
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 7 March 2019 from 7.00pm - 10.34pm.

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Rob Bailey, James Freeman, Andrew Jeffers, Kellie MacKenzie, Cheryl Parks, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Bowles.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Mike Henderson and Bryan Mulhern.

542 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair asked if anyone would need specific assistance to evacuate the building, and Councillor Prescott confirmed that he would.

543 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 February (Minute Nos. 486 – 489) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair as a correct record, subject to the following amendment to Minute No. 487 The Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 30 January 2019 (Minute Nos. 470 – 474):

Councillor Mike Baldock requested that it be recorded that he did not agree the Minutes, as he had **not had the time to read them**.

544 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair asked Councillor James Hall whether he had an interest to declare in respect of item 2.5 18/505929/FULL Land rear of 54-76 Oak Road, Sittingbourne. Councillor Hall stated that he had no interest to declare.

545 DEFERRED ITEM

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair advised that this item had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

546 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 1

Reports to be considered in public session not included elsewhere on this Agenda

1.1 REFERENCE NO – 18/503723/MOD**APPLICATION PROPOSAL**

Modification of Planning Obligation dated 18/05/2010 under reference SW/08/1124 to allow removal of on-site affordable housing.

ADDRESS 153 London Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1PA

WARD Borden and Grove Park

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

APPLICANT

Clarity

Properties Ltd

AGENT Brachers LLP

Lee May, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. The Major Projects Officer confirmed that the date of the Viability Appraisal was June 2017 and that it was appended to the Committee report. However, as set-out in the report, officers had carried out further work to establish whether the viability situation had changed and had come to the conclusion that it had not, and this was set-out in paragraph 6.02 on page 25 of the Committee report. He explained that the original application was not a formal application but a modification (by Deed of Variation) to the Section 106 Agreement as set-out in paragraph 2.05 of the report, this was why the relevant planning history was not set-out in the report.

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

Ward Members spoke against the application and raised the following points: there had been no significant material change to the application; hard to believe that the application was not viable; was the same viability report as before; was right that the Committee considered the application; needed affordable housing; small sites were not viable; would struggle to deliver affordable housing levels set-out in the Council's Local Plan; was not the Council's problem if the applicant had not managed the development properly in the first place; the Council's Local Plan required affordable housing, this application was undermining the principles of that Plan; and should refuse the application and stand firm.

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

- Thanked officers for their work in securing an extra £9,000;
- A lot had changed within the housing market since permission had been given;
- Did not accept that £40,000 was equivalent of 20%, developers cannot say they would not make a profit;

- The Council would not do anything with the £40,000 it would just sit in a pot;
- Would like further evidence to support the viability appraisals;
- The Council had made positive statements on the need for affordable housing and should stand firm; and
- It was the applicant's own fault if they had paid too much for the land.

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

For: Councillor James Hunt. Total = 1.

Against: Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Monique Bonney, Andy Booth, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Ken Ingleton, Peter Marchington, Prescott and Ghlin Whelan. Total = 14.

Abstain: Nigel Kay Total = 1.

At this point the Head of Planning Services used his delegated powers 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 a future meeting of the Committee.

PART 2

Applications for which PERMISSION is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO – 19/500446/FULL & 19/500447/LBC		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Proposed demolition of existing bathroom/utility room and erection of new bathroom, link and courtyard deck.		
ADDRESS 28 Abbey Street Faversham Kent ME13 7BE		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Mr Leslie Broer AGENT

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

A Member stated that it was disappointing that Faversham Town Council were not present to advise why they had objected to the application.

Resolved: That application 19/500446/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (4) in the report.

Resolved: That application 19/500447/LBC be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO – 18/506279/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Conversion of existing garage to provide extra ancillary living space, with the relocation of workshop to combined study space. (Revision of 18/502040/FULL).		
ADDRESS Orchard Cottage Keycol Hill Bobbing Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8NE		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newington	APPLICANT Ms L and J Cashford and Hales AGENT Olson Design Group

The Chairman advised that this item had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

2.3 REFERENCE NO – 19/500219/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of detached workshop garage with self contained annexe above and associated drive to facilitate the care of elderly parent.(Revision of 18/505632/FULL)		
ADDRESS 20 Hustlings Drive Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4JX		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr Dennis Kavanagh AGENT CB Planning

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

Mr Kavanagh, the applicant who had registered as a speaker, declined to speak and said that he would prefer to speak at the site meeting.

On being put to the vote the motion for a site meeting was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/500219/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.4 REFERENCE NO – 18/501667/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Application to extend the time limit to submit a site development scheme required by condition 4 of the planning permission granted on a ground A appeal against notice ref 17/500054/CHANGE		
ADDRESS New Acres Spade Lane Hartlip Kent ME9 7TT		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hartlip	APPLICANT Messrs S, M and P Maughan and others listed AGENT Heine Planning Consultancy

The Area Planning Officer reported that a Ward Member had raised further objection to the application which he read out for Members.

Parish Councillor Graham Addicott, representing Hartlip Parish Council, spoke against the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. In response to queries, the Area Planning Officer explained that the application had been delayed as the High Court decision had only been received January 2019. A Member queried whether the Council could now demonstrate a five year supply of gypsy and traveller sites. The Area Planning Officer stated that the Council's Planning Policy team were working to ensure the five year supply was available.

Some Members were confused about the application and what exactly they were considering. The Area Planning Officer clarified the details of the application for Members.

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:

- Confused as to why the officer recommendation was for approval;
- the Planning Inspectorate had been clear that septic tanks needed to be provided but these had not, so should refuse for that reason;
- officers had done a lot of work on the application and there was a reason it was for three years, it had also been through the High Court;
- officers did not want to recommend approval but had to 'tick boxes'; and
- concerned that conditions would not be complied with;

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

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following motion to refuse the application: The applicant had not complied with the condition in question as imposed by the Planning Inspector and the reasons for refusal were still applicable. This was seconded by Councillor Ken Ingleton.

There was discussion on the motion to refuse the application and whether other reasons could be included. The Area Planning Officer stated that the application could not be refused on the basis that conditions had not been complied with, Members needed to identify harm. The previous reasons identified demonstrable harm to visual amenity and the character and appearance of the countryside and to highway safety. A Member suggested including harm to the ground water zone.

In response to a query, the Area Planning Officer confirmed that the applicants could appeal and be allowed on the site until the appeal decision was received which could be up to six to eight months.

Discussion ensued and the proposer and seconder of the original motion to refuse the application agreed to amend the reason to read: The application would cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the countryside, harm to the ground water source protection zone and harm to highway safety.

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

Resolved: That application 18/501667/FULL be refused as it would cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the countryside, harm to the ground water source protection zone and harm to highway safety.

2.5 REFERENCE NO – 18/505929/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of 6no.3 bedroom houses in 2 terraces of 3 houses each, with associated gardens, general landscaping and visitor parking (11 spaces total).		
ADDRESS Land Rear of 54-76 Oak Road, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3PF		
WARD Murston	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT PSP Facilitating Ltd AGENT Pozzoni Architecture Ltd

Asad Ahmed, an objector, spoke against the application.

Nick Challis, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. In response to questions from Members, the Area Planning Officer advised that Councillor James Hall had raised objection to the application but had later withdrawn that objection.

A Member queried the legal width requirements for two way traffic, which he believed was six metres and raised concern that the width of the access was only four metres, and queried whether road restrictions would be provided due to the poor vision splays. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that the access was single width but for two way traffic. He confirmed that Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation amendments to the scheme were in respect of access, parking and refuse and they had thoroughly considered the scheme and raised no objection.

The Area Planning Officer confirmed that regarding distances from neighbouring properties, the proposed dwellings were in advance of the required distances. The bins would be located adjacent to the proposed dwellings. There was no legend regarding the hatch margins on the proposed road layout.

At this point, the Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved a motion to defer the application give the number of questions Members had. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

Councillor Mike Baldock moved a motion for a site meeting so that Members could get a better idea of the access to the site. This was seconded by the Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 18/505929/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

2.6 REFERENCE NO – 19/500084/FULL**APPLICATION PROPOSAL**

Change of use of public open space/grass area to mixed use as a public open space and beer garden (Class A4 drinking establishment), including siting of tables and chairs/picnic benches.

ADDRESS Land Adjacent To The Albion Taverna PH 29 Front Brents Faversham Kent ME13 7DH

WARD Priory

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL
Faversham Town

APPLICANT Mr George Barnes

AGENT Milliken & Co
Chartered Surveyors

Town Councillor Ben Martin, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke against the application.

Michael Ellsmore, an objector, spoke against the application.

Daniel Sidders, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Area Planning Officer reported that a Ward Councillor had sent all Members of the Committee a letter of objection, which was also tabled. The Area Planning Officer outlined the main points of the letter: The Albion was not a local pub but attracted restaurant customers from outside the town, mostly by car; the pub already has an outside seating area for 56 customers and more tables to the front; the application site was immediately adjacent to two listed buildings and the proposal would damage their amenity; potential for noise and litter despite no record of objections to the current situation; parking was a serious issue, with both the pub and Creekside car parks full and little on-street parking available – indiscriminate parking may block Front Brents of the flood gates there; and the site was part of the Local Green Space governed by Policy DM18 and the land would no longer be open and its character would be changed.

The Area Planning Officer further reported that the applicants had submitted a short Supplementary Planning Statement responding to local objections, they also noted that: the Council's own Green Spaces Manager did not object to the application, saying that the usability of the area *"is somewhat limited due to its size and location between the car park and Albion Taverna"* and *"given the alternative larger open spaces located to the north east and south west and Village Green Creekside"*; they also pointed to a recent planning decision in Canterbury where a similar use of open space in the City Centre for pub tables was approved on appeal as the Inspector felt such a use was light weight, not permanent and to be expected near to a pub; with licensing controlling use of the area by the pub; they confirm that the application site does not form part of a registered town or village green, and that granting of a licence for use as a beer garden did not contravene Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 if the lease was for less than seven years; in relation to noise and disturbance the applicants stated that the site was in a good location away from local housing, with the Council's Environmental Health Manager reporting no complaints from the Albion in the past. It would be in the applicant's own interests to manage the site well to ensure that any licence was not revoked; they did not expect pressure for additional car parking; they accepted a temporary two year planning permission with conditions relating to 9pm closing and no barriers

being erected, they anticipated no restrictions on the public using the benches alongside pub customers.

The Area Planning Officer stated that following publication of the Committee report an additional letter of objection had been received from a local resident who had already objected to the proposal and this had been emailed to Members of the Committee directly.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. The Area Planning Officer responded to questions raised and confirmed that the public open space and car park were owned by the Council and that the application was for 12 benches, so seating for 72 people. He was unsure how much money the Council would receive, this was dependant on negotiations of the lease. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that if the application was refused, the applicant would be able to appeal the decision. He advised that there were no parking restrictions along Upper Brents and confirmed that if the application was refused, people would still be able to drink on the open space and bring their own deck chairs if they so wished.

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:

- Had some sympathy with the applicant but concerned that it would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of local residents;
- the permanency of the tables would change the amenity use of the open space;
- would have detrimental impact on visual amenity of the area;
- this green space was contained within the Council's Local Plan. Such areas have to be suggested by local residents and supported by local residents for inclusion so needed to protect;
- not a compatible use;
- should note the objections from local residents, Faversham Society, Faversham Town Council and others, local residents wanted to keep as a green open space;
- could a condition be imposed requiring no more than 10 tables?
- did not agree with taking this green space away from local residents;
- shame that a Section 106 could not be imposed as local residents would be losing a green open space;
- the tables would cause mud to be churned-up and may result with mud on the road;
- would have a detrimental impact on local residents;
- was not a sensible idea;
- putting tables out would not detract it would still be an open space;
- people could use the green space to drink and sit on anyway so the application would not cause harm;
- parking would be a problem;
- the open space area would be lost; and

- proximity of neighbouring properties and effects on those residents would be unacceptable.

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

For: Councillors James Hunt, Prescott. Total = 2.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Monique Bonney, Andy Booth, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Peter Marchington, Ghlin Whelan. Total = 14.

Abstain: Total = 0.

The motion to approve the application was therefore lost.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds that it would negatively impact on the green open space, listed buildings and the conservation area, with a direct impact on adjacent residents. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Baldock.

Councillor Mike Baldock asked that the following amendment be added to the reason for refusal: No proven need had been demonstrated. This was not seconded. The Area Planning Officer advised against adding this as it was not a material planning reason to use.

Councillor Cameron Beart requested the following amendment to the reason for refusal: lack of parking. This was seconded and agreed by Members.

Councillor Nicholas Hampshire requested a further amendment: loss of a valued public green open space. This was seconded and agreed by Members.

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

Resolved: That application 19/500084/FULL be refused as it would negatively impact on the green open space, listed buildings and conservation area, with a direct impact on adjacent residents, lack of parking and loss of a valued public green open space.

2.7 REFERENCE NO – 18/505468/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of a single storey dayroom building and single storey utility block (part retrospective).		
ADDRESS The Orchard Holywell Lane Upchurch Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7HP		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Mr Miles Cash AGENT

The Area Planning Officer reported that amended plans had been received reducing the ridge of the proposed building to 4 metres.

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

Resolved: That application 18/505468/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.

PART 3

Applications for which REFUSAL is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 18/506424/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Variation of condition 3 to application 15/510605/FULL to allow for Speedway motorcycle racing to operate one day per week on Mondays to Saturday, whilst continuing with the already approved Bank Holiday arrangements.		
ADDRESS Central Park Stadium Church Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 3SB		
WARD Murston	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Cearnspport Ltd AGENT PowerHaus Consultancy

The Area Planning Officer reported that Members should be aware of the document emailed directly to them by the agent for the applicant. In the document, it was implied that a condition should have been included in the report restricting speedway use on Mondays, after use on the preceding Saturday. The Area Planning Officer stated that this was specifically referred to in paragraph 7.16 on pages 183 and 184 of the Committee report. The condition was not in the report as the recommendation was for refusal. The Area Planning Officer reported that despite previously advising, as set out in paragraph 7.17 on page 184 of the Committee report that restricting the number of uses on Saturdays was unacceptable and that her client required the ability to race on any Saturday without restriction, Members would note that the agent was now suggesting that her client would accept a restriction of no more than 25 uses on a Saturday per year. The Area Planning Officer stated that in his view a total of 25 races on Saturdays would be excessive and was likely to give rise to significant harm to residential amenity as set out in the Committee report.

The Area Planning Officer stated that notwithstanding this, he had looked at the number of meetings per season that had taken place at the site since the use commenced in 2013, according to the Kent King's website. The number of meetings at Central Park per season, not including any cancelled meetings, was as follows: 2013 – 18 in total; 2014 – 21 in total; 2015 – 21 in total; 2016 – 24 in total; 2017 – 27 in total; and 2018 – 20 in total.

The Area Planning Officer reported that the number of fixtures for the current 2019 season, including reserved dates (although it was unclear whether these were reserved for cup meetings or meetings postponed from earlier in the season) was 22. It was therefore the case that since the use commenced in 2013, there had only been one season to-date, in 2017, where more than 25 meetings had taken place at Central Park.

The Area Planning Officer stated that given that the restriction suggested by the agent for the applicant would allow more meetings to take place on a Saturday than had taken place over every season bar one that the site had been in use, it was his view, questionable whether such a restriction would, as the agent asserted, give comfort to Members, or members of the public regarding the impact on residential amenity. As it stood, restricting the number of meetings on Saturdays to 25 would in reality not amount in practice to a restriction at all. The Area Planning Officer further stated that he was of the view that that number was excessive, and that it would cause harm to residential amenity in the manner set-out in the Committee report. Members were of course, entitled to take a different view. As set out in the report, it might be possible to support substantially fewer meetings taking place on Saturdays. The agent had signalled very firmly though, as set-out in the report, that this would not be acceptable for league and cup meetings and his view on this was set out in paragraph 7.18 on page 184 of the report. The Area Planning Officer stated that in his view, the proposal remained unacceptable and recommended refusal.

Simon Kellow, a Supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Michelle Rolfe, an Objector, spoke against the application.

Roger Cearn, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that the Council owned the site, and that the acoustic fence had not been constructed in-line with the approved designs but that notwithstanding this, it was as effective as the approved fence. The Area Planning Officer advised that Environmental Health had carried out noise monitoring some time ago, he was unaware that silencers had been fitted to the motorcycles and confirmed that Environmental Health Officers considered the application would cause significant noise and disturbance.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He did not consider this application was an improvement on the previous one, and that noise from the site was intrusive to local residents.

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

- Note the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Manager that he considered it *completely unreasonable* for local resident to suffer the noise on both a Saturday and Monday;
- would have a greater impact on a Saturday as this was a family day;
- the Council needed to address the noise issue from the site;
- noise from the site impacted on a wider area and could be heard as far away as Rodmersham;
- concerned about unleashing more noise and a constant droning sound on local residents;

- did not accept that people would attend the speedway on a Saturday and then travel to the High Street; and
- was a qualitative difference between weekdays and Saturdays in how people used their homes.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair read-out the recommendation for refusal for Members.

Resolved: That application 18/506424/FULL be refused for the reason set out in the report.

3.2 REFERENCE NO – 19/500111/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
New 3 bedroom self-build eco-home domestic dwelling and associated amenities to replace existing demolished dwelling and outbuildings.		
ADDRESS Little Miss Acres Farm Butlers Hill Dargate Kent ME13 9QH		
WARD Boughton and Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hernhill	APPLICANT Dr Victoria Clayton AGENT Miriam Layton AR

Councillor Mike Baldock stated that he had been invited to visit the site along with a Ward Member but this had not happened and he had not therefore visited the site.

The Area Planning Officer reported that one further letter of support had been received from a local resident just after the report was finalised, reiterating points already raised by other local residents. He stated that 16 letters of support from 13 different addresses, and as a correction to the Committee report, five letters of support from four different addresses (one was a duplicate) had been received.

Paul Marsh, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Ian Grant, an objector, spoke against the application.

Dr Victoria Clayton, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Members to ask questions. A Member asked how many more blank footprints were in Dargate. The Area Planning Officer advised that he was unaware of any, but there could be many. In response to a query from a Ward Member, the Area Planning Officer explained that Passiv/Haus were high efficiency homes. The Area Planning Officer showed Members plans of the site and explained how the development site sat with regard to adjacent properties. The design of the proposed dwelling was traditional rather than “exceptional design”.

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

A Ward Member welcomed the design of the proposed dwelling and that it was in the same location as the previous dwelling. He asked whether an agricultural tenancy condition could be imposed.

A Ward Member spoke in support of the application.

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

- Pleased that the applicant had listened to previous concerns of the Committee and welcomed the design of the dwelling;
- balanced design and better than others the Committee had considered;
- needed to listen to local residents and the Parish Council who supported the application;
- the design was in-keeping with the rural location and would blend-in;
- the applicant was committed to rural life;
- know the site and there is sporadic development and can see was house there before;
- would not do any harm;
- this was purely an application for a replacement dwelling;
- may be applications for caravans on plot in the future; and
- applauded the applicant on a good the application.

Councillor James Hunt moved a motion for a site meeting. This was not seconded. Some Members were unsure of the need for a site visit. Councillor Hunt withdrew his proposal.

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

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair moved the following motion: That the application be approved subject to the imposition of suitable normal conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Baldock. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/500111/FULL be approved subject to the imposition of normal conditions.

PART 5

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

A Member congratulated officers on the appeal decisions.

Item 5.1 – Stanbourne House, Church Road, Eastchurch

APPEALS DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Item 5.2 – Greenhurst, Heart's Delight Road, Tunstall

APPEALS DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Item 5.3 – 1 Chiddingfold Close, Minster

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Item 5.4 – Land Adjacent to 1 Seaview Mews, Leysdown

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

547 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm and 10.30pm Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders in order that the Committee could complete its business.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel