
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 15 October 2015 from 7.00 - 10.35 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, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman), Prescott (Vice-Chairman) and Ben Stokes.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Artemis Christophi-Turner, Rob Bailey, Philippa Davies, James Freeman, Kate Jardine, Alun Millard, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Derek Conway, Paul Fleming, Mick Galvin, Gerry Lewin and David Simmons.

APOLOGY: Councillor Lesley Ingham.

276 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 September 2015 (Minute Nos. 240 – 244) and the Reconvened Meeting held on 29 September 2015 (Minute No. 245) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

277 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

278 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 October 2015 (Minute Nos. 249 – 250) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

15/505666/FULL – Bourne Place, Stockers Hill, Rodmersham

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

The Kent County Council (KCC) Highways Officer acknowledged that there was parking on the road and footpath near the application site; he stated that this issue did not effect the development as there was plenty of parking on-site, and so it could cope with its own demand. He added that on-road parking did not effect the sightlines.

A Member considered the proposed development was sited on a dangerous road.

Resolved: *That application 15/505666/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report.*

279 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/502982/ADV		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Advertisement consent for two externally illuminated hoarding signs		
ADDRESS Syndale Park London Road Ospringe Kent ME13 0RH		
WARD East Downs Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ospringe	APPLICANT Mr David Holbrook

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

Discussion ensued on the amount of signs that had been displayed so far and that enforcement action should be put in place if the conditions in the report were not adhered to.

Resolved: That application 15/502982/ADV be approved subject to conditions (1) to (10) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 14/506519/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Redevelopment of existing landscape contractor's yard and land surrounding Kent Terrace to provide 13 dwelling houses and an extension to the existing terrace with associated car parking and landscaping. In addition, a ground floor rear extension to Number 15 Kent Terrace.		
ADDRESS Land At Kent Terrace, Canterbury Lane, Upchurch, Kent, ME8 8QP		
WARD Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Mr Tim And Mark Williams AGENT Mr Ralph Salmon

The Major Projects Officer reported that Natural England had raised no objection to the application subject to screening mitigation measures being taken in respect of the site being in close proximity to the Medway Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site, before the dwellings were occupied. The Major Projects Officer confirmed that this was addressed under condition (4) in the report and the Section 106 agreement. An ecology survey had been carried out which showed there might be bats and slow worms on the site. KCC Ecology had not yet responded to the survey.

The Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to approve the application subject to an appropriately worded Section 106 agreement and to secure

contributions as appropriate when triggered, and to any further conditions requested by KCC Ecology in response to the ecology survey.

Mr Ralph Salmon, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member raised concern with the effect of the earth works on the existing properties and whether the developers would take this into consideration, and was curious why Section 106 monies was going to a school four miles away from the site. He also asked whether KCC Highways would adopt the road on the site. In response, the KCC Highways Officer explained that, although the road was built to adoptable standards, it would not be adopted by KCC Highways, and would remain a private road.

Members raised the following points: concerned with the structural soundness of the other buildings during construction of the development; the countryside gap should be taken into consideration; concerned that KCC Highways was not adopting the road, with the complications of a maintenance contract; issue of the footpath becoming available, subject to a third party; and clarification was needed on tandem parking as considered this was not acceptable.

The Major Projects Officer explained that it was known who the third party was and he was confident that the footpath would go ahead. The KCC Highways Officer confirmed that a strip of land to accommodate the footpath had been secured within the planning approval granted at the neighbouring Four Gun Field development site.

A Member considered that the site's proximity to the SPA should be taken seriously in respect of the impact on wildlife. The Major Projects Officer confirmed that Section 106 monies would be paid to fund mitigation and that triggers would be included to control when the money was spent. The Head of Planning further explained that the Section 106 monies were the mechanism to ensure payment, as part of an EU directive to ring-fence funds, so that there was no harm to the SPA.

Resolved: That application 14/506519/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (25) in the report, an appropriate Section 106 agreement and to secure contributions as appropriate when triggered, and to any further conditions requested by KCC Ecology in response to the ecology survey.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 15/505910/REM
APPLICATION PROPOSAL
Approval of Reserved Matters including details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 86 dwellings pursuant to outline application SW/08/1127
ADDRESS Land adj. Coleshall Farm, Ferry Road, Iwade, Kent ME9 8QY

WARD Bobbing, Iwade & Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade	APPLICANT Persimmon Homes AGENT Pegasus Group
--	----------------------------------	--

The Major Projects Officer reported that amended layout plans had been received. Swale Footpaths Group had no objection.

Two further representations had been received, which included the following comments: a request for a minor change to the fenceline; and the scale of the development next to Mansfield Drive. He advised that no 3-storey dwellings were proposed, there would be 2.5-storey and 2-storey dwellings. KCC Highways had raised no objection to the amended layout.

The Major Projects Officer read out a statement from Iwade Parish Council. Their comments included: swap plots around; the amended plans opened up a corridor; Iwade stream was a health and safety issue, with steep banks and was fast flowing; were Kent Police consulted?; close board fencing was needed; 2.5 storey was much higher than 2-storey; loss of privacy; was told only 2-storey houses would be built; proposed hedge required maintenance, and was not a suitable barrier; lack of security; and they requested a site visit.

A representative from Iwade Parish Council did not speak at the meeting.

Diane Anderson, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Andy Meader, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He considered the scale and position would result in loss of privacy and security issues; and the amended layout had not been consulted on.

Councillor Ben Stokes moved a motion for a site meeting and this was seconded by Councillor Roger Clark. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 15/505910/REM be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/505554/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of side and rear extension, creation of first floor including dormer windows and rooflights to North and South Elevations - (resubmission of 15/501692)		
ADDRESS 30 Woodside Gardens, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1SG.		
WARD Woodstock	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL None (Sittingbourne)	APPLICANT Ascot Park Ltd AGENT Coteq Ltd

The Area Planning Officer reported that amended plans had been submitted, correcting a minor error in those originally submitted. One further objection had been received which had requested a site meeting, and had considered the re-submission had not been amended and it would be a blight on the neighbourhood.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He explained that the cul-de-sac comprised mainly of bungalows and the application would seriously alter the bulk, scale and appearance of the property. He acknowledged it was slightly amended since the last application but considered it to be too extensive, and that the impact on local residents was substantial.

Councillor Bryan Mulhern moved a motion for a site meeting and this was seconded by Councillor Mike Dendor. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 15/505554/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 15/503300/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Demolition of existing car sales showroom and MOT bay and workshop and the residential development of 4no. four bedroom, two storey houses together with all associated garages, parking spaces and access driveway			
ADDRESS 2 Horsham Lane, Upchurch, Kent ME9 7AL			
WARD	Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Paul Ashby Developments AGENT Harrison Mutch
		Upchurch	

The Area Planning Officer reported that the application was for three-bed, not four-bed dwellings, and the reference to a 1-bed flat in the report should be ignored. He drew Members' attention to the tabled Habitat Regulations Assessment for the site. The Area Planning Officer further explained that there was a statutory duty to have special regard to the setting of a listed building and conservation area but he considered these would not be harmed by the application.

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

A Ward Member requested that the timber cladding of some of the units be amended, as the style did not fit in with the surrounding area and suggested a design similar to what was approved last time.

Members agreed that officers be given delegated authority to re-negotiate to find a more suitable style for the exterior of the properties.

The Head of Planning suggested that the negotiations included the Ward Member and the Planning Committee Chairman.

Resolved: *That application 15/503300/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to re-negotiation with the applicant, officers, the Ward Member and Planning Committee Chairman to decide a revised exterior for the properties and to conditions (1) to (26) in the report.*

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 14/504665/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Demolition of existing garages and boundary wall and construction of three detached 3 bedroom house with associated landscaping parking and access			
ADDRESS The Vicarage, Church Lane, Newington, Kent ME9 7JU			
WARD	Hartlip,	PARISH/TOWN	COUNCIL
Newington & Upchurch		Newington	
		APPLICANT	Mr Julian Hills
		AGENT	Mr Michael Gibbs

The Area Planning Officer reported that condition (3) on page 87 of the report was duplicated by condition (23) on page 91, so condition (23) needed to be deleted. He confirmed that the outbuilding on the site was not used for community use, but for storage. The choir met in the church, as would any Sunday School in future, the church had a meeting room, and there were other similar facilities in the immediate area. He considered the loss of the outbuilding not to be a harmful loss of a community use.

KCC Highways had no objection to the application, subject to the access being reinstated as a footpath, and they requested a cross-over point on the road. Amended plans had been received and these addressed issues of overlooking, with the use of obscured glazing to the flank of the Vicarage. Landscaping (in particular boundary treatments) had been satisfactorily amended. The Tree Officer had raised concern with car parking spaces nos. 2 to 6 as they were too close to the trees on the southern boundary of the site and would potentially harm them. He requested that the spaces be moved further into the site. The Area Planning Officer reported that he was waiting to receive information on whether it would be appropriate to protect these trees by way of a Tree Preservation Order. He sought delegated authority to approve the application subject to the deletion of condition (23), an additional condition requiring the flank windows in the Vicarage to be obscure glazed, re-positioning the parking spaces and re-consultation with KCC Highways, the Parish Council and local residents and to no fresh issues being raised in any additional representations received.

Mr Robert Stevenson, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member spoke with concern on the effect of the development on Church Lane, a main access road, as it was already very congested. He requested that Members considered highway implications on Church Lane.

Resolved: *That application 14/504665/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (24) in the report, with the deletion of condition (23), an additional condition requiring the flank windows in the Vicarage to be obscure glazed, re-positioning the parking spaces and re-consultation with KCC Highways, the Parish Council and local residents and to no fresh issues being raised in any additional representations received.*

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 15/504264/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline application (with all matters reserved other than access into the site) for a mixed use development comprising: up to 310 dwellings; 11,875sqm of B1a floorspace; 3,800sqm of B1b floorspace; 2,850sqm of B1c floorspace; a hotel (use class C1)(up to 3,250sqm) of up to 100 bedrooms including an ancillary restaurant; a care home (use class C2)(up to of 3,800sqm) of up to 60 rooms including all associated ancillary floorspace; a local convenience store (use class A1) of 200sqm; 3 gypsy pitches: internal accesses; associated landscaping and open space; areas of play; a noise attenuation bund north of the M2; vehicular and pedestrian accesses from Ashford Road and Brogdale Road; and all other associated infrastructure.		
ADDRESS Land At Perry Court, London Road, Faversham, Kent ME13 8YA		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham	APPLICANT Hallam Land Management Ltd AGENT Barton Willmore

The Major Projects Officer introduced the application as set out in the report and provided updates.

He reported that the Greenspaces Officer had no objection to the application and welcomed the 15.2 hectares of open space on the site. The play area would be adopted by the Council, but the allotments would not.

The Major Projects Officer explained that the high pressure pipeline running east to west across the site would need to be considered at the Reserved Matters stage. Condition (24) would also need to be extended to include a clause in relation to the pipeline.

The Environmental Protection Team sought developer contributions to mitigate the effects of the development on the air quality in Ospringe.

Affordable housing would be secured by a Section 106 agreement, with a 30% provision and appropriate tenure split. Three further representations had been received with comments similar to those already noted in the report on pages 108 to 114.

A further letter had been received from Countryside under Threat. A summary of their earlier letter was set out in paragraph 6.09 on Page 116 of the report. The new letter raised further issues, summarised as follows: highlighted large volume of objections received during course of the application against the proposals; stated that the 'green setting south of the A2' which had been 'safeguarded for an age' to protect the character of Historic Faversham was supported by the letter received by Historic England; it was understood that homes were needed but not at the expense of destroying heritage and setting; and Faversham historically competed with Canterbury and York as a very important historic town.

The Major Projects Officer drew Members' attention to the tabled representation from the Faversham Society and the complete Brogdale Road Appeal Decision (APP/U2255/A/14/2224509). This had been included in the report, but some pages had been missing.

He advised that the voucher scheme referred to in the report had been withdrawn as legal advice had stated that it was not Section 106 compliant and the funding would be used to increase the bus contribution instead.

The Major Projects Officer emphasised that further to the discussion of 'heritage impact' at paragraphs 9.83 to 9.87 in the report, not only had consideration being given to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in the assessment of potential heritage impacts, it was also the case that proper consideration had been given to the statutory duty imposed under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of heritage assets.

Further to paragraph 7.19, on Page 124 of the report, delegated authority was sought to impose an additional condition in respect of the crossing to Ashford Road (at the north-east corner of the site) and to require the path through the site, parallel to Ashford Road. The Major Projects Officer considered that both should be of a specification suitable for both pedestrians and cyclists.

The Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to approve the application subject to further negotiation on the open spaces; air quality mitigation; an additional condition for pedestrian and cycle crossing the north east of the site to give safe access; amend condition (24) as above and negotiate the Section 106 agreement based on matters noted within paragraphs 9.69 to 9.80 in the report.

Parish Councillor Dean Kimili, representing Ospringe Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr Tovey, an objector from Ospringe, spoke against the application.

Mr Bass, an objector from Faversham, spoke against the application.

Mr David Murray-Cox, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Faversham Ward Member spoke against the application. He acknowledged that the employment proposals within the application were welcomed by some, and stated that there had been 290 letters of objection to the application and he did not want to see Faversham become a dormitory town. The Ward Member explained that the application land was important fruit and arable land. He considered the required housing figures could be sought by using brown field sites; the poor air quality in Ospringle would get worse; the adopted Local Plan was outdated; this was building on best land and was not sustainable; and this should be deferred until the emerging Local Plan had been examined; the application was premature.

The Ospringle Ward Member spoke against the application. He considered that, due to the amount of objection received, including a petition against the application, it should be deferred to another meeting for determination to allow more people to attend.

Councillor Prescott withdrew his support of the motion for approval and moved a motion to defer the application to another evening. This was seconded by Councillor Andy Booth.

A Member did not consider a deferment would resolve a conclusion on the application. He considered it was a premature proposal, and not in the adopted Local Plan or the emerging Local Plan. He stated that of the houses needed within Swale, this was not one of the sites that should be chosen; residents needed to be aware of the long-term housing needs and where houses should be sited; the Brogdale Road Appeal Decision was not comparable; suggest that a further proposal comes forward until the Local Plan was decided, or refuse the application and not consider until the new Local Plan was adopted.

At this point the Major Projects Officer advised that the applicant could appeal against non-determination. He suggested there could be a site visit to enable all parties to give their point of view. In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer confirmed that if there was a site visit, the applicant could still appeal against non-determination.

Councillor Prescott withdrew his motion to defer the application to another evening. Councillor Andy Booth withdrew from seconding the motion.

Councillor Prescott moved a motion for refusal. This was seconded by Councillor Roger Clark.

In response to a question, the Head of Planning advised that Swale had an out-of-date Local Plan and no 5-year supply of housing. Additional housing provision would be needed to meet the Borough's housing needs. The targets were unknown, but likely to be significant.

A Member suggested that loss of high quality agricultural land be a reason for refusal. The proposer of the motion for refusal suggested the following reasons for refusal: loss of best and most versatile farmland; highway congestion; air quality; density of development too high; and conflict with Bearing Fruits 2031.

A Member suggested that the reasons for refusal be the same as the previously refused application (reference SW/14/0015) at this site as it was almost identical to this application. These were noted on page 134 of the report.

Another Member suggested that a further reason be that the site was not specifically allocated for development in the Adopted Local Plan 2008.

At this point the Head of Planning used his delegated powers to 'call-in' the application. The Chairman explained the effect of the 'call-in' procedure to members of the public.

Resolved: That as the Planning Committee was minded to make a decision that would be contrary to Officer recommendation and contrary to planning policy and/or guidance, determination of the application be deferred to a subsequent meeting when the Head of Planning should advise Members of the prospects of such a decision if challenged on appeal and if it becomes the subject for costs.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 & 3.2 REFERENCE Nos - 15/504946/FULL and 15/504931/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Installation of an external wall insulation system to all external walls of property			
ADDRESSES: 1 and 2 Valley Cottages, Stalisfield Road, Stalisfield, Kent ME13 0HU			
WARD	PARISH/TOWN	COUNCIL	APPLICANT
East Downs Ward	Stalisfield		C/O Agent AGENT Amicus Horizon

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

The Ward Member spoke in support of the application.

Discussion ensued on the colour of the render. The Area Planning Officer advised that this was not the only way to insulate a property.

On being put to the vote the motion for refusal was lost.

Councillor Prescott moved a motion for approval and this was seconded by Councillor James Hunt.

A Member raised concern with the application being approved as it was within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

On being put to the vote the motion for approval was agreed.

Resolved: That applications 15/504946/FULL and 15/504931/FULL be approved.

3.3 REFERENCE NO - 15/505114/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use of land from agricultural to mixed agricultural/equestrian use. Construction of stabling for housing of horses, strictly private use.		
ADDRESS Land Adj To And Forming Part Of 2 Swedish House, Throwley Road, Throwley, Kent ME13 0PF		
WARD East Downs Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Throwley	APPLICANT Mr Paddy Reeves AGENT Agriquestrian Consultants

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

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

The Ward Member spoke in support of the application. He considered the positioning of the stables would not have a visual impact on the surrounding area.

Councillor Andy Booth moved a motion for a site meeting and this was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 15/505114/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

3.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/506335/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of first floor side extension and balcony and amendment to elevations of conservatory permitted under application SW/15/502989/FULL		
ADDRESS 226 Chequers Road Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 3SJ		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster	APPLICANT Mr And Mrs P Sumner AGENT Lander Planning

Klaire Lander, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application and considered the cumulative effect of the scale and bulk was too big.

Resolved: That application 15/506335/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 – Former Transport Depot, Standard Quay, Faversham**

APPEAL ALLOWED

280 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.**

281 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

6.1 - Stationing of mobile home/caravan at Standard House, Standard Quay, Faversham

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

Resolved: That an Enforcement Notice be issued in respect of the breach of planning control, pursuant to the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, requiring the use of the land for the stationing of a caravan used residentially to cease within 3 months of the Notice taking effect.

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

6.2 Ref ENF GEN – Change of Use and Un-authorized Developments at Sharsted Lodge, Sharsted Road, Doddington (Grade II Listed Building)

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

Resolved: That a Listed Building and /or Planning Enforcement Notice be issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, requiring the following within 6 months of the Notice taking effect.

- (1) The removal of the stainless steel flue from Sharsted Lodge and making good of the roof and wall finishes;***
- (2) The removal of the two sheds and fencing within the grounds of the listed building;***
- (3) The removal of the uPVC windows in the rear elevation of the garage building;***
- (4) The complete restoration of the garage building to the development referred to in planning permission SW/08/0826 and***
- (5) The cessation of the use of flats within the garage building by persons not associated with the residential use of the listed building Sharsted Lodge.***

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

6.3 Ref 15/500703/OPDEV – Siting of portacabin at 140 Halfway Road, Minster, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 3AR.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the reason for serving the notice would be that: “the stationing of a portacabin would give rise to a visually prominent and harmful development, out of character with the existing streetscene and materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies E1 and E19 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008.”

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

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 portable building within 3 months of the Notice taking effect.

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

282 URGENT ITEM

Appeal reference APP/V2255/W/15/3133538: Proposed change of use of land for the creation of hardstanding to site 16 mobile homes for 52 weeks of the year occupation by seasonal agricultural workers along with associated engineering works at Howt Green Farm, Sheppey Way, Bobbing, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME9 8QT (Planning Application reference number 14/505985/FULL).

The Chairman accepted this Urgent Item as the hearing statement was due with the Planning Inspectorate on 23 October 2015. There was no opportunity to put this to Committee previously or to include it on the main agenda.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to not contest the appeal and this was seconded.

Resolved: That the Council confirms in writing to the Planning Inspectorate that it does not intend to contest the appeal.

283 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8.15pm and reconvened at 8.26pm.

284 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