
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber - Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 8 November 2018 from 7.00 - 10.15 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Lloyd Bowen (In place of Prescott), Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Gerry Lewin (In place of Nigel Kay), Peter Marchington and Ghlin Whelan.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey, Philippa Davies, Colin Finch, Paul Gregory, Andrew Jeffers, Cheryl Parks, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Mike Whiting.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Nigel Kay, Bryan Mulhern and Prescott.

322 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

323 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 October 2018 (Minute Nos. 278 – 282) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Vice-Chairman in-the-chair as a correct record.

324 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Lloyd Bowen declared that he was pre-determined in respect of item 2.4, 18/503697/FULL, Land at Station Road, Teynham. Councillor Bowen spoke on the item as Ward Member and then left the chamber.

Councillor Cameron Beart declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.8, 18/501726/FULL, Land between 119a and 121a High Street, Sittingbourne, as he was Chairman of the Licensing Sub-Committee when the licensing application was considered. He reminded Members that Planning and Licensing were two separate regimes.

325 HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENTS - TABLED UPDATE

The Area Planning Officer referred to the tabled paper for this item which outlined the need for the Council to seek mitigation contributions on all applications for new residential development, for the impact from the development on nearby Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Officers sought delegation to permit or refuse each of the affected applications on the basis of whether the applicant was prepared to make these mitigation payments.

The following items now required mitigation payments to be secured if consented:

- Deferred item 1 – 82 Church Lane, Newington
- 2.5 – 9 Whitstable Road, Faversham
- 2.7 – 172 Scarborough Drive, Minster
- 2.8 – Land between 119A & 121A High Street, Sittingbourne
- 2.10 – Land at Old Billet Lane, Eastchurch
- 2.11 – 2 Arthur Street, Sittingbourne

326 DEFERRED ITEMS

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

DEF ITEM 1 REFERENCE NO - 18/503274/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of 1 detached 3 bedroom chalet bungalow.			
ADDRESS 82 Church Lane Newington Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7JU			
WARD	Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr K Cooper AGENT T Fleming Homes Ltd
		Newington	

The Area Planning Officer reported that Newington Parish Council had submitted further comments in light of the appeal decision (tabled) on SPAs. The Parish Council suggested the same considerations of the appeal decision should be applied to this application. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that delegation was sought to approve or refuse subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

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

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

A Member made a general point in relation to consideration of the natural environment when considering applications. He considered the natural environment was critical to every planning decision that was made. He referred to condition (3) in the report and explained that he had requested this on previous applications, that landscaping be added to improve bio-diversity and native species included to improve the natural environment.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer outlined the changes to the application since 2016. He explained that in 2016 Members had been concerned with the rooms in the roof area, and officers had assessed the implications of these rooms on the current application. The distances between the proposed dwelling and neighbouring properties was 28 metres to 82 Church Lane, and 78 metres to

no. 78 Church Lane. He explained that three off-road car parking spaces were included within the application, only two were actually required. He added that it would be difficult to defend on appeal in respect of, the impact of additional traffic from the application. The Area Planning Officer concluded that the addition of rooms in the roof had been assessed to show no material planning harm.

The Committee debated the proposal to approve the application, which centred on the following themes: condition (3) needed to be expanded upon, as above; this was overdevelopment; impact on traffic was unacceptable; traffic would increase on an already perilous road; nothing had changed with the scale of the building, this was not overdevelopment; and the only change was the addition of two windows, with the potential for overlooking, but no reason to refuse.

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

Councillor Mike Baldock moved a motion: That the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment giving rise to a harmful increase in traffic on Church Lane, and the size of the rear garden being too small for a 3 bedroom dwelling. This was seconded by Councillor Bobbin who stated that a bungalow would be more suitable at this location.

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

Resolved: That application 18/503274/FULL be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment, giving rise to a harmful increase in traffic on Church Lane, and the size of the rear garden being too small for a 3 bedroom dwelling.

327 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 1

Any other reports to be considered in the public session

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

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

Resolved: That the planning permission granted under 15/502716/FULL is revoked under the provisions of s.97 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 18/504460/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of full width first floor balcony and replacement of ground floor window with new french doors to the front.		
ADDRESS 10 Provender Walk, Belvedere Road, Faversham, Kent, ME13 7NF		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Mr Edward Bollen AGENT Mr David Marman

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Resolved: That application 18/504460/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO – 18/504421/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of single storey extension to front, side and rear.		
ADDRESS 1 Wihfred Road, Bapchild, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME9 9ND		
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bapchild	APPLICANT Mr Sam Feaver AGENT Mr Julian Mann

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

At this point, Councillor Nicholas Hampshire declared a non-pecuniary interest and did not vote on this item.

Resolved: That application 18/504421/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (2) in the report.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 17/504813/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Part change of use from car wash to residential for one studio flat within the main		

building.			
ADDRESS Car Wash 67 High Street Newington Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7JJ			
WARD	Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Acorn Car Wash AGENT Kent Drawing
		Newington	

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair advised that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 18/503697/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Demolition of 56 and 58 Station Road and erection of 130 dwellings, with associated public open space, landscaping, access, parking and drainage, together with parking for existing Station Road and Nobel Close residents.			
ADDRESS Land At Station Road Teynham Kent ME9 9SY			
WARD	Teynham And Lynsted	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Crest Nicholson Eastern AGENT DHA Planning
		Teynham	

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair advised that Ward Members, Councillors Lloyd Bowen and Mike Whiting had requested to speak on this item.

The Senior Planning Officer drew attention to the tabled update in relation to the recommended amendment to condition (35) in respect of the north western link and the recommendation to impose an additional condition relating to water consumption. He explained that the highways contribution for the A2 / Station Road junction had been agreed. The secondary education and secondary education land contribution remained under discussion.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the site was allocated in the Local Plan for residential development. He sought delegation to approve the application, subject to the amended wording to condition (35), an additional condition in respect of water consumption, the agreement of the contribution for secondary education and secondary education land, the remainder of the conditions in the report and the signing of a suitably worded Section 106 Agreement.

The Senior Planning Officer also drew Members' attention to the tabled paper in respect of mitigation payments from minor developments for recreational disturbance to the SPAs. As such, major development would no longer be required to compensate for minor development. This meant that the payment per dwelling for this development had been readjusted from £301.14, to £239.61 per dwelling. He sought delegation for the Section 106 agreement to include this new figure.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Mr Dave Gurney, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Loughead, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

A Ward Member spoke against the application on behalf of residents in Teynham and the surrounding villages. He acknowledged some of the merits of the application, but raised the following concerns: the major issue was traffic, especially the impact on the Station Road/A2 junction which was already over capacity; residents should not be expected to find alternative routes to get to their destination; the installation of any traffic lights at the junction would increase the problem, and cause stop/start issues; Teynham Primary School and the GP were already over-subscribed; electricity power, public transport, water, drainage and flooding issues; the effects of the underground stream; and older buildings' foundations being affected by the building work. The Ward Member summarised that he accepted that this development was included in the Local Plan, but considered the access was not good enough. The Ward Member then left the chamber.

A second Ward Member also spoke against the application and included the following concerns: traffic impact; 20mph speed limit would be a good initiative; air quality issues, which were at an unacceptable level already; water run-off, and fears that there would be increased flooding and issues with the managed land within the application site which he reminded Members would be paid for by the new residents, and could put people off living there.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair referred Members to pages 60, 61 and 62 in the report which summarised the concerns from local residents.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions, and seek clarification on matters within the application.

More information was sought on who would be considered for the affordable housing, and the management of the car parking areas and play areas. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the affordable rented housing would be offered to those within the locality, and the potential for the Parish Council to manage the open space was discussed earlier in the process, although this had not been agreed which had resulted in the current situation where a Management Company was proposed.

A Member referred to the tabled paper and the water consumption rates of 110 litres per person per day, the partner involved with the social housing and the need for the Section 106 monies to be allotted to Teynham and not added to 'the pot'. The Senior Planning Officer explained that water saving measures such as dual-flush toilets would be submitted to building regulations; the applicant would go out to registered providers in respect of the social housing, and the Section 106 monies would be apportioned direct to the Teynham area, and those junctions along the A2 which would require enhancement, in part, as a result of this development.

Another Member questioned whether the reduced figure of £100,000 was enough for the junction improvements on the Station Road/A2 junction, already over capacity and suggested the money be paid before development commenced. The Member also suggested the developer paid for rear access gates for residents parking to the rear of Station Road, so that they would then be more likely to use the facility. The Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that the junction was not currently over-capacity, and that £100,000 was sufficient for the junction improvements. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the developer could be asked what the trigger points were for the Section 106 monies to be paid. He added that the rear access to the car park point could be included within the legal agreement, not a condition.

Another Member sought clarification on whether there was an update on the comments made by UK Power Networks, as noted in paragraph 6.06 of the report, and on the figure requested by the Swale Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The Senior Planning Officer advised that the Party Wall Act referred to in paragraph 6.06 was not a material planning consideration, and referred to the pro-rata payments per dwelling, and the increased figure to the CCG due to the net gain of additional housing.

Another Member wanted reassurance that the Section 106 monies came forward and whether access to the site was included in the Local Plan. The Senior Planning Officer explained the process of the apportioning of funds throughout progress of the development. He added that the access was shown on the indicative layout which Kent County Council (KCC) would have been able to comment on at the Local Plan stage and that KCC Highways and Transportation had confirmed that it was acceptable for this development.

Another Member queried the 20% reduction in the SPA mitigation contribution £239.60 per dwelling, he requested a condition relating to flooding, and the facility to make the developer liable if a study showed there was no problem, but there was, and he was surprised that the process had got this far and the developer had not found an affordable housing provider to work with, and whether there was a switch to limit water use over 110 litres per day per person. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the figure of £239.60 was calculated by the Spatial Planning Team, that conditions (10), (11) and (12) dealt with water/flooding issues, and that it was not a requirement for the applicant to confirm who the housing provider was, but this would come forward in the Section 106 Agreement. He added that he was unaware of a 'switch off' button to stop excessive water use.

The Member, in relation to water/flooding issues asked whether if any mitigation works failed, the developer could be forced to solve any problems resulting from this. The Major Projects Officer explained that the Council would agree a scheme with the developer, which would be signed-off by KCC specialists. If something went wrong, the agreement could be re-visited, checks made to see if the developer had conformed with the agreement, with the possibility of enforcement action if there had been a breach.

The Committee then debated the motion to approve the application, during which comments were made on the following themes: could not refuse on access reasons, as this could not be defended on appeal; there were other allocated sites

for housing, but we needed to look at this one on its merits; not happy with the management company set-up; this was a good quality and well laid out development; considered access and air quality concerns had been dealt with; welcomed building for life aspect; impact of school journeys on the road network to the Isle of Sheppey and Sittingbourne; air quality issues were really important; there was a duty to improve air quality; 107 houses were allotted in the Local Plan for this site, the application had 130 houses; the mitigation measures in regard to air quality were not innovative enough; there would be further impact on junction 5 and 7 of the M2; the train service from Teynham was intermittent; impact of additional journeys on the roads to supermarkets for example; needed to consider impact on the A2/Station Road junction; Lower Road was not a viable alternative to the A2; impact on hospitals, secondary schools; was a well-sited and a sensible development; and Teynham was a secondary area for development, so needed to look at this positively.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following amendments:

- (1) That the Section 106 agreement must be agreed as written;
- (2) That the management regime in respect of the open space be included within the Section 106 Agreement, and present the way in which it should be managed to ensure it was not too onerous for residents, and estimate the maximum cost to residents;
- (3) Conditions (10) and (11) to include a scheme, agreed by KCC experts, and enforcement action taken against the developer to correct any issues if required;
- (4) That the developer agrees to add rear access for the houses backing onto the Station Road car park, and this added to the Section 106 agreement;
- (5) That everything to be done to improve the natural environment, not solely mitigate; and that conditions (3), (4), (8) or (9) be amended to include matters within paragraphs 2.05, 8.09, 8.12, 8.13, 8.14, 8.15, 8.40 and 8.41.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair seconded the amendments and they were agreed by Members.

A Member was concerned with the use of any restrictive covenants over time in respect of any flooding issues; and a restrictive period of just 5 years was suggested, and this was agreed by Members.

Further debate ensued and the following points were made: this was a well-rounded application; extreme weather, with regard to any flooding issues needed to be considered; other developments would also enable funding for schools; concerned the roads were not wide enough for refuse vehicles; needed to consider a whole policy on additional traffic issues, not direct this to individual sites; and delighted to see 40% affordable housing.

In response the Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that the roads were 5.5 metres wide and reduced in parts to 4.8 metres, and this was sufficient for refuse vehicles. In response to the debate on water consumption, the Development Manager reminded Members that they had agreed to 110 litres per day per person in Policy DM21 of the Local Plan, agreed by Council, and this was added to all major applications.

Resolved: That application 18/503697/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (40) in the report, and to the above amendments, amend the SPA mitigation payment per dwelling to £239.61 amended wording to condition (35), an additional condition in respect of water consumption, the agreement of the contribution for secondary education and, secondary education land and the signing of a suitably worded Section 106 Agreement.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 18/503140/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Conversion of existing ground floor store with room above to create 1 bed flat. Conversion and extension of existing ground floor store into 1 bedroom flat and erection of a single store above to provide 1 bedroom flat. Erection of a first floor extension above the retail space to provide 2 bedroom flat.		
ADDRESS 9 Whitstable Road Faversham Kent ME13 8BE		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Mr S Baines AGENT Olson Design Group

The Area Planning Officer reported that the applicant had agreed to the SPA contributions, and he sought delegation to approve or refuse subject to the issue of the SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Mr Baines, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

There were no questions from Members.

Resolved: That application 18/503140/FULL be delegated to approve subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report, and subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 17/502988/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of timber barn		
ADDRESS Land Adjacent To M2 Warren Lane Hartlip Kent ME9 7XD		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hartlip	APPLICANT Mrs Wendy Buss AGENT Nick Hatton

The Vice-Chair in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Resolved: That application 17/502988/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report.

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 18/502932/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Proposed residential development of garden land to provide 4 no. detached 4 bedroom dwellings with associated garaging, parking and shared private driveway. (Resubmission of 17/504037/FULL).		
ADDRESS 172 Scarborough Drive Private Street Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2LR		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Shaw & Conden AGENT Kent Design Partnership

The Area Planning Officer reported that there needed to be a slight amendment to condition (15), as it referred to a window, it should refer to windows. He sought delegation to approve or refuse subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

Resolved: That application 18/502932/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (15) in the report, the slight amendment to condition (15), and subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

2.8 REFERENCE NO - 18/501726/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of a 3 storey building comprising of an amusement centre (adult gaming centre) on the ground floor with 2 x single bedroom flats on the upper floors.		
ADDRESS Land Between 119A And 121A High Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 4AQ.		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Godden Two LLP AGENT Roger Etchells & Co

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

The Area Planning Officer reported that the Environment Agency (EA) had no objection, subject to standard conditions to secure a preliminary contamination survey of the site, to ensure that protected groundwater was not affected by any

previously unknown pollution. He sought delegation to approve or refuse subject to the issue of SPA payments being resolved, and the additional conditions requested by the EA.

Mr James Godden, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Jeremy Godden, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited questions from Members. The Area Planning Officer explained that the comments from the County Archaeologist had been received very late and as such his comments had been reported under paragraph 7.05, and covered by condition (4) in the report, however, the information on the front page of the report had not been updated.

The Ward Member spoke against the application. He referred to a similar application refused in 2012 and considered it should be refused for the same reasons, it was an inappropriate use in the core town centre, and that gambling was already catered for elsewhere in the High Street, and there was no need for an additional one.

The Committee then debated the motion to approve the application, during which the following comments were made: this was infilling a gap, which was overgrown and an eyesore; it did not match, but there was a variety of styles there in any case; could see no reason to refuse the application; there were already gambling establishments in the High Street; this did not enhance the area, and would demonstrably harm the retail area; the design fitted in well; as it was a completely new building, it was not taking over retail space; it added to the mix of the town centre; this could help to increase footfall in the High Street; and should embrace and welcome business into the town centre.

Resolved: That application 18/501726/FULL be delegated to approve subject to conditions (1) to (15) in the report, and subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

2.9 REFERENCE NO - 16/507586/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Removal of containers and brick toilet and erection of a data storage facility building with associated off-street parking.			
ADDRESS Former Raf Mast Site Courtenay Road Dunkirk Kent			
WARD Boughton And Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN Dunkirk	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mynydd Brith Ltd AGENT Robinson Escott Planning

The Area Planning Officer explained that there were a couple of mistakes in the report. The last sentence in paragraph 1.01 should read ‘The site is located within a High Landscape Value (Kent Level) Area’, not ‘Special Landscape Area.’ He added that at the end of paragraph 1.05, it should refer to paragraphs 15 to 19. He

reported that comments had now been received from the County Archaeological Officer who had requested a condition for a programme of archaeological works be added. The County Archaeological Officer noted and agreed with Historic England's comments. The Area Planning Officer suggested an additional condition to ensure the site was used only for data storage, not other uses, i.e. it could not become a distribution centre.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

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

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. The Area Planning Officer explained that as the proposed facility relied on the mast, this would ensure the mast would be safeguarded and maintained.

A Ward Member spoke against the application.

The Committee then debated the motion to agree the application and the following comments were made: removal of the containers and brick toilet would enhance the site; this would cause harm to the listed monument, and did not enhance it; and any damage was still harm.

Resolved: That application 16/507586/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (16) in the report, an additional condition as requested by the County Archaeological Officer, and a condition in relation to the storage being for data, not general B8 use or other uses.

2.10 REFERENCE NO - 18/503259/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Material change of use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation with associated development (hard standing, utility building and cess pit).		
ADDRESS Land At Old Billet Lane Eastchurch Kent ME12 4JJ		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs V and C Brown AGENT Heine Planning Consultancy

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair 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.

Mr Gow, an objector was advised that he could still speak now, and at the Planning Working Group, but not the meeting afterwards. Mr Gow chose not to speak at this meeting.

Resolved: That application 18/503259/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.11 REFERENCE NO - 18/503616/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Conversion of existing dwelling to create 3no. dwellings and insertion of two dormer windows.		
ADDRESS 2 Arthur Street Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1BA		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr John Whiteley AGENT Designscape Consultancy Limited

The Area Planning Officer reported that amended plans had been received correcting an error in the site of a small window at the rear. He sought delegation to approve or refuse subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

Mrs Wetherall, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Kingsley Hughes, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

No questions were asked.

The Ward Member spoke against the application and raised points which included: this was only a short street, but there had been many planning applications; there would be an increase in traffic noise and pollution, and an increased demand for parking spaces; and this was over intensive, and harmful to residential amenity.

Debate ensued on the motion to approve the application, and centred on the following themes: this would have an impact on parking and the application would work for residents who wanted to commute and use public transport; and could not refuse on highway grounds.

Resolved: That application 18/503616/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (8) in the report and subject to the issue of SPA mitigation payments being resolved.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – 47 Brier Road, Sittingbourne**

Committee Refusal Against Recommendation

APPEAL ALLOWED

Members expressed disappointment on this outcome.

- **Item 5.2 – 17 to 20 Arthur Street, Sittingbourne**

Delegated Refusal

APPEAL DISMISSED

Members welcomed this outcome.

- **Item 5.3 – 27 Woodlands Road, Sittingbourne**

Delegated Refusal

APPEAL DISMISSED

Members welcomed this outcome.

- **Item 5.4 – 22 Power Station Road, Sheerness**

Delegated Refusal

PART ALLOWED / PART DISMISSED

Members noted the decision.

328 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:

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 it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 5 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act:

5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

7. Information relating to any action taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

329 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

6.1 Stones Fisheries, Halfway Road, Minster

Resolved: That the situation be noted, but no further action be taken in relation to the formation of a temporary holding lake at the present time.

330 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