
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 18 August 2016 from 7.00 pm - 10.40 pm.

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Rob Bailey, James Freeman, Allan Ledden, Kellie MacKenzie, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

APOLOGIES: Councillors James Hunt, Nigel Kay and Samuel Koffie-Williams.

829 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

830 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 July 2016 (Minute Nos. 798 – 804) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

831 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Tina Booth declared a Pecuniary Interest in respect of items 2.1 16/503388/FULL 11 Leet Close, Eastchurch and 2.5 16/501159/OUT Land adjacent to Eastchurch Village Hall, Eastchurch. Councillor Booth left the room during consideration of these items.

832 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 August 2016 (Minute Nos. 823 – 824) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the following amendment: Minute No. 824, the penultimate paragraph should read: Local residents raised the following concerns: 'proposed **extension** would block-out light to the adjoining property', not windows as stated.

16/503948/FULL The Old School, Painters Forstal Road, Ospringe, ME13 0EG

Members considered the proposal and raised the following points: thankful to the applicants for marking out the proposed extension for Members; disappointing that no Parish Council representatives were present; and well designed extension which would do no real harm.

The Ward Member stated that he did not consider the proposal would cause problems.

Resolved: That application 16/503948/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report.

833 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 2.1 REFERENCE NO - 16/503388/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a first floor front extension over garage to form bedroom together with internal alterations to form new en-suite bathroom, and new bathroom window to side elevation. | | |
| ADDRESS 11 Leet Close Eastchurch Kent ME12 4EE | | |
| WARD Sheppey East | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch | APPLICANT Mr Paul Faiers AGENT Britch & Associates Ltd |

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

Members considered the application and the following points were raised: recall the site meeting at this property and the unacceptable impact it would have on the neighbouring property; and houses should not have been built that close.

The motion to approve the application was lost.

Councillor Andy Booth moved the following motion: That the application be refused due to being an over-intensive development, harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene, and would cause demonstrable harm to the residential amenities and lifestyle of the residents of the neighbouring property. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 16/503388/FULL be refused due to an over-intensive development, harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene, and would cause demonstrable harm to the residential amenities and lifestyle of the residents of the neighbouring property.

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2.2 REFERENCE NO – 16/504234/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Single storey rear infill extension and single storey extension to side following demolition of garage. | | |
| ADDRESS 34 Ethelbert Road, Faversham, Kent ME13 8SQ | | |
| WARD | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL | APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Lloyd |

| | | |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Watling | Faversham Town | AGENT Ms Hayley Cannon |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------------|

The Area Planning Officer reported that amended drawings clarifying the design of the extension had been received. These were as hoped for by officers.

Mrs Tara Lloyd, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included: cannot see how it would affect the property to the east as stated by Faversham Town Council; good application; the reasons for allowing the application were necessary and acceptable; and lots of space in Ethelbert Road for the development.

Resolved: *That application 16/504234/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report and as per the amended drawings.*

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| 2.3 REFERENCE NO - 16/505096/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing garage and formation of new single-storey side and double-storey rear extension complete with pitched roofs. | | |
| ADDRESS 47 Berkeley Court Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1UP | | |
| WARD Homewood | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL | APPLICANT Mr and Mrs Vickery AGENT LT Drawing Services Ltd |

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

A Member stated that he was aware that the Ward Member was concerned about the impacts the proposal would have on No. 90 College Road, Sittingbourne.

In response to a query from a Member, the Area Planning Officer confirmed that if the Ward Member had not called-in the application it would have been delegated to officers, as there were only three letters of objection.

Resolved: *That application 16/505096/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (4) in the report.*

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 2.4 REFERENCE NO - 16/500338/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use from static holiday caravan park to residential park home site (Resubmission). | | |
| ADDRESS Red Lion Caravan Park London Road Dunkirk Kent ME13 9LL | | |
| WARD Boughton & Courtenay | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Dunkirk | APPLICANT Mr Horace Gaskin AGENT TMA Chartered |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| | | Surveyors |
|--|--|-----------|

The Area Planning Officer requested the imposition of a further condition to ensure that there were no more than ten caravans on the site at any time. This was agreed by Members.

Mr Jeff Tutt, Dunkirk Parish Council, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Tim Matthews, 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 spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: the local public house and farmshop would benefit from the application; would bring vitality to the village; should encourage this type of development in other areas; totally different from caravan parks on the Isle of Sheppey; this site has spent the last few years in breach of planning conditions; why can this not be compared to holiday homes on the Isle of Sheppey?; was against planning policy; need to take a stand against this type of development; provided affordable housing; concerned that some Members were distancing themselves from similar sites on the Isle of Sheppey; this was a good scheme; and nice ‘starter home’ development in the village.

Councillor Mike Henderson requested that officers be delegated authority to clarify the wording in the Local Connection Criteria outlined on pages 17 and 18 of the Committee report. In particular that Part 1 (a) be amended to read ‘Whose **parent**’ not ‘mother’ as stated, that the person criteria in Part 1A and Part 2A are clearly stated as alternatives, and Part 1 (d) be amended to read ‘Whose permanent place of work’, not ‘or work’. Members agreed to these amendments.

Resolved: That application 16/500338/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report, the imposition of a further condition to ensure that there are no more than ten caravans on the site at any time and the clarification of the wording of the Local Need Criteria as minuted.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 2.5 REFERENCE NO – 16/501159/OUT | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL | | |
| Outline (All matters reserved) - Single dwelling and associated residential curtilage | | |
| ADDRESS Land Adjacent To Eastchurch Village Hall Warden Road Eastchurch Kent ME12 4EJ | | |
| WARD Sheppey East | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch | APPLICANT Mr Simon Tomlin AGENT Green Planning Studio Ltd |

Mr Nathaniel Green, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included: Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation previously acknowledged that it was not advisable to access onto Warden Road; unacceptable as it was outside the built-up area of Eastchurch, if allowed development outside the built-up area how far do you go?; local residents were very concerned; inappropriate location; would be establishing the principle for ribbon development all the way out to the countryside; need to approve as the Council has no five-year housing land supply provision currently; do not consider the access was dangerous; do not support but not a lot we can do about it; although we currently have no five-year housing land supply provision we are progressing towards a valid Local Plan so soon will have; why are we not able to support refusal as it was outside the village envelope?; and all previous applications at the site have been refused.

In response to queries from a Member, the Area Planning Officer advised that he was not able to show elevational drawings as the application was at outline stage. He advised that the one letter of support was not from a local resident.

The Area Planning Officer reminded Members that they could only refuse the application on material planning considerations. He drew attention to paragraph 4.01 on page 32 of the Committee report, which set out paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and that any harm had to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. With regard to the village envelope, the Area Planning Officer stated that as the Council could not demonstrate a five-year supply of housing sites, then the Council's policies relating to the location and housing were out of date. However, once the five-year supply was achieved this would change.

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

There was some discussion on potential reasons for refusing the application which included: outside the built-up boundary of Eastchurch; the other applications at the site were refused on highway grounds nothing has changed in this respect; outside the village envelope; would cause demonstrable harm to the countryside; policies from the existing local plan have been saved so were relevant; and the application did demonstrably outweigh the benefits as one dwelling was not much of a benefit.

At this point the Legal Partnership Planning Lawyer reiterated the Area Planning Officer's comments that the Council's Local Plan policies were out-of-date due to the lack of a 5-year housing supply and no weight could be attached to them. He reminded Members that they had to demonstrate that the harm caused by the development significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits.

Discussion ensued and Councillor Andy Booth moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds that it would cause significant harm to the countryside, significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the proposal, and the proposed access would cause harm to the safety of persons

travelling along Warden Road, significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the proposal. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Baldock. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: *That application 16/501159/OUT be refused as it would cause significant harm to the countryside, significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the proposal, and the proposed access would cause harm to the safety of persons travelling along Warden Road, significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the proposal.*

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 2.6 REFERENCE NO – 16/504186/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing garage and the erection of two bedroom family dwelling and studio space at ground floor level. | | |
| ADDRESS Land Opposite 117 Upper Brents Faversham Kent ME13 7DZ | | |
| WARD Priory | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town | APPLICANT Mr Damian Rowe AGENT Timothy Hatton Architects |

The Area Planning Officer reported that amended drawings had been received showing the removal of the side window and screening the end of the top floor balcony to remove any overlooking issues to the adjacent plot of land.

Mr Damien Rowe, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Timothy Hatton, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Ward Member spoke in support of the application.

Resolved: *That application 16/504186/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (18) in the report and as per the amended drawings, with consequent amendments to condition (2).*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.7 REFERENCE NO – 16/505697/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use from light industrial (office/storage) B1/B8 to Micropub A4. | | |
| ADDRESS Trafalgar Court, West Street, Queenborough, Kent, ME11 5AD | | |
| WARD Queenborough and Halfway | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Queenborough Town | APPLICANT Mr Christopher Collier AGENT |

The Area Planning Officer drew attention to an error in the report and advised that there was no courtyard at the premises. The Area Planning Officer reported that three further letters of objection and three further letters of support had been received raising issues already covered in the Committee report.

Mr Paul Jarvis, an objector, spoke against the proposal.

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

Ward Members spoke in support of the application.

In response to queries, the Area Planning Officer clarified that KCC Highways and Transportation would not comment on such an application. He confirmed that the opening hours were 11am to 11pm, as requested by the Council’s Environmental Health Manager and potential noise from customers would be dealt with by licensing.

Resolved: That application 15/505697/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 2.8 REFERENCE NO – 16/503740/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL | | |
| Alterations to existing elevations of existing residential dwellings, including new windows and new entrance door positions on south-east elevation & new glazed doors to north-west elevation. New rooflights & flues. | | |
| ADDRESS Black Barn Farm Crockham Lane Hernhill Kent ME13 9LB | | |
| WARD Boughton & Courtenay | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hernhill | APPLICANT Mount Ephraim Farms AGENT Miriam Layton Architectural Design |

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| 2.9 REFERENCE NO – 16/503782/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL | | |
| Refurbishment and conversion of The Tapster Inn from restaurant/residential use into two residential houses. | | |
| ADDRESS The Tapster Inn Seed Road Newnham ME9 0NA | | |
| WARD East Downs Ward | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newnham | APPLICANT Earthrise Developments Limited AGENT SRC Architecture |

Mr Cox, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

Members considered the proposal and raised the following points: would prefer to see conversion into four or more houses; and needed to consider the application before us, not what we would prefer to see.

With regard to queries about more than two houses, the Area Planning Officer explained that the building was quite narrow inside and the agent was concerned about the costs and the damaging impacts to the building if more houses were allowed.

The Ward Member raised concern about the entrance to the site. He wanted to ensure that the applicant was fully aware of the issues with the unauthorised access.

The Area Planning Officer clarified that the entrance to the site was via the delivery stables. Enforcement action had been taken against the unauthorised entrance along Seed Road. He confirmed that this was not owned by the applicant and had now been blocked-up, pending the appeal.

Resolved: That application 16/503782/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report.

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 2.10 REFERENCE NO – 16/504494/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a cold store. | | |
| ADDRESS Owens Court Farm Owens Court Road Selling ME13 9QN | | |
| WARD Boughton and Courtenay | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Selling | APPLICANT FW Mansified & Son AGENT Amos Dawton & Finn |

The Area Planning Officer reported that further discussions with the applicant had resulted in agreement that the hours of use of the building could be restricted to 5am to 10pm and a further recommendation was requested requiring this. He reported that a further objection had been received which focused on the fact that this was the last of a series of applications here, and that it looked like an abuse of the planning process.

The Area Planning Officer further reported that emails had also been received from a neighbour who remained concerned that alternatives had not been fully explored, including: re-use of an existing building; demolishing an existing building and building on its footprint, so avoiding any changes to access or loss of trees; whether or not the doors could be re-arranged to face into the farm, rather than towards the land; whether an access road could be built across the farm from the Selling Road to provide access to the site without using Owens Court Road; and possible use of a mobile cooling unit.

The Area Planning Officer stated that they also requested conditions limiting the hours of use to 7am to 8pm, and restricting advertising at the site area. The Area Planning Officer stated that he had already mentioned a new hours of use condition, and advised that a condition restricting advertising was not necessary or reasonable here. Finally, due to people’s holidays, it was requested that consideration of the application be delayed.

Mrs Deborah Cook, Selling Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mrs Janet Upson, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Nicholas Rooke, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

Councillor Bobbin, a Ward Member, moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded from the Chair by Councillor Bryan Mulhern.

Some Members raised concern about the highway implications of the application and considered the site meeting would allow Members to view these. Members requested that a representative from KCC Highways and Transportation attended the site meeting and also that the area of the proposed building be marked out for Members.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken on the site meeting as follows:

For: Councillors Mike Baldock, Bobbin, Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Mike Henderson, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern, Prescott and Ghlin Whelan.

Against: Councillors Cameron Beart, Andy Booth, Tina Booth, Ken Ingleton, and Sue Gent.

The motion for a site meeting was agreed.

Resolved: That application 16/504494/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 2.11 REFERENCE NO – 15/510527/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Development of disused grazing paddock to form 15 new dwellings. | | |
| ADDRESS Scocles Court, Scocles Road, Minster-On-Sea, Kent, ME12 3RU. | | |
| WARD Sheppey Central | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea | APPLICANT Mr Abhaey Singh AGENT Nigel Bird Architects |

The Major Projects Officer reported that further to the discussion of developer contributions on page 89 of the Committee report, the open spaces within the site would not be offered for adoption, partly in recognition of the limited size of the site and partly also with regard to the very tight viability of the scheme – financial contributions towards future upkeep would not have been viable, thus leaving the Council to incur all future costs. The applicant intended to make use of a management company to ensure care of these areas, and the Major Projects Officer suggested that Members may want to consider an additional condition to ensure details of such an arrangement were submitted to the Council.

The Major Projects Officer further reported that in light of the very limited contributions to be provided as part of this development, only Natural England’s

Special Protection Area Mitigation Contribution and wheelie bin payment, and the significant viability issues, it was not considered appropriate for an administration charge to be sought here.

The Major Projects Officer concluded that as set out on page 90 of the Committee report, delegation was sought to approve, subject to conditions as set out and to the signing of a suitably worded Section 106 Agreement.

Mr Abhaey Singh, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

Ward Members raised the following concerns: the design of the 'barn' style properties was not acceptable adjacent to a Listed Building; and disappointed that no footpath was being provided and this would have an adverse impact on highway safety.

Members considered the application and raised comments which included: highway concerns as the road was narrow and there was a blind bend as you approached the roundabout at the site; disappointed with KCC Highways and Transportations comments; the previous design would have allowed for a footpath; and the applicant has stated that they can reduce the Volatile Organic Compound (VOCs) so would like this added as a condition.

Members were disappointed that no representative from KCC Highways and Transportation was present at the meeting to advise on highway issues.

In response to queries from Members, the Major Projects Officer reported that if Members were minded to approve the application they could delegate authority to officers to enhance condition (7) to include reduction of VOCs and to require the Passivhaus sustainable design and conclusion standard. The Major Projects Officer further reported that KCC Highways and Transportation had advised that it would not be possible to provide a footpath due to the narrowness of the road and the location of the pond.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following amendment: delegate to officers to re-word condition (7) to include reduction of VOCs and Passivhaus sustainable standard and that a footpath was provided along entire site frontage to allow safe access for pedestrians at the end of the site. This was not seconded.

Councillor Andy Booth moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow KCC Highways and Transportation to comment further on the provision of a footpath. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 14/510527/FULL be deferred to allow KCC Highways and Transportation to comment further on the provision of a footpath, and to allow officers to negotiate an amendment to achieve the

provision of a footpath to the entire site frontage. And to agree amended wording for condition (7).

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 2.12 REFERENCE NO – 13/1455 | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Outline planning application for the residential development (of up to 431 dwellings). | | |
| ADDRESS Land At Harps Farm, Parcels D,E,F & G, Thistle Hill, Minster, Sheerness, Kent | | |
| WARD Sheppey Central | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea | APPLICANT Mr Peter Taylor AGENT Matthew Blythin |

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to the tabled update. He also reported that with regard to the use of local labour and apprenticeship places, Members should note that Economic Development offices were seeking the provision of these as part of the Section 106 Agreement. Further to Paragraph 7.02, Highways England had now commented on the amended scheme, The Major Projects Officer read out the following extract: *“Having reviewed the revised details relating to this application, we are concerned that background circumstances (for example, emerging new local plan and other developments applied for and/or permitted) may have changed since the original traffic surveys were undertaken in May 2012. To enable us to understand whether there have been any material changes to the operation of the highway network which require us to take a different view of the proposals, we request that a comparison of 2016 traffic data and the traffic data contained within the assessment is undertaken. If appropriate, this could involve a simple comparison of 2016 Automatic Traffic Count data to the existing 2012 traffic survey data on key links connecting to the A249 which will be affected by the proposals.”*

Mr David Bedford, 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 points which included: no faith in KCC Highways and Transportation, and consider they have made a mess of the road network on this part of the Isle of Sheppey; no footpath access to Minster; most of the youth provision from the Section 106 Agreement will go to Sheerness, which is difficult for the youth in Minster to access due to lack of buses; access to the site would be difficult; lacking in community open space provision; how would the off-site sports facilities be accessed?; needs to be deferred until the traffic issues have been resolved; KCC Highways and Transportation do not have the communication with local residents that local Ward Members do, and local residents are concerned about the implications of further development here until highway issues had been resolved.

There was some discussion about the upgrading of the Lower Road/Barton Hill Drive junction and the Head of Planning Services reported that he was confident that funding for this improvement would be forthcoming.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: even with proposed improvements at Cowstead Corner and Lower Road there would still be a 'pinch point' in respect of access to the development; concern that shops proposed at Thistle Hill had not been developed; no footpath provided; KCC Highways network 'abysmal'; lots of houses and not much else; concern that we keep approving development in this area without any improvements to road network; no vote of confidence in KCC Highways; and application was 'wholly unreasonable'.

In response to queries, the Major Projects Officer advised that the developer contribution of £433,586 would be paid on commencement of the development. He further advised that Members could delegate to officers to negotiate with the developer earlier triggers for this contribution.

Resolved: *That application 13/1455 be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (24) in the report and to additional information being provided and Highways England, Lower Medway Internal Drainage Board, and KCC Flood and Water Management withdrawing their objections, additional conditions as minuted, and as set-out in the tabled update; and the signing of a suitably-worded Section 106 Agreement. With officers having authority to make amendments to conditions and Section 106 wording as may reasonably be required.*

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 2.13 REFERENCE NO –15/506945/OUT | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Outline application for residential development comprising of up to 8 dwellings with access and parking. (access being sought). | | |
| ADDRESS Land At School Lane Bapchild Kent | | |
| WARD West Downs | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bapchild | APPLICANT Crabtree & Crabtree (Bapchild) Ltd AGENT BDB Design LLP |

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.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: concern at the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land; outside the village envelope and part of important countryside gap; groundwater and flooding issues from A2 to Tonge Pond, was a condition on groundwater flooding considered?; would affect a Grade II listed building; the harm would outweigh the need for the development; would have an adverse impact on the village of Bapchild; drew attention to a recent planning appeal for a similar application which was refused and the Inspector had

given weight to Swale Borough Local Plan policies; and would not be in the interests of local residents and did not fit in with the Council's plan for Bapchild.

The Major Projects Officer stated that Members should consider the application on its own merits. The housing density of the application was low and the land was not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. He considered that it would improve the local landscape and was in a sustainable location.

The Conservation Officer reported that they had had concerns with the previous application for 14 houses but were happy that this had been reduced to eight, and considered the proposed landscaping would soften the impact of the dwellings on the landscape. He did not consider that the proposal would adversely impact on the adjoining Grade II Listed Building.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken on the motion to approve as follows:

For: Councillors Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Roger Clark, Mike Dendor, Ken Ingleton, Sue Gent, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern, Prescott and Ghlin Whelan.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock, Richard Darby, James Hall, Tina Booth and Mike Henderson.

The motion to approve the application was agreed.

Resolved: That application 15/506945/OUT be approved subject to conditions (1) to (29) in the report.

PART 5

- **Item 5.1 – Land adjacent to Marley, High Street Road, Dargate**

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.2 – 61 Newton Road, Faversham**

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.3 – 120 Park Drive, Tunstall**

APPEAL DISMISSED

834 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 item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 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.**

835 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

Ref ENF/SW/13/1272 Parsonage Farm Bungalow, Painters Forstal, Faversham

Resolved: That an Enforcement Notice pursuant to the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, requiring that the dormer windows be either removed or constructed in accordance with the sizes and design as shown on Drawing No. BRW-0413-01 Revision B Sheet 2 of 2 of planning permission SW/13/1272 within 6 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.

836 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 9.30pm and reconvened at 9.37pm.

837 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm and 10.30pm Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders in order that the 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