

---

## PLANNING WORKING GROUP

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held at the sites listed below on Monday, 25 March 2019 from 10.00am - 11.48am.

**582 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

*Resolved:*

*(1) That Councillor Cameron Beart be elected Chairman for these Meetings.*

**583 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

**584 2.5 18/505929/FULL LAND REAR OF 54 - 76 OAK ROAD, SITTINGBOURNE, ME10 3PF**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cameron Beart (Chairman), Richard Darby, James Hall, James Hunt, Nigel Kay and Peter Marchington.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Matt Bembridge (Kent County Council (KCC)), Philippa Davies and Ross McCardle.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Andy Booth, Ken Ingleton, Bryan Mulhern and Prescott.

The Chairman welcomed the Applicant's Agents and members of public to the meeting.

The Senior Planner introduced the application which sought planning permission on a rectangular piece of land to the rear of 54 to 76 Oak Road, Sittingbourne. The application was for 6no. 3 bedroom houses, arranged in two terraced blocks, with vehicular access from Oak Road. The northern boundary of the site faced onto East Hall Farm. The Senior Planner explained that the houses would be of a traditional design, measuring 9metres to the ridge of the roof, with eaves height of 5metres. Vehicle access onto Oak Road would be from the existing access point to the south of the site, with pedestrian only access from the north, and the site was within the built-up area of Sittingbourne. The two terraced blocks would have a uniform scale and mass, matching those of nearby houses.

The Senior Planner reported that 24 letters of objection had been received from local residents, and a Ward Member. Their comments were outlined in the report. No objections had been received from statutory consultees. The Senior Planner considered the application to be reasonably visually attractive, with no serious amenity impact in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, or loss of light. He advised that Permitted Development Rights would be removed so that additional new openings could not be installed to the eastern and southern flanks, to mitigate against the potential for future over-looking.

The Development Planner (Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation) explained that the existing vehicular crossover of the pavement had an historic use, and the six dwellings were expected to amount to one additional car movement every 20 minutes. The access to the site would be widened to accommodate movement of vehicles in both directions, which would improve highway safety and prevent vehicles from waiting on the highway, and the access would become narrower further into the site to reduce vehicle speed. The Development Planner advised that vehicle tracking had taken place and this had indicated that a fire tender, or service vehicle, could turn within the site and exit in a forward-facing position. Refuse collection would be from Oak Road. The parking met current adopted standards for residents and visitors in a suburban location and he considered the site to be remote enough from Oak Road to prevent any overspill parking on the highway.

One of the agents for the applicant outlined the application and explained that it was within the built-up area, was a modest development, and there had been no issues from KCC with regard to highway/access issues.

Local residents raised the following points:

- Parking issues, especially when there were visitors;
- loss of habitat for wildlife such as hedgehogs, foxes, frogs and bees;
- loss of amenity space;
- parking issues;
- housing density;
- lack of services such as doctors surgeries/school spaces, this would make it worse;
- lack of shops;
- this had been 'crammed in';
- there would be at least two cars per dwelling;
- this was developers being greedy;
- nuisance during construction and dust/fumes etc. would effect people with health issues, such as asthma;
- preparation work had already commenced on the site – indicating approval of the application was a foregone conclusion;
- the road was busy and the access to the site was blocked every evening;
- there was no need for the development;
- the application site should be used for something else, such as a doctors surgery or a park;
- there would be a lot of additional vehicles;
- long-term effect on children's health in the area;
- this was a disaster waiting to happen with vehicles driving over the footpath to get onto Oak Road;
- issues with access being so close to the bus stop;
- we thought we would be getting a doctors surgery;
- I offered to plant fruit trees on the site;
- overlooking issues and loss of privacy; and
- land ownership issues.

A Ward Member asked how emergency vehicles would access the site. The Development Planner advised that tracking had been carried out which had shown that it was accessible for emergency vehicles, and this was indicated on a plan. The Ward Member also raised concern with loss of visibility at the access to the site if there was a bus stopping at the bus stop, and asked if there would be parking restrictions. The Development Planner advised that there would be no restrictions, but the access to the site would be widened. The Ward Member also stated that there would be a loss of parking on Oak Road, and the Development Planner responded by stating that technically there was no inherent right to park on the highway and the loss of on-street parking would be minor. He confirmed that the access would be 4.3-4.4metres wide, with two cars needing a minimum of 4.1metres to pass. He added that it would actually be a rare occurrence for two vehicles to be passing each other at the access, given the projected number of vehicle movements. The Development Planner explained that the access would be widened for the first 12metres to allow for two vehicles to pass each other.

Clarification was also sought on the ownership of the land/access. The Senior Planner explained that the relevant ownership searches would have been carried out, but there maybe a right of access onto the site, and he would look into this further and update Members at the Planning Committee meeting on 4 April 2019.

Members viewed the application site with officers.

**585 2.3 19/500219/FULL 20 HUSTLINGS DRIVE, EASTCHURCH, SHEERNESS, ME12 4JX**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cameron Beart (Chairman), Richard Darby, James Hall, James Hunt, Nigel Kay and Peter Marchington.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Tina Booth and Lynd Taylor.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Philippa Davies and Megan Harris.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Andy Booth, Ken Ingleton, Bryan Mulhern and Prescott.

The Chairman welcomed the Applicant, members of the public, a representative from Eastchurch Parish Council and a Visiting Ward Member to the Meeting.

The Planner introduced the application which sought permission for the erection of a detached double garage, west of the main dwelling. The application site was within the built-up area of Eastchurch. The building would be 6.4metres wide and 7metres long, with the eaves height 3.8metres high, and the ridge height being 6.2metres. The materials would match the main house. The Planner explained that upstairs would be for use by a disabled relative, and the application was a re-submission of a previous application which had been refused. This application was of a smaller footprint and improved design, and had more appropriate fenestration. The rear window on the first floor would be obscure-glazed and was a significant distance from the nearest property. The annex's habitable floor space had been reduced from 38.9m<sup>2</sup> in the previous application to 23.9m<sup>2</sup>. The annex was dependent on the main house, and was not a separate dwelling.

The Planner advised that there had been 10 objections to the application, as noted in the report. She explained that Eastchurch Parish Council had also objected.

The Applicant gave an overview of the application and the reasons that he wanted the additional accommodation. He explained the addition of the double garage would allow him to park his vehicles off the road, as they did not fit in the garage currently on the site.

A Visiting Member who was also a representative of Eastchurch Parish Council spoke against the application and considered it to be not-in-keeping with the streetscene. She questioned the practicalities of having upstairs accommodation for someone who was disabled. The Applicant confirmed that a stair lift would be installed.

A Visiting Ward Member spoke against the application and understood there was a covenant on the original dwelling preventing a second dwelling on the site.

Local residents raised the following points:

- This looked like it would be a separate dwelling, and could be rented out independently in the future;
- this would be an eyesore;
- it would set a precedent, with the gaps in the spacious housing being filled;
- loss of character of the estate;
- more vehicles;
- concerns on how the disabled person would evacuate if there was a fire;
- the covenant on the house seemed to have been ignored;
- overlooking; and
- loss of winter sunshine to nearby property.

In response, the Planner explained that covenants were not taken into account in the planning process; and a condition would be added to the permission to state that the new building would be ancillary to the main dwelling. She re-iterated that this was not a separate dwelling, and it would be a planning breach if it became separate from the main building.

The Planner responded to Members' questions and explained that garages were not taken into account when considering parking standards, and the parking standards for this property were as they would be for this size of dwelling, i.e. parking for two cars.

Members toured the application site with the officer.

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