
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 18 July 2019 from 7.00pm - 10.38pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, Roger Clark, Simon Clark, Tim Gibson (Chairman), James Hall, James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes, Peter Marchington, Benjamin Martin (Vice-Chairman), Ben J Martin (Substitute for Councillor Eddie Thomas), David Simmons, Paul Stephen, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Rob Bailey, Philippa Davies, Andrew Jeffers, Benedict King, Graham Thomas, Steve Wilcock and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Ken Ingleton and Ken Rowles.

APOLOGY: Councillor Eddie Thomas.

139 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

140 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 June 2019 (Minute Nos. 62 – 71) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Minute No. 67 item 2.7 19/501378/FULL Annexe, James House, Kent View Drive, Eastchurch, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 4DP the resolution to read: That application 19/500577/REM be **deferred and** delegated to officers to discuss with the applicant the possibility of a larger amenity space being provided for the annexe.

The Minutes of the Reconvened Meeting held on 27 June 2019 (Minute Nos. 96 – 98) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

141 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Simmons declared a Disclosable Non Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.3 Hoppers Huts, South Street, Boughton, as the family was known to him. Councillor Simmons spoke, but did not vote, on this item.

Councillor David Simmons declared a Disclosable Non Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.9 Ewell Farm, Graveney Road, Faversham, as his business involved the use of polytunnels. Councillor Simmons spoke, but did not vote, on this item.

142 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 July 2019 (Minute Nos. 117 – 118) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

19/500577/REM Land to the north of Vicarage Road, Sittingbourne, ME10 2BL

A Ward Member, also a member of the Planning Committee, spoke against the application. He considered the proposed properties to the south of the site were too close together, the development would cause over-intensification, the properties were too high and would cause over-shadowing to neighbouring properties. The Member also raised concern where the access road narrowed, that two vehicles, especially in an emergency situation would not be able to pass each other.

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

There were no questions or debate.

Resolved: That application 19/500577/REM be approved subject to conditions (1) to (13) in the report.

143 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/502510/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a new lych gate and front porch extension.			
ADDRESS Denley Hall Seasalter Road Graveney Faversham Kent ME13 9ED			
WARD Boughton Courtenay	And	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Graveney Goodnestone	APPLICANT Mr Jackson AGENT A P Whiteley Consultants Ltd

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

Resolved: That application 19/502510/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/502286/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of 5no. mirrors at one end of the riding arena.			
ADDRESS Telfords Otterden Road Eastling Faversham Kent ME13 0BN			

WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastling	APPLICANT Mrs Anne Adams AGENT
------------------------	--	---

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

Resolved: That application 19/502286/FULL be approved subject to condition (1) in the report.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/501417/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Conversion and extension of former hoppers huts to create 4 holiday lets and 1 laundry room.		
ADDRESS Hoppers Huts South Street Boughton Under Blean Kent ME13 9NB		
WARD Boughton And Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Boughton Under Blean	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs J Berry AGENT Anthony Swaine Architecture Ltd

The Area Planning Officer explained that Kent County Council (KCC) Flood and Water Management Team had been consulted, but this application was not within their scope, and as such they had no comments to make. He said the application would be subject to the collection of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) mitigation payments.

Mr Josh Berry, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

The Area Planning Officer confirmed that the site was large enough to accommodate eight parking spaces. He said the huts would be sited 120 metres from the lane, and over 100 metres to the nearest dwelling. In response to questions about how much the hopper huts visual appearance would change, the Area Planning Officer explained that the general appearance would be the same. The roof slope and shape would remain, and the extensions to the development would be matched as close as possible to what was already there.

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

Members debated the application and raised points which included:

- This was an excellent use of old redundant farm buildings;
- there was demand for this type of holiday accommodation;
- condition (10) (landscaping) needed to be strengthened so that bio-diversity was improved, and removed trees replaced and more added as well; and

- because of climate change, considered ‘native’ species was not crucial as these often did not survive.

The Area Planning Officer advised that condition (10) could be amended to include the word ‘enhance’, rather than “encourage’ wildlife...’, and the deletion of the word ‘native’.

Councillor Benjamin Martin moved the following amendments: That condition (10) be amended to include the word ‘enhance’, rather than “encourage’ wildlife...’, and the deletion of the word ‘native’. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt. On being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/501417/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (17) in the report, with amendments to condition (10) to include the word ‘enhance’, rather than “encourage’ wildlife...’, and the deletion of the word ‘native’, and to the collection of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) mitigation payments.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 18/503057/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of a 3 storey, 66 bed care home for older people with associated access, car park and landscaping.		
ADDRESS Land At Perry Court Ashford Road Faversham Kent ME13 8YA		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT LNT Care Developments & HDD (Faversham) Ltd AGENT LNT Construction Ltd

The Major Projects Officer referred to the tabled paper for this item.

Jo Kemp, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member noted the increase from 60 bed (approved as part of outline planning consent) to 66 bed and asked what increase in percentage would be a material change. He also considered that 20 car parking spaces were not enough for 40-50 FTE, 66 residents and visitors, and asked what nature of care was being offered, noting that there was a critical shortage of dementia care. The Major Projects Officer explained that although there was a change in the number of rooms, the floorspace was less than in the 2017 outline application. He advised that KCC Highways and Transportation had no objection to this increase, and there would be no material change to traffic impacts. The Major Projects Officer explained that the staff use of the car park would be staggered over 24hours, and the development was close to public transport links, and KCC Highways and Transportation had raised no objection to the parking figures. He added that the care would be for older people with dementia, and KCC had welcomed the proposal.

A Member asked whether there were both single and double rooms available, and considered the design of the buildings could be improved. The Major Projects Officer explained that all the bedrooms were single bedrooms, but that KCC had been happy with the internal layout. He considered it to be a good design, and the application included hard and soft landscaping conditions.

In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer explained that drainage issues would be addressed by conditions (17) and (18) in the report.

A Member asked how much of the roof would be covered by solar panels, considered parking was 'tight' and queried whether the bland design fitted the local vernacular. The Major Projects Officer referred the Member to the renewable energy measures within condition (9) in the report, which gave the applicant flexibility to agree a package of measures. He explained that condition (8) required the building to be constructed to Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREAAM) 'Very Good' standard. The Major Projects Officer said that KCC Highways and Transportation had confirmed that 20 car parking spaces were acceptable. The Conservation and Design Manager gave an overview of the finish of the building. He explained that it would be mainly brickwork, with rendered sections, and some projecting bays, with yellow brickwork. The render was similar to the nearby houses and supermarket, and the cladding used was similar to the hotel and supermarket. He explained that the overall finish of the care home provided a transition between the hotel and supermarket developments and the housing.

A Member welcomed the renewable energy aspect of the development, but emphasised the need for the building to generate electricity from photovoltaic panels. He stated that as a result of climate change, the residents would be vulnerable to warmer summers and he asked how the building was designed to safeguard residents from the heat. He also sought clarification as to whether it was a 3-storey or 2-storey building. The Major Project Officer suggested that condition (9) could be amended to include a target for renewable energy, and also refer to photovoltaic panels. He acknowledged the vulnerability of the residents and advised that together with the design incorporated by the agent, building regulations would ensure the building was appropriately built. The Major Projects Officer confirmed that it was a 3-storey building, however it sat lower than the road at the front to decrease the visual impact.

A Member asked why only 15% solar paneling was being installed. The Major Projects Officer explained that this was the figure mentioned by the Applicant, but re-iterated that there was a condition where a package of energy measures could be agreed.

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

Members debated the application and raised points which included:

- The proposed building looked bland, and did not match the local vernacular;
- some over-hangs were needed to help shade the south facing windows;
- the design needed to be improved;

- 15% solar energy seemed low for this development;
- lack of car parking, especially with increase in residents;
- this was a mish-mash design;
- photovoltaic roof tiles, rather than panels should be installed, and that would increase solar energy coverage;
- this building, plus supermarket and hotel would be clearly visible;
- suggest green living walls instead, and green roofs, and this would help water drainage;
- condition (9) needed to include the wording ‘reach and attain 15% renewable energy’ and ‘seek and enhance biodiversity’;
- there needed to be a new condition to ensure sustainable habitats and wildlife areas were provided;
- nothing wrong with the design, but it could be improved;
- the development should not be looked at until the junction of the A2 and the A251 was improved;
- design needed to be softened;
- increase in size was a material consideration despite the fact that the building was being dug down; and
- needed to resolve where we were pitching the level of renewable energy figure.

Councillor Benjamin Martin moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to review the design, and the renewable energy measures, and officers discuss these further with the Applicant and Agent. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt.

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

Resolved: That application 18/503057/FULL be deferred to review the design, and the renewable energy measures, and officers discuss these further with the Applicant and Agent.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 19/501799/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a single storey one bedroom dwelling with 4 roof lights and bike store. Proposed Parking and garden to side. (Revised scheme to 18/502384/FULL)		
ADDRESS Porch House The Street Eastling Faversham Kent ME13 0AY		
WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastling	APPLICANT Gail Boucher AGENT Redsquare Architects Ltd

The Area Planning Officer referred to responses from a neighbour to comments made by the Applicant outlined in the Committee report. The neighbour was concerned with damage to pipework during recent works; deliveries to the site, and the access road.

Mr Stewart Bromley, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer explained that planning officers had not been involved in the removal of trees from the garden, and that in any case this might have taken place outside of the application site.

A Member asked if there was a landscape plan, and whether there was an issue with over-looking. The Area Planning Officer explained that as it was a long-established mature garden already, there was little to gain in requesting a landscaping plan. He explained that there were only ground floor front windows, so there would not be an issue with overlooking.

A Member asked how many car parking spaces there were, and the car movements at the junction. The Area Planning Officer explained that two car parking spaces were proposed, and KCC Highways and Transportation had not considered there would be an access issue at the junction.

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

Members debated the application and raised points which included:

- Sympathy with the neighbour as this was the only access to the site;
- the access was a narrow alleyway;
- the access was already being used; and
- there was already an approval on the site.

Resolved: That application 19/501799/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (9) in the report.

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 19/501385/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of 2no. semi detached dwellings to replace 1 existing derelict dwelling (Resubmission).		
ADDRESS 4 Jetty Road Warden Sheerness Kent ME12 4PS		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Warden	APPLICANT T & J Utting AGENT Peter Jackson Architects

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

Resolved: That application 19/501385/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (10) in the report and to the provision of SAMMS payments.

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 19/501816/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use of the land for the stationing of a mobile home for a temporary period (Retrospective).		
ADDRESS Whitegate Stables Wallbridge Lane Upchurch Sittingbourne Kent ME8 7XH		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Palm Investments Ltd AGENT Tetlow King Planning

The Area Planning Officer reported that a redacted personal statement had been received from the Agent, which the officer was happy to share with the Committee. He added that the information in the statement was an expansion of what was already outlined in the report. There was some discussion and Members were happy to proceed with the information they had already, within the report.

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

Resolved: That application 19/501816/FULL be approved subject to condition (1) in the report.

2.8 REFERENCE NO - 19/500051/LBC		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Conversion, part demolition and extension of former school building to provide two 4 bedroom dwellings.		
ADDRESS Tunstall Church Of England Primary School Tunstall Road Tunstall Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8DX		
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Tunstall	APPLICANT Mr G Swift AGENT Penshurst Planning Ltd

The Area Planning Officer briefly outlined the reason why this application had come back to the Planning Committee, following it being considered at the June 2019 meeting alongside the planning permission. Both had been refused, but the reasons for refusal were not related to the works to the listed building.

Mavis Hibben, representing Tunstall Parish Council, spoke against the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

The Ward Member requested further details of the application. The Area Planning Officer explained that the 1970s addition would be demolished. The building frontage would remain the same. He added that there were no changes to the

application submitted to the Planning Committee in June 2019. The Conservation and Design Manager explained that a lot of the original internal features had been removed. He considered it to be a sensitive scheme, and an improvement to the last two previous schemes.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer confirmed that the application was to alter the physical form of the building, but not beyond the existing footprint/envelope. The garden etc. was not being considered in this application, just the windows and doors etc.

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

Members were invited to debate the application.

The Ward Member supported the preservation of the building, including parts that had not been unearthed yet. The Conservation and Design Manager explained that there would be a schedule of works for the building. The Area Planning Officer stated that this was covered within conditions (6) and (11) in the report and that the words 'items uncovered' could be added, and the two conditions enhanced to reflect the need to protect the heritage of the building. Members were happy with this approach.

Resolved: That application 19/500051/LBC be approved subject to conditions (1) to (11) in the report, with the inclusion of the words 'items uncovered', and conditions (6) and (11) enhanced to reflect the need to protect the heritage of the building.

2.9 REFERENCE NO - 19/500862/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of polytunnels (retrospective).			
ADDRESS Ewell Farm, Graveney Road, Faversham ME13 8UP			
WARD Boughton Courtenay	And	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Edward Vinson Ltd AGENT Finn's

Members were invited to ask questions.

In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer suggested that the timeframes outlined in condition (5) of the report could be re-visited, and he sought delegated authority to do this, following discussion with the Applicant.

The Major Projects Officer confirmed that there was no conflict with the footpath on the site, and the footpath would remain.

In response to questions, the Major Projects Officer stated that KCC Flood and Water Management had advised that the proposal was low risk in terms of

rainwater run-off and the impact on the land, and he said that conditions (3) and (4) could be amended to take into account the need to mitigate any possible detrimental impact on the nearby listed building.

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

Resolved: That application 19/500862/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report, condition (5) be re-drafted to vary the timeframe that the polytunnels would be covered, following discussion with the Applicant, and conditions (3) and (4) amended to specifically refer to mitigating any detrimental impact on the nearby listed building.

2.10 REFERENCE NO - 19/501160/REM			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Reserved Matters relating to layout, scale and appearance of the proposed building and the landscaping of the site pursuant to outline application 16/505299/OUT for construction of a 60 bed care home (within Class C2).			
ADDRESS Coleshall Farm Ferry Road Iwade Kent ME9 8QY			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade	APPLICANT Frontier Estates (Frome) Ltd -	
		AGENT Gillings Planning Ltd	

The Major Projects Officer referred to the tabled paper for this application.

Emma Patchell, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to ask questions.

A Member asked for confirmation on the shape of the building and what the proposed figure was for renewable energy. The Major Projects Officer explained that the layout was acceptable. He added that BREAM ‘Good’ standard had been established at the outline stage of the application.

A Member considered 25 car parking spaces was not enough and asked where excess parking would go and noted the potential impact on surrounding roads. The Major Projects Officer explained that the Applicant had experience in operating this type of facility, including parking provision, and they had an interest in ensuring that it worked well. He stated that KCC Highways and Transportation had looked at the application and were satisfied with the parking provision. Further parking would be to the detriment of landscaping on the site.

In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer explained that a swept path analysis had been carried out to ensure access and egress to the site was adequate.

A Member asked what would happen if the care home changed to different care facilities, whether more parking would be required at a later stage, and why the BREAAAM was 'Good', and not higher. The Major Projects Officer explained that the application was not tied to this Applicant in the Reserved Matters stage of the application. He explained that the BREAAAM rating was a legacy of the 2017 application, under a previous Local Plan, requiring good, rather than very good.

A Member asked whether reinforced grass/tarmac areas could be utilised to aid additional parking opportunities. The Major Projects Officer explained that there were trees on the site preventing this unless Members were prepared to reduce the level of landscape planting. Parking need was in competition with the need for visual appearance and improving bio-diversity.

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

Members debated the application and raised points which included:

- The care home was too big for the site;
- needed to get design and parking sorted out now;
- BREAAAM 'Good' standard was not enough;
- the massing of the building was wrong;
- the parking was adequate;
- residents in this type of care home wanted tranquillity, with gardens, not a car park to look at; and
- 25 spaces was not enough.

The Major Projects Officer re-iterated that the 60-bed outline planning permission had already been agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/501160/REM be approved subject to conditions as set out in the tabled paper.

2.11 REFERENCE NO - 19/501789/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Erection of a pair of semi detached houses with associated driveways and parking.		
ADDRESS Land East Of 11 Southsea Avenue Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 2JX		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Batten AGENT Prime Folio

The Area Planning Officer reported that the recommendation on page 107 of the report should also include the receipt of SAMMS payments. He explained that the adjoining site was the subject of an application for in excess of 70 dwellings and this had included a habitat appraisal. The Area Planning Officer sought delegation to approve the application subject to the submission of an ecological appraisal of the site, to any further information as requested by KCC Ecology and to no objection being raised by them to the application.

Mr Prasanna Willatgamuwa, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer explained that the application could be deferred until receipt of the ecological survey.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved a motion for a site visit. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless.

There was some discussion on the usefulness of a site visit, and that they were often poorly attended by Members.

Councillor Beart withdrew his proposal for a site visit.

Councillor Tim Valentine moved the following motion: That the application be deferred until an ecological survey had been carried out. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

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

Resolved: That application 19/501789/FULL be deferred until an ecological survey had been carried out.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/501570/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of rear extension (Retrospective) (Resubmission of 18/500629/FULL)		
ADDRESS 156 Scarborough Drive Private Street Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2LS		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr K Davies AGENT Ks Architectural Services

Jeanette Reay, an objector, spoke against the application.

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

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer advised that there was a permission to convert the garage to the property.

A Member asked if a temporary permission could be issued. The Area Planning Officer advised that this was rare for a permanent development. However, he

stated that this option could be explored and the chimney flue and overlooking windows could be reviewed at the same time.

A Member asked if the application could be restricted to the Applicant. The Area Planning Officer explained that the application was restricted to the land, not the Applicant.

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

Members debated the application and raised the following points;

- It was worth officers speaking to the Applicant;
- the appearance could be improved; and
- other services could become involved.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be deferred so that a temporary, personal permission could be discussed, and improvements made to the application. This was seconded by Councillor Roger Clark.

Resolved: That application 19/501570/FULL be deferred so that a temporary, personal permission could be discussed, and improvements made to the application.

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/502305/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Demolition of existing outbuilding. Erection of two storey side extension, rear infill extension, loft conversion and detached triple garage to rear (Resubmission to 19/500129/FULL)		
ADDRESS Cripps Farm Plough Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 4JH		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT D Buckley Ltd. AGENT DEVA Design

The Area Planning Officer reported that the Applicant had submitted an email, taking issues with some of the content of the Committee report. The comments included a dispute over the site entrance and shared boundary which the Area Planning Officer stated was not a planning consideration. The applicant had stated that there had been a static caravan to the rear of the site for over 20 years; and a hardstanding to the front, again not a planning consideration. The Applicant had also explained the proximity of the site to Kingsborough Manor. The Area Planning Officer acknowledged that the site was close to Kingsborough Manor, but stated that it was materially a different street scene. The Applicant had also raised the issue of the height of frontage, but the Area Planning Officer said that this was not relevant to the proposed development.

Mr David Buckley, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer referred to the two reasons for refusal of the application at the meeting on 25 April 2019, which did not solely focus on the proposed garage to the front, but also to the bulk of the proposed extension. He also confirmed that the 140% increase in size related to a comparison of the original dwelling on the site as required by the Council’s longstanding policy.

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

Members debated the application and raised points which included:

- The dwelling currently looked unfinished, it was not symmetrical;
- this was an exception site, and would not set a precedent;
- the main objection to the previous application had been the triple garage to the front of the property;
- the application as it stood now was acceptable;
- the proposed development was an improvement, and enhanced the area;
- the design did not sit well, supported officer recommendation; and
- not against the development, but the design could be better, especially to the rear.

The motion to refuse the application was put to the vote and was lost.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following motion: That the application be delegated to officers to approve, subject to the necessary conditions, including a full landscaping scheme. This was seconded by Councillor Benjamin Martin. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/502305/FULL be delegated to officers to approve, subject to the necessary conditions, including a full landscaping scheme.

3.3 REFERENCE NO - 18/506680/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of a new detached two storey dwelling with habitable loft space and detached garage.			
ADDRESS Land South of 106 Scrapsgate Road Minster-on-Sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2DJ			
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN Minster-On-Sea	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr A Brooks AGENT Anderson Design

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

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

A Member acknowledged that the streetscene was varied, but stated its position on the site was not acceptable.

Resolved: That application 18/506680/FULL be refused for the reasons stated in the report.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – Land Rear of Lord Stanley Bungalow, Upchurch**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.2 – 32 The Broadway, Minster-on-sea**

COMMITTEE REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.3 – 20 Hustlings Drive, Eastchurch**

COMMITTEE REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

A Member was disappointed with the appeal decision.

- **Item 5.4 – 12 Laxton Way, Faversham**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.5 – 1 Boughton Field Cottages, Faversham**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.6 – 240-248 High Street, Sheerness**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

A Member was appalled by the decision and considered it to be an awful building.

- **Item 5.7 – 240-248 High Street, Sheerness (ADVERT CONSENT)**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.8 – Lodge Farm, Old House Lane, Hartlip**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.9 – Land Rear of Unit 5, Stickfast Farm, Bobbing**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

A Member was disappointed with the appeal decision.

144 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8.33pm and reconvened at 8.40pm.

145 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