated that he had asked the agent to provide information to satisfy the comments of the KCC SUDS Team and in accordance with the committee report, he sought delegated authority to resolve the matter, including any amendments required.

The Major Projects Officer reported that further information had been received from the applicant's agent advising that the payment of developer contributions as set out in the Committee report, together with the provision of 30% of the dwellings as affordable units, and off-site highway improvements as sought by KCC Highways was acceptable.

The Major Projects Officer stated that with regard to the open space, the applicant accepted in principle that the ownership of the public open space land could be transferred to the local authority with a 10-year commuted sum being paid to the local authority as set out in the Council's developer contributions Supplementary Planning Document. It was also acceptable for the S106 Agreement to require the developer to provide an equipped children's play area and casual kick about area. Any play equipment to be provided was to be designed and laid out to a standard agreed with the Council.

The Major Projects Officer concluded that authority was sought to approve the application, subject to the above, the conditions as set-out in the report, with amendments if required, the further comments of Natural England, and the signing of a Section 106 agreement, pursuant to paragraphs 9.14 to 9.17 in the Committee report.

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

A Ward Member raised no objection.

Members raised the following points: was either contrary or not applicable to the following policies of the Local Plan and/or Bearing Fruits 2031 E6, E7, B1, DM25, RC3 and National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 17 and 34; contrary to Policy ST3, as it was not allocated in the Local Plan; did not comply with Policy DM3 as it would be detrimental to rural employment and DM25; was within a sensitive Swale Special Protection Area (SPA) and this had not been given enough weight by officers; was an unsustainable development; did not comply with Policy RC3 criteria T4 or T5; there were already traffic problems at both the Grovehurst Road and Key Street roundabouts, this would just add to them; officers needed to ensure that any SPA money available is spent in Swale; concerned that the footbridge to Kemsley was not lit; concerned there were no footpaths to Iwade proposed; and would exacerbate parking problems in Bobbing.

In response to a request from a Member, the Major Projects Officer stated that officers could negotiate with the applicant a clause under the Section 106 Agreement requiring use of local labour.

***Resolved: That application 14/506167/OUT be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (27) in the report, with amendments if required, clarification in respect of the SUDs system, the further comments of Natural***

**England, and the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to include a clause requiring use of local labour following discussions with the applicant and upon the information in Paragraph 9.14 to 9.17 in the Committee report.**

**PART 3**

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/503258/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Partial demolition of existing dwelling house and demolition of outbuilding to facilitate two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, and construction of a double garage		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Brickfield House, Seasalter Road, Graveney, Kent ME13 9DY		
<b>WARD</b> Boughton & Courtenay	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Graveney & Goodnestone	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Matthew French <b>AGENT</b> Diocesan Architects

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

<b>3.2 REFERENCE NO - 14/504208/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> New dwelling.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land to rear of 143 Minster Road, Minster-on-Sea, Kent ME12 3LJ		
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey Central	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Minster	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mrs D Davie <b>AGENT</b> Nigel Sands and Associates

The Area Planning Officer reported that Minster Parish Council had withdrawn their support for the application.

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

A Ward Member supported the recommendation and was disappointed by the Parish Council’s original comments.

**Resolved: That application 14/504208/FULL be refused as per the recommendation set out in the report.**

<b>3.3 REFERENCE NO - 15/500815/OUT</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Outline (Access not reserved) - Two-storey detached three-bedroom dwelling and new single-storey pitched roof double garage.		

<b>ADDRESS</b> 48 Keycol Hill, Bobbing, Kent ME9 8ND		
<b>WARD</b> Grove Ward	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Bobbing	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr And Mrs D Blythe <b>AGENT</b> Alpha Design Studio Limited

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

Councillor Ben Stokes moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**Resolved: That application 15/500815/OUT be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.**

<b>3.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/503038/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Change of use from A1 and C3 use to C3 use only.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 75 High Street, Milton Regis, Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 2AR		
<b>WARD</b> Milton Regis	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr John Stephens <b>AGENT</b> CJS Design Services

The Area Planning Officer drew attention to an error on page 107 of the report under relevant Planning History and stated that both the refusal date and appeal date should be amended, as they occurred in 2014, not 2015 as stated.

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

Councillor Roger Clarke moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**Resolved: That application 15/503038/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.**

<b>3.5 REFERENCE NO - 15/500671/OUT</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Outline application for residential development of up to 330 dwellings plus 60 units of extra care (including a minimum of 30% affordable), an allocated 1/4 acre of serviced land for potential doctors surgery, demolition of farm outbuildings, planting and landscaping, informal open space, children's play area, surface water attenuation, a vehicular access point from London Road and associated ancillary works. (Access being sought).		

<b>ADDRESS</b> Land off London Road, Newington Kent		
<b>WARD</b> Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Newington	<b>APPLICANT</b> Gladman Developments <b>AGENT</b>

The Major Projects Officer reported that three further letters of objection had been received raising issues already contained within the report and the following new issues, including a quote from one of the letters, had been raised:

*“Very importantly beautiful apple and other fruit trees will be destroyed...buildings, which I believe to be listed, had a fire recently as they are derelict and I can see from my window I called the fire brigade very swiftly and it was dealt with; there is a great deal of local opposition in Newington there is a lot of opposition to this development. However, it appears that only Playstool Road houses have received this letter and are aware of the appeal.”*

The Major Projects Officer stated that particular concern was expressed about cumulative impacts, taking into account other developments that were proposed or had been approved in the local area.

The Major Projects Officer reported that a letter has been received from the Member of Parliament, who opposed the planning application and raised the following points: the site was not allocated for development in the emerging Local Plan; the development was considered to be premature; he also stated that brownfield land should be released for development “before green-field sites, particularly ones such as Pond Farm that were “of food-producing quality”.

The Major Projects Officer further reported that Southern Gas Networks had commented that: they do not object to the development, and had provided a plan showing the positions of their network of pipes in the vicinity of the site.

The Major Projects Officer stated that in response to the Committee report, he had received correspondence from the applicant and read out the following extract:

*“As you are aware, the above application is the subject of a non-determination appeal but will be heard by the planning committee on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> August such that Members can indicate what they would have decided had Swale Borough Council been determining the application.*

*Whilst Gladman accepts the recommendation for refusal stated in your report, we are concerned that your committee report states that ...it is important for Members of the Committee to pass a resolution to refuse the application and that Members may therefore be misled into such a decision.*

*Therefore, please could you ensure that when this proposal is presented to committee, members are clear that they do not have to resolve to refuse the application and that their resolution should be made following the normal decision-making procedure.”*

The Major Projects Officer confirmed, for the avoidance of doubt, that Members had the option of resolving that, had an appeal not been lodged, they would have resolved that permission should be granted.

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to an error in paragraph 1.01 (on Page 116) of the report and confirmed that the fruit farm holding was NOT abandoned and it was currently being farmed for soft fruits and apples.

The Major Projects Officer reported that KCC Minerals raised objection in relation to sterilisation of mineral resources at the site and that KCC Archaeology raised no objection.

The Major Projects Officer stated that in conclusion, and as set out in the report, it was recommended that Members resolved that, had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged, the application would have been refused, for the reason set out on Page 132 of the report.

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

Mr Buttle, an objector, spoke against the application.

A Ward Member spoke against the application and raised the following points: was not allocated within the Swale Borough Local Plan for housing; there had been discussions in the past with government offices about the possibility of a Newington bypass as the A2 at Newington was very busy and particular narrow; would adversely impact on air quality management levels; pedestrians already experienced difficulties crossing the A2 in the centre of the village, this would add to the problem; the application was not well sited in terms of facilities; the applicant had not resolved or looked at any of the issues raised; information from the applicant with regard to access to the site was incomplete; would create a 30 per cent increase in housing; would smother community assets; and was not in a sustainable location as it was not connected to the centre of the village.

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

The Major Projects Officer stated the recommendation in the report supported the fact that it was not in a sustainable location. He pointed out that the applicant had provided a substantial amount of supporting documents and he drew attention to the documents listed on page 124, paragraph 8.01 of the report.

A Member requested that officers contact Gladman Developments and make it clear to them that every member of the Planning Committee at Swale knew that they do not have to follow officer recommendations. This Committee would have read the report carefully, and Members did give careful consideration. Members considered it was an insult that Gladman Developments had written to Members telling them to do this.

A Ward Member concluded and thanked officers for the report which supported their views that the application was not acceptable. He noted Medway Council had

been asked to comment, as the application would affect the whole of the A2 corridor (including parts of their Borough). The Member stated that Newington was also subject to a further application for 100 houses and the combined effect of that would be unacceptable.

**Resolved:** *That had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged application 15/500671/OUT would have been refused as per the reasons set out in the report.*

## **PART 5**

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

- **Item 5.1** – Swanton Croft, Swanton Street, Bredgar  
Appeal Allowed.
- **Item 5.2** – Little Norwood Farm, Parsonage Lane, Bobbing  
Appeal Allowed.
- **Item 5.3** – Parklands Village, The Broadway, Minster  
Appeal Dismissed.
- **Item 5.4** – Land adj. 71 South Road, Faversham  
Appeal Allowed.

## **151 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.**

**152 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING**

**6.1 – APP/V2255/W/15/3014371: The erection of four wind turbines with maximum blade tip height of 126.5 metres and associated works/infrastructure at New Rides Farm, Leysdown Road, ME12 4DD (Application SW/13/1571).**

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

***Resolved: That, potential harm to the health of sufferers of tinnitus and hearing aid users, be removed from the reason for refusal for APP/V2255/W/15/3014371.***

**153 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 9.05pm and reconvened at 9.10pm.

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