
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber - Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 10 January 2019 from 7.00pm - 11.05pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth (Vice-Chairman, in-the-Chair), Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Gerry Lewin (Substitute for Councillor Prescott) and Ghlin Whelan.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Claire Attaway, Rob Bailey, Andy Byrne, Philippa Davies, Colin Finch, James Freeman, Andrew Jeffers, Cheryl Parks and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Roger Truelove.

Mr Nigel Jenkins – Air Quality Consultant, Phlorum.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Bryan Mulhern and Prescott.

427 **EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

428 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 December 2018 (Minute Nos. 374 – 379) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair as a correct record.

429 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

430 **PLANNING WORKING GROUP**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 January 2019 (Minute Nos. 409 – 413) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair as a correct record.

18/504824/FULL 16 Hawthorn Road, Sittingbourne, ME10 1BB

The Area Planning Officer provided updates to queries raised by Members at the site meeting. He reported that there was no planning history in relation to the railings to the side of the property, and explained that they had been installed as a result of Police Community Support Officer involvement, and the railings would remain in place. However, he added that they were not within the application site and as such were not a consideration of this application. The Area Planning Officer

advised that the size of the rear windows were as follows: toilet window: 0.6m width x 0.7m height; bedroom window: 0.9m width x 0.8m height; and lounge/sitting room window: 1.2m x 0.8m height.

The Ward Member spoke against the application. He raised the following concerns: access from the development onto Arthur Street, Sittingbourne was narrow and impractical; the size of the flat was too small, and not fit for purpose; the ceiling was too low; and lack of parking in the area.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer explained that this application addressed issues in the previous application in terms of size and layout. It now met the minimum requirements, as set out in paragraph 8.06 in the report considered by the Planning Committee on 6 December 2018.

Resolved: That application 18/504824/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report, and the securing of a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) mitigation contribution.

18/504307/FULL Land rear of 343 Minster Road, Minster ME12 3NR

The Area Planning Officer provided updates to queries raised by Members at the site meeting. He outlined the planning history of the site which included three refusals, two dismissed at appeal. In 2004, although refused because of being backland development, the Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal on grounds of the impact of traffic movements, and disturbance of the dwellings to 343 and 341 Minster Road, rather than reasons of backland development. The Area Planning Officer referred to an application in 2006 for 14 retirement flats which had been refused because of them being backland development, and the Inspector had dismissed the appeal, not because it was backland development, but because of the harm to residential amenity due to the scale and intensity of the development. The Area Planning Officer therefore explained that the principle of backland development was acceptable on the site, and that the application was for only two dwellings. He confirmed that Plot 1 rear to rear distance was 45m, side to rear 17m, and Plot 2, rear to rear distance was 25m. He added that the site had gated access, and he stated that condition (17) in the report required details of the gates to be provided prior to the construction of the foundations being completed. In response to concerns about how wet the site had been, the Area Planning Officer sought delegation to approve the application, subject to the addition of a surface water drainage condition.

Resolved: That application 18/504307/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (17) in the report, and an additional condition in relation to surface water drainage and the securing of a SAMMS mitigation contribution.

18/503678/FULL 344 Minster Road, Minster ME12 3PE

A Member explained that the site meeting had been beneficial and had clarified the details of the application.

Resolved: That application 18/503678/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (11) in the report and the securing of a SAMMS mitigation contribution.

431 DEFERRED ITEM

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

DEF ITEM 1 REFERENCE NO - 17/500727/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline application for residential development for up to 50 dwellings with access off Chestnut Street (All others matters reserved), as amended by drawings received 31/05/2017 and further amended by drawings received 9 November 2017		
ADDRESS Manor Farm Key Street Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1YU		
WARD Borden And Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Borden	APPLICANT Balmoral Land (UK) Ltd AGENT

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to the tabled update, and explained that since that had been written, four further objections had been received from local residents which included the following comments:

- Why did the independently commissioned review not refer to the Swale Air Quality Report, which showed that air pollution levels were above EU objectives?;
- the report omitted a summary of the comments raised since the August 2017 Planning Committee (note: these were appended with the agenda);
- there were no published air quality monitoring results since August 2018;
- the application should not be decided before the Swale Air Quality Action Plan is completed and published, with all data independently analysed;
- there was a conflict of interest as Phlorum had a business relationship with Swale Borough Council (SBC);
- the applicant needed to remember that this was not just a development of 50 houses, it must also include the 700 houses proposed for the Wises Lane, SW Sittingbourne, development;
- the design of the slip road leading to the site was yet to be finalised by Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation, and this would create further traffic problems; and
- the biased air quality reports could not seriously be considered, and an independent review should be carried out across multiple points around the A249 and A2/M2 junctions, especially at pinch points, for a 12 month period to get a comprehensive set of data.

The Major Projects Officer reported that KCC Ecology raised no objection to the application. He added that an additional contribution was required to provide waste bins for each property: £101 per house and £945 per five flats.

He sought delegation to approve the application, subject to the addition of a further condition for off-site highway works under a Section 278 Agreement to be carried out.

The Major Projects Officer also referred to the tabled update which included a report from the University of Kent, which responded to the independent air quality report, produced by Phlorum, and commissioned by the Council.

Nigel Jenkins from Phlorum was invited to speak in response to the University of Kent's report.

Mr Jenkins explained that verification of the air quality data did follow official Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) standard guidance and looked at all information available in 2016. In response to the report, produced by Entran in support of the SW Sittingbourne planning application, Mr Jenkins confirmed that the most up-to-date data was used. He also noted the short timescales used by the University of Kent, in their air quality work for Borden Parish Council, and explained that this undermined their results. He also stated that the data used by the Council was more accurate.

Parish Councillor Clive Sims, representing Borden Parish Council, spoke against the application.

John Waters, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions, which included the following themes: the affordable housing allocation should be 40%, not 10%, as the development was in the countryside; who would benefit from the contribution to the National Health Service? And clarification was needed on the reliance on the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) in order for the Key Street highway improvements to go ahead.

In response, the Major Projects Officer explained that this development came under the Sittingbourne built-up area, as detailed in the Local Plan, as an extension of the town, and as such only 10% affordable housing was required in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Local Plan; that officers would liaise, in preparing the Section 106 Agreement, with the Clinical Commissioning Group to clarify what the NHS requirements were in the vicinity of the development; that the Key Street highway works were not a requirement for the 50 houses at Manor Farm, Sittingbourne, only access onto Chestnut Street, via developer contributions, and the HIF funding could be put towards the Key Street roundabout. The Principal Transport and Development Planner (KCC), added that in terms of reliance on HIF, there was no reliance, as the monies would be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

In response to a procedural question, the Head of Planning Services explained that the procedure set-out in the Council's Constitution on whether a matter could be brought back to the Committee less than six months after it was last debated, did not apply in this case. Officers were aware that the Applicants could appeal against non-determination. The Planning Lawyer referred the Member to Part 4 of the

Constitution, paragraph 20.2, and where paragraph 33 stated that the rules involving motions did not apply to Committees, i.e. Planning Committee.

There were further questions on the following themes: there was a shortfall on funding for junction 5 of the M2, so could money be sought from this development? How secure and reliable was the proposal for Key Street roundabout? In response, the Major Projects Officer advised that no contribution had been sought by Highways England (HE) for junction 5. The Principal Transport and Development Planner (KCC), explained that HE's concern was safety at the Key Street junction, where traffic was backing-up on the northbound carriageway. The development was providing a contribution to signalise that arm of the junction to alleviate the concern. He added that HIF funding had been applied for to improve the Key Street junction.

A Member asked whether the Wises Lane development air quality data included this development as well, and how reliable the 2015 base air quality data was, bearing in mind that there had been considerable development since then? Mr Jenkins explained that in terms of Wises Lane, there was an undertaking to look at other developments as well and this would have been done and added to the air quality data. He explained that historic base data was used, then scaled forward. In response to further questions on air quality levels around Key Street, the relevance to this application and being above the legal limit, and whether this was correct, Mr Jenkins explained that there could be fluctuation in air quality and the Major Projects Officer added that Key Street's inclusion was as part of the 'bigger picture'.

A Member considered there was conflicting information regarding air quality, and how Members could make a judgement based on that, and with the views of different consultants, which one could be relied upon? The Major Projects Officer explained that there were three main consultants: Entran, Wises Lane air quality assessment; Borden Parish Council had commissioned the University of Kent's response to Phlorum's review; and Phlorum, independent consultants for SBC. He added that SBC had commissioned independent consultants and they had come to the conclusion that there was not a robust air quality issue to justify the refusal of the application.

A Member asked whether Phlorum had an indication of accuracy of future years predictions of air quality. Mr Jenkins outlined the data that was used to assess future trends using modelling and met data, information provided by Government, and then the information projected forward.

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

The Committee debated the proposal to approve the application, and raised the following points:

- This application was deferred for 12 months in August 2018; disappointed it was back;
- there was a lot of reliance on future development to deliver the highway infrastructure;

- there was a lack of funding for highway improvements;
- entrance and exit to the development was dangerous, with problem of HGVs parking on the road in the vicinity;
- should reject or defer for 12 months;
- if approved there should be funding for junction 5 of the M2, single storeys on the Cherry Fields side, and screening around the boundary;
- nothing had changed since August 2018;
- real air quality data was needed;
- questioned the independence of the consultants commissioned by SBC;
- the evidence needed to be balanced;
- needed to consider badgers on the site, plus mitigation measures;
- the air quality at this location was not as bad as parts of the A2 elsewhere in Swale;
- Members should trust officers to get the expertise/consultants as necessary;
- a judgement was needed on this, we could not refuse on air quality grounds;
- the development, if approved, needed to be well-designed;
- hedges around the site needed to be protected and widened;
- landscaping and design was very important, particularly to the right hand corner where the site rose; and
- dormice and badgers, if found to be present at the site, needed to be protected.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following addendum: that the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to ensuring that there was the highest quality of landscaping, both visually and for wildlife ecology.

Members made further comments which included: nothing had changed since August 2018; there was no reason to defer, the application should be approved; the T-junction would be a catastrophe; it had been decided to defer for 12 months, the application should not have come back yet; and the Committee should be thinking about health, not the potential costs to the Council for non-determination.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken on the motion to approve the application, plus addendum, and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Cameron Beart, Andy Booth, Mike Dendor, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay and Gerry Lewin. Total equals eight.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock, George Bobbin, Richard Darby, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Peter Marchington and Ghlin Whelan . Total equals eight.

Abstain: Total equals nil.

The Vice-Chairman in the Chair announced that the vote was tied and he used his casting vote to approve the application.

Resolved: That application 17/500727/OUT be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (30) in the report, an additional condition

in respect of water conservation, the amendment of condition (18) (ecology) as set out in the tabled update, a suitably worded Section 106 Agreement and to ensure that there was the highest quality of landscaping, both visually and for ecology.

432 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 18/505761/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of a detached 2 bed dwelling with associated access, parking and dropped kerb.			
ADDRESS 47 Brier Road, Borden, Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 1YJ			
WARD Borden And Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Borden	APPLICANT Mr Paul Muehlthaler	AGENT

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application and raised concern with the windows on the side elevation, with potential overlooking issues as the site was elevated. A second Ward Member also spoke against the application and stated that the turning circle would be impeded.

The Planner explained that the side windows met planning requirements, and the rear distances were 22 metres to Maylam Gardens, and 15 metres to Grove Park which were within minimum limits.

Resolved: That application 18/505761/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (8) in the report and securing mitigation payments in respect of the Swale Special Protection Area.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 18/505315/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of 5 no. detached houses with associated access and parking including detached carport to Plot 2.			
ADDRESS Land At The Tracies Newington Kent ME9 7TQ			
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newington	APPLICANT Mr D King	AGENT Shaw Design Services Ltd.

The Area Planning Officer reported that he considered none of the trees within the site were worth retaining, and as such condition (9) should be deleted. He sought additional delegated authority to approve the application, subject to the deletion of this condition.

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

John Pike, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions. In response to a comment made by the Parish Councillor, a Member asked whether further discussions could be had with the applicant to change the position of one of the houses? The Area Planning Officer explained that the application had to be considered on its merits. Any access through the site to potentially more development land could be addressed by amending the layout of the site, but this would require amended plans, and the Area Planning Officer suggested delegated authority could be given to do this.

A Member sought clarification on the trees/conditions that were going to be removed at the same time considering bats on the site, and the opportunity to establish good landscaping. The Area Planning Officer stated that condition (8) could be more strongly worded if Members thought there should be more trees on the site.

Another Member raised some issues with the footpath route and the Area Planning Officer confirmed that the layout could be amended to accommodate a diverted footpath. He also responded to a question on the housing numbers on the site and explained that at the time of a previous application, the Local Plan had not been adopted

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

One of the Ward Members spoke in support of the application and welcomed a condition in relation to the footpath diversion.

The Committee debated the proposal to approve the application, which centred on the following themes:

- Conditions (6), (8), (9) and (11) did not resolve the position of the trees/landscaping on the site;
- condition (9) should not be removed;
- the conditions needed to meet the requirements under paragraph 9.9 in the report;
- there needed to be a condition where bats were identified, and needed to maximise the number of trees retained;
- there should be a landscaping plan;
- conditions (6) and condition (8) needed to be strengthened;
- the principle of development on the site was agreed, this application was not unreasonable; and

- this site was not suitable for five dwellings, it was over-development, and some of the houses were too large.

In response, the Area Planning Officer stated that his recollection was that bats foraged at the site, and that delegation could be sought to approve the application subject to a landscaping scheme being submitted prior to determination, with discussion with Councillor Mike Henderson and Ward Members.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved an amendment: that conditions (6) and (8) be strengthened, and conditions be amended in-line with paragraph 9.9 in the report. This was seconded by the Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair. The Member also said that condition (6) should be amended to state that if there were bats present, the trees should be retained. In response to further comments, the Area Planning Officer explained that there was already permission for four houses on the site, and so the applicant could clear the site in any case.

Resolved: That application 18/505315/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (11) in the report, and that conditions (6) and (8) be strengthened, and conditions be amended in-line with paragraph 9.9 in the report.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 18/502095/FULL & 18/502096/LBC			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Conversion of existing barn to residential use, including revised internal layout, minor changes to external windows and doors (Wagon window/door and single door) and erection of a new outbuilding; as amended by drawing 000-22 Revision R7 received 10 September 2018.			
ADDRESS Green Farm Barn Stalisfield Road Stalisfield Faversham Kent ME13 0HY			
WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Stalisfield	APPLICANT Mr Jon Hutchings	
		AGENT Guy Hollaway Architects	

The Development Manager reported that there was a small typo on page 122 of the report, on condition (3). The words on line four ‘...for the that’ should be replaced by ‘and which’. This also needed to be replicated for the listed building consent application on page 124 of the report.

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

Jon Hutchings, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

A Member considered it was an excellent, well-designed development.

Resolved: That application 18/502095/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (12) in the report, and to the small change to condition (3) as noted above.

Resolved: That application 18/502096/LBC be approved subject to conditions (1) to (8) in the report, and to the small change to condition (3) as noted above.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 17/502604/REM		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Reserved Matters application, pursuant to application 14/502729/OUT, for the construction of 127 dwellings, public open space, landscape planting, pedestrian, cycling and vehicular links; and associated infrastructure. Related only to the northern section of the site as shown on drawing number BOV1150305 LP.01 C (Location Plan).The discharge of Condition 1 (Reserved Matters) pursuant to application 14/502729/OUT. (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale being sought).		
ADDRESS Ospringe Brickworks Sumpter Way Faversham Kent ME13 7NT		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Bovis Homes Limited AGENT Boyer Planning

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to the tabled updates. He sought delegated authority to approve the application subject to the addition of the standard water conservation condition, which had the intention of limiting water consumption to 110 litres per person per day.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions. A Member asked why KCC Highways and Transportation had not objected to the application, considering there were already major problems on the A251 and A2. The Principal Transport and Development Planner (KCC) explained that this was the reserved matters stage, and traffic flow implications had been fully considered at the outline stage. Another Member referred to paragraph 8.16 of the report and wanted to know what the Conservation and Design Manager thought of the application. The Conservation and Design Manager stated that he was confident the scheme was of a high standard, although there was an initial view that a contemporary design should have been sought. Details of materials to be used were included in the conditions, and he hoped this would be a good scheme.

In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer explained that the comments made by Kent Wildlife Trust, objecting to the application, were addressed in the tabled papers. He added that KCC Ecology had not objected and had been in touch with Kent Wildlife Trust, and he was confident that overall ecologically, the scheme was worthy of support. The Major Projects Officer also explained that the comments in paragraph 6.10 were a generic response because there was not an existing UK Power sub-station close to the site boundary.

Town Councillor Geoff Wade, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke against the application.

Jonathan Lieberman, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Committee debated the proposal to approve the application, which centred on the following:

- This was an acceptable development, although the housing could have been of a better design, the design should reflect the site’s industrial significance; and the conditions should specify a better designed scheme.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved a motion: that the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the addition of a condition to continue to seek design improvements, with regard to the built environment and landscaping. In response, the Major Projects Officer explained that a condition could not be set out to do that. He suggested that it be delegated to officers to approve, subject to officers meeting with the developer to negotiate improvements to the design.

Resolved: That application 17/502604/REM be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (21) in the report, the addition of the water conservation condition, condition (1) being amended to refer to the amended/additional plans, and officers meeting with the developer to improve the design.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 18/501863/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of a new single storey special educational needs primary school with formation of a new access onto Vellum Drive and associated car parking and drop-off area, pedestrian access, drainage, areas for formal and informal outdoor play, and landscaping works.		
ADDRESS Land East Of Vellum Drive Sittingbourne Kent ME10 5BE		
WARD The Meads	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bobbing	APPLICANT Education & Skills Funding Agency AGENT DHA Planning Ltd
DECISION DUE DATE 04/07/18		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 18/05/18

The Major Projects Officer referred to condition (27) on page 213 of the report and explained the Agent had confirmed that covered cycle parking facilities would be provided for 10 bicycles. Delegated authority was sought to amend the condition to reflect this. He reported that in terms of surface water drainage and comments made by the KCC Flood and Water Management Team, a further response had been provided in light of extra information provided by the Applicant, and KCC had advised that the wording of condition (5) needed to be refined, and that condition (6) could be omitted. The Major Projects Officer also reported that the existing Section 106 Agreement tied to the original planning permission for The Meads (reference SW/96/0717), needed to be varied as it currently required SBC to plant

the site out as a community woodland. This variation would need to be negotiated prior to the issuing of the decision notice.

The Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to approve the application subject to making the amendments to the conditions, as above, and to the signing of a Deed of Variation.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions. A Member asked whether parking restrictions on Vellum Drive, Sittingbourne, had been considered? The Major Projects Officer explained that KCC Highways and Transportation had not considered this at the moment, and a condition could not be added regarding this, in case the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was not successful. However, he added that he could speak to officers about the possibility of a TRO being imposed. The Major Projects Officer also confirmed that the community woodland would remain.

Ceranne Litton, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Ward Member spoke in support of the application. He made the following points: the design of the school could have been better; loss of open amenity space; road issues, there needed to be restrictions on Vellum Drive before the school opened; concerned that contractors had already started work on the site; important that local residents were kept informed; and welcomed the Code of Construction Practice, as outlined in condition (3) of the report.

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

The Committee debated the proposal to approve the application, which centred on the following themes:

- Disappointed that the school did not include solar panels on its flat-roof;
- this was a good proposal;
- the design could have been better;
- provision of SEN was important;
- on-going, monthly, dialogue with local residents was important;
- solar panels should be installed;
- concerned that there might still be archaeological artifacts on the site, a field examination should be carried out; and
- not happy that there was a loss of woodland area enjoyed by residents.

In response to comments, the Major Projects Officer referred to condition (3) in the report, regarding community engagement, and considered the application was highly conditioned, and if neighbours had concerns, they should speak to Councillors or officers in the normal way.

Further comments included:

- Supported this whole-heartedly;
- paragraph 7.20 stated that archaeologists had already looked at the site, so concerns raised above had been addressed;

- happy for parking restrictions along Vellum Drive to be considered;
- there needed to be some screening between the school and some of the nearby houses; and
- the parking on site was very well thought out, so hopefully there would not be too much of an impact on Vellum Drive.

Resolved: That application 18/501863/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (32) in the report, amendments to the conditions, as above, and to the signing of a Deed of Variation. Officers also to raise the possibility of a TRO for parking restrictions on Vellum Drive, Sittingbourne, with the relevant colleagues.

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 17/506603/REM		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Approval of reserved matters relating to scale, layout, appearance and landscaping for the erection of 310 dwellings, pursuant to conditions 1, 4, 10 and 24 of outline planning permission 15/504264/OUT. Approval sought for residential part of outline scheme only.		
ADDRESS Land At Perry Court London Road Faversham Kent ME13 8YA		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ospringe	APPLICANT BDW Kent AGENT
DECISION DUE DATE 26/04/18		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 27/11/18

The Senior Planner confirmed that the application site was within the boundary of both Faversham Town Council and Ospringe Parish Council. He referred to the tabled paper and sought delegated authority to approve the application, subject to no objections being raised by the Council’s Tree Consultant or Greenspaces Manager, to the amendments submitted. He added that with reference to paragraph 6.11 in the report, Kent Police had requested further crime prevention details, and he requested that the standard condition relating to this also be included.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions. A Member asked if there were going to be any alterations to the roundabout on the A251 as there were issues with HGVs driving over it? The Member also suggested that the road through the application site linked Brogdale Road with the Western Link and that be utilised to take traffic away from the A2. The Principal Transport and Development Planner stated that he was aware of the problems on the roundabout and this would be covered with a Section 278 Agreement, and so there would be further alterations to the roundabout. He acknowledged the route through the application site could be used as a through-route, avoiding the A2, but it was designed as a residential zone with low speeds.

Another Member asked if there were two lanes on the exit route from the application site onto the roundabout, and the Principal Transport and Development Planner (KCC) explained that it was a single lane. In response to other questions,

the Senior Planner explained that there were separate applications now for the care home and supermarket as they were larger than those submitted at the outline application stage. He explained that access was also agreed at the outline stage, but could be considered again with the supermarket application, as there would likely be additional traffic. The Senior Planner explained that the gypsy and traveller sites were part of the outline application, but the Local Plan Policy was amended during the Local Plan Examination, and there was no longer a requirement for them to be provided.

Town Councillor Geoff Wade, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke in support of the application.

Karen Dunn, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Committee debated the proposal to approve the application, which centred on the following themes:

- Access issues needed to be addressed, especially when the supermarket was built;
- note that Faversham Town Council and Ospringe Parish Council both supported the application;
- disappointed that the whole application was not being considered together, as in the outline application, there should be a masterplan;
- concerned that the employment area might not be developed; and
- detailed landscaping for the whole site should be provided at this stage.

The Senior Planner referred to a separate condition (32) of the outline application for a strategic landscaping scheme, and said that detailed landscaping was being considered for the residential area at this stage, and both combined to provide landscaping overall.

Resolved: That application 17/506603/REM be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (16) in the report, to no objections being raised by the Council’s Tree Consultant or Greenspaces Manager to the amendments submitted, and a standard condition relating to crime prevention.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 18/505513/FULL
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Reconstruction of bay window to front extending to first floor. Insertion of side window, replacement balustrade, along with internal alterations.
ADDRESS 54 The Leas, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness, Kent ME12 2NL

WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Andrew Hill AGENT
DECISION DUE DATE 24/12/18		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 27/11/18

Mrs Terrena Hill, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

The Committee debated the proposal to refuse the application, which centred on the following themes:

- The Leas had an unique outlook, and every house was different, this was a very sympathetic application;
- the frontage looked tired; this would enhance the building;
- the neighbours did not object to the application;
- there would be a loss of some parking provision to the front; and
- agreed with the issue of the first floor window.

The Area Planning Officer suggested that if Members were content with the front extension, the application could be delegated to officers to go back to the applicant and amend the plans relating to the flank window.

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

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved a motion: that the application be delegated to officers to permit subject to the submission of amended plans addressing the harm from the side window or to refuse if this was not resolved. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 18/505513/FULL be delegated to officers to permit subject to the submission of amended plans addressing the harm from the side window or to refuse if this was not resolved.

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 18/505689/FULL & 18/505690/LBC		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Partial demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single storey rear extension with roof lights. Replacement timber sash windows to front and rear elevation.		
ADDRESS 12 Abbey Street Faversham Kent ME13 7BE		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Mr M Williamson AGENT Peter Jackson Architects
DECISION DUE DATE		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE

02/01/19

07/12/18

Town Councillor Peter Flower, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

The Committee debated the proposal to refuse the application, and a Member considered that looking at the overall 'big picture', the application was acceptable.

The Conservation and Design Manager outlined the harm the development would have in relation to public benefit, and stated that as this was within the Faversham Conservation Area and a listed building, the application was not acceptable in heritage terms, and that the open space to the rear of the property should remain and not be built upon.

Resolved: That application 18/505689/FULL be delegated to officers to refuse subject to the rewording of reason (2) in the report.

Resolved: That application 18/505690/LBC be delegated to officers to refuse subject to the rewording of reason (1) in the report.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 - Chalet No. 7 Hazeldene Chalet Park, Fourth Avenue, Eastchurch**

ENFORCEMENT APPEAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

A Member was happy with this outcome.

- **Item 5.2 – 2 Arthur Street, Sittingbourne**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.3 – Vicarage Cottage, The Street , Hartlip**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.4 – 141 Ufton Lane, Sittingbourne**

AGAINST OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

APPEAL ALLOWED

A Member expressed disappointment with this outcome.

- **Item 5.5 – Bobbing Kennels, Quinton Road, Sittingbourne**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.6 – Pond, Perrywood Place (Grove Road), Selling**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.7 – Jack Russell Place, Lower Halstow**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.8 – 36 The Glen, Minster**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

A Member expressed disappointment with this outcome.

- **Item 5.9 – 26 Forbes Road, Favesham**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.10 – 2 Little Kennaways, Ospringe**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

A Member expressed disappointment with this outcome.

- **Item 5.11– Building at Keycol Farm, Bobbing**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.12– Tranquillity, Otterham Quay Lane, Upchurch**

COMMITTEE REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

433 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm, 10.30pm and 11pm 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