
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 8 December 2016 from 7.00 - 10.27 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Tina Booth (In place of Bryan Mulhern), Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Samuel Koffie-Williams, Peter Marchington, Prescott and Ghlin Whelan.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Andy Byrne, James Freeman, Kate Jardine, Andrew Jeffers, Kellie MacKenzie, Ross McCardle and Andrew Spiers.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Lloyd Bowen and Nicholas Hampshire.

APOLOGY: Councillor Bryan Mulhern (Chairman).

1058 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Vice-Chairman in the Chair ensured that those present were aware of the emergency evacuation procedure.

1059 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 November 2016 (Minute Nos. 999 – 1005) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

1060 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

1061 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 November 2016 (Minute Nos. 1028 – 1030) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendment: That the apologies be amended to include these three Members only: Councillors James Hunt, Ken Ingleton and Bryan Mulhern.

16/506618/FULL 41 Windsor Drive, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1UN

The Planning Officer reported that two additional letters had been received, one asking for a copy of the minutes and the other saying there were trees within the adjacent school site and that the application site could not be seen from public land.

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

Resolved: *That application 16/506618/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.*

16/506288/OUT 100 Station Road, Teynham, Kent, ME9 9TB

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application and raised the following points: would have an over-bearing impact on the area; the open aspect of Amber Close would be lost; would set a precedent for similar developments in the area; unfair on local residents; and would have an adverse effect on the character of the area.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: concerns about visibility onto a busy road; access to Amber Close was already difficult; highway concerns due to lack of visibility; would have an overbearing effect on the area; parking concerns as residents would have to park in a line rather than side-by-side; vehicles would have to reverse out of Amber Close which was unacceptable; and the area was designed as an ‘open area’.

In response to queries, the Planner advised Members that this was an outline application, therefore details about fencing to be provided would be considered as part of any Reserved Matters application.

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

Members suggested various reasons for refusal and, upon further discussion with the Planner, withdrew matters which were not considered sufficient grounds for refusal (i.e. highway and parking issues). Councillor Mike Baldock moved the following motion: That the application be refused as it was an inappropriate area for housing, contrary to the open-plan nature of the estate, would have an overbearing effect on the area, would be detrimental to the streetscene and character of the area and have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of occupants in Amber Close. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson.

On being put to the vote the motion to refuse the application was carried.

Resolved: That application 16/506288/OUT be refused as it was an inappropriate area for housing, contrary to the open-plan nature of the estate; would have an overbearing effect on the area, would be detrimental to the streetscene and character of the area and have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of occupants of Amber Close.

1062 DEFERRED ITEMS

REFERENCE NO - 15/510565/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Part retrospective application for attenuating fence and canopy.			
ADDRESS Hand Car Wash, 15 – 21 Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YX			
WARD	Borden	and	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL
			APPLICANT Mr L Kapaj

Grove	Bobbing	AGENT Associates	Woodstock
-------	---------	----------------------------	-----------

The Planning Officer drew attention to paragraph 7.07 of the Committee report and advised that the application was for consideration of an attenuating fence and canopy only; the hours of operation were not part of this application.

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

Ward Members raised concerns which included: spray into neighbouring gardens was unacceptable; disappointed with the amount of time taken by officers to consider local concerns; caused environmental issues; suggest two further conditions, one to ensure the acoustic fence was erected within a certain period of time and another requiring that the effectiveness of the fence was considered after six months of being erected to ensure it was fit for purpose; appreciate they had permission for a car wash but this does not give them ‘carte blanche’ to affect local residents; the Council had a duty to ensure the operation of the car wash did not impede local residents; and the proposal would not alleviate all the issues at the site.

In response to queries from a Member, the Planning Officer confirmed that two letters of objection had been received. He was aware however, that the Council’s Environmental Health Team had received several complaints from local residents about the site. He confirmed that a condition requiring that the fence be erected within six months of the permission could be imposed.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following amendment: That a further condition be imposed requiring the erection of the fence within 6 months from the date of permission. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was carried.

Resolved: That application 15/510565/FULL be approved subject to condition (1) in the report and the imposition of a further condition requiring the fence be erected within 6 months from the date of permission.

1063 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 16/507069/ADV
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Advertisement consent for 5 x non-illuminated pole mounted sponsorship signs.
ADDRESS Advertisement on roundabout at Sonora Way/Jacinth Drive, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 5SN

WARD The Meads	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bobbing	APPLICANT Force Limited AGENT N/A	Marketing
--------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-----------

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

The Ward Member spoke against the application. He raised the following concerns: highway safety; dispute paragraph 8.02 of the Committee report which stated the roundabout has clear visibility, it did not because of the vegetation on the roundabout; the roundabout was already dangerous and this will further impact on highway safety; the roundabout was not on a main road; and if approved should be on a temporary three year basis to enable highway safety to be monitored after that time.

Members considered the application and raised the following points: the Council should have a policy approach on this type of application; unacceptable to add to the ‘visual clutter’ on the roundabout; will make it more difficult for pedestrians to cross safely at this point; should refuse on highway safety grounds; should consider the concerns of local residents; did not seem sensible to have adverts on a roundabout; adverts make a roundabout look untidy; signs were so small how would motorists be able to view the signs in any case?; these signs were a distraction to drivers; and note that the sign will be lower than the foliage but consider the foliage to be a danger as it also obscured motorists’ view.

In response to concerns from a Member, the Planning Officer stated that KCC Highways and Transportation had not provided any evidence to support suggestions that the roundabout was dangerous.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following amendment: That the application be approved on a temporary three year basis and that highway safety at the site was reviewed after that time. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was carried.

Resolved: *That application 16/507069/ADV be delegated to officers to approve on a temporary three year basis to allow highway safety to be reviewed after that time and to conditions (1) to (6) in the report.*

2.2 REFERENCE NO – 16/507097/ADV			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Advertisement consent for 6 x non-illuminated pole mounted sponsorship signs.			
ADDRESS Roundabout junction with A249, Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YU			
WARD Borden and Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bobbing	APPLICANT Marketing Force Ltd AGENT N/A	

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

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following amendment: That the application be approved on a temporary three year basis and that highway safety at the site is reviewed after that time. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

There was some discussion about whether Borden Parish Council had been consulted and the Development Manager stated that for the avoidance of doubt the application could be approved subject to receipt of the views of Borden Parish Council.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was carried.

Councillor Mike Baldock requested that his vote against the application be noted.

Resolved: That application 16/507097/ADV be delegated to officers to approve on a temporary three year basis to allow highway safety to be reviewed after that time and to conditions (1) to (6) in the report and the receipt of the views of Borden Parish Council.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 16/507183/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Classroom Extension		
ADDRESS Milstead Primary School School Lane Milstead Kent ME9 0SJ		
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Milstead	APPLICANT Mrs Katherine Baker AGENT Ian Titherington

The Planner reported that the drawings received were inaccurate, showing the building to have been 'flipped'. He stated that he had not yet received amended drawings, so would be seeking delegation to approve the application, subject to the receipt of corrected drawings.

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

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following motion: That the application be deferred pending receipt of amended drawings. This was seconded by Councillor Prescott.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

Resolved: That application 16/507183/FULL be deferred pending receipt of amended drawings.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 16/505280/OUT
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Outline Application for residential development (up to 33 dwellings), and open space; including associated access (vehicular / cycle / pedestrian), alterations to levels, surface water attenuation features (including swales), landscaping and related development.

ADDRESS Land At Swale Way East Hall Farm East Hall Lane Sittingbourne Kent ME10 3TJ		
WARD Murston	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Trenport Investments Limited AGENT Vincent and Gorbing

Mr Trevor Grain, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Chris Hall, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members were given time to read the tabled statement from the applicant’s agent.

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

The Senior Planner confirmed that the applicant had offered a further £20,000 contingency fund against the costs of setting-up a community shop, and this would be specified separately within the S106 Agreement. He explained that the fund would provide a contingency for construction and related fees, and fit-out costs for the building.

Ward Members spoke against the application and raised points which included: land had been set-aside by the developer to provide a medical centre, public house, school but had not been provided; the local community must come first; strong objections to the proposal by local residents; lack of community cohesion; lack of facilities; and would add to current congestion and access problems.

Members considered the application and raised points which included: important for the local community to have a convenience store; should add a condition that a shop be provided within one year; should be no more development on the Great East Hall estate until the Northern Relief Road (NRR) was completed; local residents should have confidence that the Local Planning Authority ensured developers deliver what they have promised; the Council should have requested that the developer provide shops after so many houses had been built; need to look at the Eurolink V development and the impact it would have on the viability of a community centre; cannot build 700 properties and not have shops; should not accept the application without substantial changes; concern that the developer misled people when they were purchasing properties at the site; do not consider that residents should have to operate the shop; two or three shops would be a better proposal; the developer needs to consider the future viability of the site; as the estate increases there would be a need for shops to be provided; the developer needs to ensure they leave space for retail; and should refuse as premature application and provision of a shop will become viable in the future.

In response to queries from Members about the development of Eurolink V and its impact on the viability of a neighbourhood centre, the Senior Planner drew attention to paragraph 9.06 of the Committee report which clarified the position. He advised that the additional money that the developer was offering would not be available until the development commenced.

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

At this point the Head of Planning Services used his delegated powers listed under Part 3 (Responsibility for Council Functions) of the Council's Constitution for the Planning Committee to 'call-in' the application.

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 the next meeting of the Committee.

2.5 REFERENCE NO – 16/506068/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of chalet bungalow with detached double garage/store and associated parking, access and landscaping works		
ADDRESS Land At Callaways Lane Newington Kent ME9 7LU		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newington	APPLICANT Mr J Lane AGENT DHA Planning

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

A Member considered that it was an inappropriate location for the proposal.

On being put to the vote, the motion to approve was carried.

Resolved: That application 16/506068/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (17) in the report.

2.6 REFERENCE NO – 16/505956/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of the existing commercial buildings, erection of 3, four bed terraced dwellings and 2, four bed semi-detached dwellings, creation of 11 car parking spaces and area for cycle spaces to rear of dwellings as amended by drawings received 3 November 2016		
ADDRESS 42-44 The Street Bapchild ME9 9AH		
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bapchild	APPLICANT Mr Herbert Gray AGENT Cook Associates Design Studio LLP

Mr Baker, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Peter Cook, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Planner clarified that officers were seeking delegation to approve the application, subject to outstanding representations to be received by 15 December 2016.

Members considered the application and raised the following points: consider that the proposed dwellings were ‘ugly’ and not-in-keeping with the area; needed to consider 21st century building design and considered this was a ‘sound development’; concern about the loss of employment space; flat roofs were prone to leaking; good that a building that may have asbestos would be cleared from the site; and technology had improved the quality of flat roofs so they did not leak.

In response to a query from a Member about the loss of employment space, the Planner reported that he had spoken informally to the Council’s Economic Development Unit and they were happy with the proposal as it was not a major employment site and was within a predominantly residential area.

In response to a query from a Member, the Planner was unable to confirm whether there was asbestos at the site. He referred to condition (21) of the Committee report which included measures for the safe dismantling of asbestos.

On being put to the vote, the motion to approve was carried.

Resolved: *That application 16/505956/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (23) in the report and any outstanding representations (closing date 15 December 2016).*

2.7 REFERENCE NO – 16/505982/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of two detached buildings comprising (i) two A1 retail units and (ii) an A3/A5 drive-thru restaurant, and associated parking (Alternative development to site 6 under application 14/505440).		
ADDRESS Depot Eurolink Way Sittingbourne Kent ME10 3HH		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT The Spirit of Sittingbourne LLP AGENT Goddard Planning Consultancy

The Senior Planner reported that the applicant had provided further information to support their case that the scheme cannot comply with Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) standards, on the basis of the additional costs that would be incurred and the effect this would have on the viability of the scheme, and that it would also require renegotiation of contracts with the occupiers of the units, with risks of further delay and uncertainty. The Senior Planner stated that on that basis, officers had taken the view that it would not be appropriate to impose a BREEAM condition on the development.

The Senior Planner reported that KCC Highways and Transportation had now confirmed formally that they were satisfied with the revised layout. This included improvements to the route of the drive-thru facility and pedestrian routes within the site, as reported in paragraph 9.38 of the main report.

The Senior Planner drew Members’ attention to paragraph 9.32 of the Committee report. He advised Members that the applicant had not made any further design changes to the scheme.

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

Members considered the application and raised the following points: needed to listen to the advice of the Council’s retail advisor who had stated that the development would have an impact on trading in the town centre; did not accord with Policy DM2 of the emerging “Bearing Fruits” Local Plan (with Proposed Main Modifications); the site will no longer be a retail park but a food outlet, should refuse the application; ‘appalled’ that the Scrutiny Committee had not been given the opportunity to consider the application; unhappy that the BREEAM standards would not be met; good scheme which was wanted by local residents; Ward Members raised no objection; poor highway layout, and the left-turn only out of the site would cause problems suggest that a right-turn be included; officers should have delegated powers to discuss the design and layout issues outlined in paragraphs 9.32 and 9.34 of the Committee report; considered that the Council was being ‘press-ganged’ into approving the application; and the regeneration should be inspiring.

The Senior Planner advised Members that the further design changes sought by officers were limited to elevational treatment of the building, and not substantive layout and scale changes.

Councillor Mike Baldock moved the following amendment: That officers be given delegated authority to discuss with the applicant the design of the scheme. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson. This was agreed by Members.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was carried.

Resolved: *That application 16/505982/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (35) in the report and officers to discuss the design of the scheme with the applicant, and to completion of a legal agreement.*

2.8 REFERENCE NO – 16/506081/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Detached four storey building comprising ground floor restaurant space (use class A3) and 63 bedroom hotel (Alternative development to site 4, Block B under application 14/505440/FULL).		
ADDRESS Site At St Michael's Road Spirit Of Sittingbourne Site 4, Block B Sittingbourne Kent ME10 3DU		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT The Spirit of Sittingbourne LLP AGENT Goddard Planning Consultancy

The Senior Planner reported that a consultation response had been received from the KCC Sustainable Drainage Team. They raised no objection to the proposal subject to a planning condition requiring a sustainable surface water drainage

scheme to be submitted and approved. The Senior Planner stated that a sustainable drainage condition was recommended under condition (5) of the Committee report.

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

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

Resolved: That application 16/506081/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (28) in the report and a legal agreement.

2.9 REFERENCE NO – 16/504551/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline application for a 50 bed care home with ancillary accommodation, over 3 floors (the top floor within the roof) and with a basement kitchen and staff rooms, with appearance, layout and scale to be considered at this stage and all other matters reserved for future consideration		
ADDRESS Little Oyster Residential Home Seaside Avenue Minster-On-Sea ME12 2NJ		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Ernesto Batten AGENT Prime Folio

Mrs Nicola Woods-Thomas, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Development Manager reported that Minster Parish Council stated that it had been approached by several local residents concerned that access was a reserved matter. He advised that the parish Council itself was disappointed that the application was reserved as it considered access an integral part of determining the application.

The Development Manager further reported that one letter of objection had been received from a local resident which was summarised as follows: it was hoped committee would take note of the large amount of objections received to the various applications on the site; proposal was out-of-keeping with the residential area; planning permission would increase the value of the land and the owner could then sell it; Care Quality Commission had only just upgraded the homes record which required improvement to good; wondered how well they would cope with 50 extra residents?; it was hoped Committee refuse permission and bring an end to the flood of applications made by the owners over recent years.

The Development Manager stated that this was an outline application with appearance, layout and scale to be considered now as noted in paragraph 2.01 of the Committee report and also that KCC Highways and Transportation raised no objection to the proposal on highway safety and convenience grounds, and under the previous almost identical application which included access as a matter to be determined, KCC Highways and Transportation raised no objection therefore it was

apparent to officers that it was appropriate to deal with access as a subsequent reserved matter and not require details at outline stage.

The Development Manager advised that in the emerging Local Plan, although the site fell outside the built-up area boundary, it was not designated as either 'Proposed Local Green Space' DM18, or 'Coastal change Management Area' DM23 and the red line was also inconsistent in that it included only half the existing car park.

The Development Manager further advised that an additional condition be added to restrict the use of the development to that of Use Class C2.

Members considered the application and raised the following points: local residents raised good points but difficult to find reasons to refuse the application; Care Quality was not a planning consideration; this application was essentially approved three years ago so should approve again; the points that Minster Parish Council raised were not relevant; how can the application be approved without the access being considered; the layout did not give a lot of opportunity to access the previous site; and this type of accommodation was urgently needed in the area.

A Ward Member considered the application was overbearing and out-of-character with the area.

In response to a query from a Member, the Development Manager stated that emergency vehicles would be able to access the Council owned car park at the rear of the site to gain access to the application site.

Resolved: That application 16/504551/OUT be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (17) in the report and to the imposition of a further condition restricting the use to Class C2.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO – 16/504551/OUT			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Construction of a one bedroom bungalow with associated parking			
ADDRESS Land South Of 30 Seaside Avenue Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 2HA			
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Investments Limited	Malro
		AGENT Partnership - Architect	Kent Design

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

A Ward Member welcomed refusal of the application.

In response to queries from a Member, the Planning Officer reported that the Committee report clearly stated that the ‘benefits of the proposal are considered to be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm caused. He stated that the potential use of the site was not for discussion but it could be used as a garage or as a garden.

On being put to the vote, the motion to refuse the application was carried.

Resolved: That application 16/504551/OUT be refused for the reason outlined in the report.

3.2 REFERENCE NO – 16/506592/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing bungalow and garage and erection of 2 replacement four bed dwellings.			
ADDRESS 13 Princes Avenue Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 2HJ			
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Harrison Roach	
		AGENT	

Mr Warner, an Objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Members considered the application and raised the following points: not-in-keeping; over-intensive; would have an over-bearing impact; and the site would be better suited to having bungalows; and Minster Parish Council have offered no reasons why they supported the application.

On being put to the vote, the motion to refuse the application was carried.

Resolved: That application 16/506592/FULL be refused for the reason outlined in the report.

PART 5

- **Item 5.1 – 43 Canute Road, Faversham**

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.2 – Alpaca Farm, Yaugher Lane, Hartlip**

APPEAL DISMISSED

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.**

1065 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

6.1 16/501080/OPDEV – unauthorised works to roof and windows of 1 Preston Street, Faversham

The Planner stated that he was happy to report that the property owner had replaced the offending tiles and windows with appropriate materials following discussions with officers. The Conservation Officer was satisfied that no further action need be taken.

Resolved: That no further action be taken.

6.2 Former Wood Yard, Horn Hill, Milstead

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 mobile home be removed from site 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.

6.3 SW/09/0613 – Plot 67, Larch End, Thistle Hill, Minster

The Development Manager reported that the developer had confirmed the mitigation measures to be undertaken as outlined in the Committee report.

Discussions ensued and Members agreed that the two offending side windows be blocked up.

Resolved: That 2 metre high fencing with climbers be planted adjacent to the rear boundary of the site within the planting season (i.e. at the latest within 4 months) and the two flank side windows be permanently blocked-up within the next 2 months.

1066 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm 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