
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 12 September 2019 from 7.00pm - 10.56pm.

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey, Andy Byrne, Philippa Davies, Andrew Jeffers, Benedict King, Alison Peters, Steve Wilcock and Jim Wilson.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Roger Clark, Nicholas Hampshire and Benjamin Martin.

222 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

223 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 August 2019 (Minute Nos. 182 – 185) and the Extraordinary Meeting held on 29 August 2019 (Minute Nos. 186 – 189) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as correct records.

224 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Simmons declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.2, 19/501640/FULL, Land North of Highstreet Road, Hernhill. Councillor Simmons spoke but did not vote on this item.

225 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 September 2019 (Minute Nos. 196 - 197) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

16/503950/FULL, Orchard View, Otterham Quay Lane, Upchurch, Nr Sittingbourne, ME8 8QR

The Area Planning Officer responded to some questions that had been raised by Members at the site meeting. He explained that the Agent had provided evidence of the applicant's gypsy and traveller status, but had declined to provide any further information, and had referred to the residents of the existing caravans already benefitting from planning permission. The Area Planning Officer added that the application was for the provision of two additional caravans, and not to determine the status of the existing residents. In response to a further question raised at the site meeting, the Area Planning Officer explained that there was a requirement for

the caravans to be six metres away from the utility building, particularly any part of it that was flammable. In this case, there was some panelling, and this would need to be removed or replaced by brickwork. Touring caravans needed to be at least one metre apart if they were being stored, and if occupied at least six metres apart. The Area Planning Officer referred to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), paragraph 13.8, raised at the site meeting, and which set out the aim to promote co-existence between the settled and travelling community. He explained that allegations raised at the site meeting were not planning considerations.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member acknowledged the distance of 6 metres between caravans, but questioned whether they were six metres away from caravans in the site next door. The Area Planning Officer explained that this was a licensing matter, and if Members were concerned that a suitable layout could not be achieved, the application could be bought back to the Committee. He added that condition (4) in the Committee report (15 August 2019) restricted the layout of the site. He reiterated that in terms of the relationship with the caravans on the adjacent site, this was a licensing requirement, not a Planning regulation.

A Member asked how many vehicles were permitted on the site? The Area Planning Officer explained that there was no upper limit on numbers, but there was a restriction on the size of the vehicle, as referred to in condition (3) of the report, and the limit was 3.5 tonnes. The Member asked whether the number of vehicles could be restricted as it was a narrow site. The Area Planning Officer explained that it was unusual to restrict the number of vehicles on a site and this would be difficult to enforce in any case. If there was a material change in the number of vehicles and therefore a change of use, then enforcement action would be taken.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following amendment: That if the application was approved, officers be given delegated authority to liaise with licensing as to whether the layout could be achieved, and if not, the application to come back to the Planning Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

Members were invited to debate the application, with the above amendment and they raised points which included:

- Concerned with the traffic linked to the site;
- this was a narrow site and there had been a fire here in the past;
- there was already a permission on the site, this was not much different to what was already there; and
- concerned with community cohesion.

On being put to the vote the amendment and substantive motion were agreed.

Resolved: That application 16/503950/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to officers liaising with licensing as to whether the layout

could be achieved, and if not, the application to come back to the Planning Committee, and to conditions (1) to (4) in the report.

226 DEFERRED ITEMS

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

Def Item 1 REFERENCE NO - 18/502735/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a new supermarket (Use Class A1) and a hotel (Use Class C1) along with associated accesses, car and cycling parking, lighting, drainage, hard and soft landscaping and associated infrastructure.		
ADDRESS Land At Perry Court Ashford Road Faversham Kent ME13 8YA		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT HDD (Faversham) Limited And Premier Inn Hotels Limited AGENT Pegasus Planning Group

The Senior Planner referred to the two tabled updates for this item and reminded Members that this application had been deferred at the meeting on 30 May 2019. He outlined changes in the design of the buildings which included reduced areas of rendered wall; and more clarity and detail on external materials. The exact detail of the external materials would be subject to planning conditions. The Senior Planner explained that there would be substantial new planting, and the number of trees to be planted had increased from 53 to 79, and the landscaping scheme would be based on the local landscape character, including additional tree planting in the car park as well. He showed Members the plans first submitted with the application, and how the current design had evolved and improved from these.

Mr John Irwin, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Scott Davidson, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member questioned the absence of a Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation Officer at the meeting and that he was very disappointed in this. The Development Manager explained that KCC officers had been invited, and reminded the Member that they were not employees of this Council. He referred to the tabled paper where KCC officers had responded to some questions raised by Members.

A Member asked whether the effects from the change from a convenience store to a 9 x larger supermarket was negligible as noted in paragraph 3.03 of the report. The Senior Planner explained that these were comments made by the Environmental Protection Team Leader. He acknowledged that it was a significant

change to the outline permission, but that the Applicant could submit a new application for a larger scheme for consideration if they wished to. The Senior Planner explained that this was a stand alone application for the supermarket and hotel scheme. The Member referred to paragraph 3.04 and the £20,000 contribution towards off-site electric vehicle (EV) charge points, and asked what the costs were for the charge points, to get some perspective? The Senior Planner said that a recent Council scheme cost £8,500 per charge point. The Member asked what the effects of signalisation at the A2/A251 junction would have on air quality? The Environmental Protection Team Leader explained that signalisation could result in the slow flow of traffic, with the potential to increase air pollution. The Member asked what a refrigerant heat recovery system was as referred to in paragraph 4.03? The Senior Planner explained that this was in relation to the food store and was a system whereby heat generated from freezers was used in a beneficial way elsewhere. The Member asked for the definition of an edge of centre location and the Senior Planner explained that this was positioned on the edge of town, but still well connected and likely to be up to 300 metres from the shopping centre boundary. The Member asked for clarification on the current application for a variation to the housing application. The Senior Planner explained that this was specific to the offsite works at the Brogdale Road/A2 junction, rather than to the A2/A251 junction. He further clarified that the highways contribution of £300,000 was for the A2/A251 junction.

A Ward Member who was also a Planning Committee Member asked for some current data for the traffic at standstill, due to traffic lights, in Faversham. The Environmental Protection Team Leader explained that a positive side to traffic lights was that on an existing road, they broke up the flow of traffic, as well as slowing it down. He explained that there was air quality monitoring data along Ospringe Street, and that the increase in traffic from the development was insignificant at this point. The Member considered that some of the figures at the Ospringe Air Quality Management Area were in breach of World Health Organisation limits, and so any increase would not be negligible? The Environmental Protection Team Leader explained that there were hotspots where the levels did exceed the limit, but that the levels of NO₂ died away further from the A2. In response to a further question, the Senior Planner advised that the total area of the hotel was 3,000 square metres.

A Member asked why there was limited network capacity on the site and considered this should be increased as it was a greenfield site. The Senior Planner advised that the Applicant had discussed the site capacity with the energy supplier, but would also contribute £20,000 towards off-site EV charge points in Faversham. Consultation had been carried out with the Climate Change Officer, Environmental Health Team and KCC Highways and Transportation and they considered the EV strategy to be acceptable. The Member highlighted that 20KWh on page 4 of the report should actually be 20KWp. The Senior Planner acknowledged the error. He considered that the proposed planning conditions and the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating had incorporated the appropriate sustainability measures into the scheme. The Major Projects Officer stated that the BREEAM rating on this site was more than what was required in the Local Plan. The Member noted that the hotel was larger than in the outline planning application. The Senior Planner explained that there were some differences from the outline application to the present application. The parameter plans for the outline scheme had shown the hotel to be 11 metres in height; it was

now 11.1 metres. The parameter plans had also indicated that the hotel would be two storey, and it was now three storey. The Major Projects Officer also said that the number of rooms had changed from a maximum of 100 to 84.

A Member sought clarification on the Section 106 Agreement. The Senior Planner explained that this was a full planning application, and generated a requirement for Section 106 payments. Whereas an outline scheme could not re-visit the Section 106 payments under reserved matters, it was possible to do that on this application. As it included the proposed supermarket, with more traffic, Highways England and KCC Highways and Transportation were seeking more contributions, specific to the movements created by the supermarket. The Member asked for details of the policy designation for hotel and retail. The Senior Planner drew the Member's attention to page 21 of the report which set out Policy MU7 in full, which showed that the allocation of the land was essentially for a mixed use development.

A Member asked if the supermarket would provide a bus service to local areas? The Major Projects Officer explained that this was not proposed here. The outline application had already been granted for the wider site, and Section 106 payments from that permission could be used to subsidise public transport provision.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

Members were invited to debate the application and raised points which included:

- Thanks to officers for their work in getting an improved scheme, the agent had pretty much taken on-board everything previously raised by Members;
- welcomed the additional EV charging points;
- there were a lot of improvements in terms of landscaping;
- concerned with certain parts of the design of the hotel and supermarket;
- the design of the hotel was unimaginative, it was just a brick box;
- the design needed to be more in-keeping;
- significant improvements but design of hotel was not good;
- impact on AQMA as residents travelled by car to the supermarket;
- orientation of the hotel was wrong relative to nearby existing houses;
- the hotel was out-of-keeping with the well designed houses on the other side of the Ashford Road; and
- appreciated the sustainability measures.

In response to a Councillor's comment, the Major Projects Officer advised that having a view, or the impact of development on it, was not a material consideration. He invited the Principle Urban and Landscape Design Officer to comment on the design. She explained that good quality materials would be used on the two buildings, she considered the design of the supermarket to have articulation, and was 3-d in appearance and not just a box. There had been an effort to improve the landscape and to respond to the local environment, with different types of habitat, and a vast amount of the planting would be native species. There would also be trees in the car park to provide shade and mitigate the heat from the tarmac areas.

Members made further points including:

- No problem with the design;
- acknowledged large change from convenience store to supermarket, but there were going to be 310 dwellings on site;
- traffic movements would be larger without the supermarket;
- other consultees, not just KCC Highways and Transportation, did not attend Planning Committee;
- there was no reason to refuse;
- grateful for the improvements;
- inadequate design;
- supermarket design falls short of other supermarkets in Faversham;
- this was a vast departure from the outline application;
- there should be a pitched roof on the buildings;
- the design should have regard for local vernacular, there was no connection to existing or new buildings;
- the supermarket would have significant impact on the landscape;
- it was a bulky goods store, so people would drive there regardless;
- there would have been even more opposition to the original planning application if there had been a large supermarket on it;
- any major development would have an adverse impact on air quality;
- adverse economic impact on town centre;
- impact on residential amenity of those who lived on Ashford Road;
- welcomed landscape improvements, but there had been a loss of hedgerow to the front of the site;
- topography of site meant that ground floor of hotel was in-line with upstairs rooms along Ashford Road;
- could not support this;
- the design was in-keeping;
- air quality issues;
- Ashford Road was the 'entrance' to Faversham, the development was not in-keeping with Ashford Road;
- impact on the setting of the listed building;
- generally impressed with the improvements to the overall quantity of EV charge points;
- this was a very strategic site for EV charging, there should be a minimum of two 100KW rapid charge points in the hotel car park;
- the buildings needed to be capable of being carbon neutral by 2030;
- we can ask for better and get better;
- justifying more vehicle movements was difficult, however many;
- not confident that there would be signalisation in 18 months;
- impact on town centre shops; and
- needed a supermarket design that was distinctive to the local area.

At this point, Councillor Tim Valentine moved the following amendment: That if approved, the application be delegated to officers to negotiate with the Applicant and Cabinet Member for Environment for the provision of two 100KW rapid charge points on site in the hotel car park. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt, and on being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

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

For: Councillors Cameron Beart, Mike Dendor, James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes, Peter Marchington and Tony Winckless. Total equals 7.

Against: Councillors Monique Bonney, Simon Clark, Tim Gibson, Ben J Martin, David Simmons, Paul Stephen, Eddie Thomas and Tim Valentine. Total equals 8.

Abstain: Councillor James Hall. Total equals 1.

The motion to approve the application was lost.

Councillor Ben J Martin moved a motion to defer the application and this was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

There was some discussion on the reasons for deferring the application, and Members suggested the following reasons:

- Issues with design and the presence of the building;
- the hotel felt like a square box, it was not grounded to its setting;
- clarification needed on the timing of the A2/A251 junction upgrade, suggested a condition of no house to be occupied until the upgrade was completed;
- a pitched roof was needed;
- vernacular of buildings on the other side of Ashford Road needed to be considered;
- some architectural style was needed;
- improved design would not change air quality issues or the impact of the development on the town centre;
- needed to be mindful of what we might lose in order to get these suggested alternatives;
- the design officer had said that the design was suitable;
- impact of possible non-determination; and
- the change in design would not take long.

At this point the Development Manager acknowledged the time taken so far in discussing the application, and stated that there could be a case for non-determination. He questioned how much more could be achieved in terms of improved design, but this could be discussed with the developer. The Major Projects Officer added that the developer could take their investment away altogether.

Councillor Ben J Martin withdrew his motion for deferral and proposed that the application be refused instead. This was seconded by Councillor David Simmons.

The Senior Planning Solicitor reminded Members that at the outline application, the principle of development for the hotel and A1 store had been agreed. He explained that Members needed to consider that, other than the principle, what were the

different factors that made the application unacceptable in planning terms, and weigh up the mitigation measures, in order to determine the reasons for refusal.

There was some discussion on the reasons for refusal. Members made the following suggestions:

- Not in-keeping with the area;
- impact on visual amenity of residents;
- anticipated impact on air quality;
- effect on the setting of a listed building;
- harm to the economic vitality of the town centre by introducing an out-of-town supermarket;
- adverse effect on the town centre;
- this was over-development of the area;
- impact of additional traffic from the supermarket, rather than a convenience store;
- the design should be distinctive and positively identify the sense of place, and rooting it into the current location; and
- the retail unit was too large.

The Planning Officers and Senior Planning Solicitor adjourned for eight minutes.

In response to the suggested reasons for refusal, the Senior Planner made the following comments:

Impact on Faversham Town Centre

The Council had taken expert retail advice from two consultants who had both concluded there was no significant impact on the town centre.

Impact on Air Quality

The Environmental Protection Team Leader had no significant concerns.

Impact on highways

KCC Highways and Transportation and Highways England had not objected to the scheme. It was risky to refuse given the lack of objection from these experts.

Effect on setting of listed building

The listed building was in excess of 500-600 metres from the application site. There was the residential site in between this application site and the listed building, and the residential buildings reached a height of 9.5 metres. It would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on these grounds.

Residential Amenity

The site was 55-60 metres from the houses along Ashford Road, and there was a busy road and landscaping in between. Members could not refuse on the grounds

of loss of view. Loss of outlook would be difficult to demonstrate given these distances.

Design Elements

Officers considered the scheme to be acceptable. However, design was subjective, and was a lower risk than those reasons above.

Members made further comments:

- The retail unit was demonstrably larger than before;
- the context of the convenience store versus the very large supermarket;
- this was a sea-change compared to the outline application;
- traffic impact, there was no certainty on the upgrade of the A2/A251 junction;
- the outline application with the convenience store was sustainable, this was an out-of-town supermarket; and
- 98 additional vehicles were not negligible.

In response, the Senior Planner explained that large, did not necessarily mean harm; that there was a lack of objection from KCC Highways and Transportation, and the temporary delay of the junction improvements had not raised concern with KCC.

The Senior Planning Solicitor advised that attempting to argue against statutory consultees at appeal was difficult.

At this point the Development Manager 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.

Def Item 2 REFERENCE NO - 19/501378/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Change of use of residential annex to independent residential use (Retrospective).			
ADDRESS Annex James House Kent View Drive Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4DP			
WARD Borden And Grove Park		PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Ms Patricia Bath AGENT Brachers LLP

The Area Planning Officer reported that additional comments had been received from Eastchurch Parish Council. They considered there had been no change to the previous application and continued to object to it. The Parish Council raised concern over the status of the proposed amenity area adjacent to the property as not being within the property curtilage. The Area Planning Officer explained that

the garden area had been enlarged, and that it was entirely within the garden of the main dwelling. He sought delegated authority to amend condition (4) in the report to require erection of the fence with details to be submitted and approved. Plus also preventing any other fencing on the site.

Patricia Bath, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

There were no questions.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

A Member thanked the Case Officer for regular updates. He considered the outlook had been improved, but raised concern with the whole process of this application.

Resolved: That application 19/501378/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (4) in the report, with the amendment of condition (4) to require erection of the fence with details to be submitted and approved and preventing any other fencing on the site.

227 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/503080/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use from Class C3 (dwelling) to C2 (residential care home for elderly people) and conversion of garage to a habitable space.		
ADDRESS 58 Volante Drive Sittingbourne Kent ME10 2JJ		
WARD Milton Regis	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT A Faseha AGENT EvolutionBlue

The Area Planning Officer reported that a revised parking layout plan had been received, indicating two parking spaces and a lawned area. However the lawned area had now been replaced with shingle. He recommended that condition (2) in the report be amended to require the removal of the shingle and it be replaced with lawn.

Mr Keith Woolward, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Anthony Faseha, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked whether there was a definition for elderly people, and whether 'elderly people' could be added to condition (5) in the report. The Area Planning

Officer advised that there was no planning definition of elderly, but if Members were concerned of any harmful impact of a general care home, then there was a possibility that a condition could be added.

A Member asked if there needed to be a minimum room size? The Area Planning Officer explained that this would come under the remit of the Care Quality Commission, and was not a planning consideration.

A Member asked whether it was legal to add an age condition? The Senior Planning Solicitor advised that it was legal to do this.

A Member asked about the modifications to the property in terms of accessibility and the Area Planning Officer advised that this was under the remit of Building Regulations. He confirmed that there was no lift in the property.

A Member asked about the design and layout and the Area Planning Officer explained that internal works did not require planning permission.

Councillor Tony Winckless moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Peter Marchington. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

Members raised the following points:

- Understood the concept, but the location was wrong;
- concerned about the size of the property for the intended use;
- in another location it would be more sustainable;
- impact on traffic;
- no turning facility on the property;
- visits from multiple agencies would impact on the location;
- the properties were too close for this use; and
- this was inappropriate for the location.

On being put to the vote the substantive motion was lost.

Discussion ensued on the reasons for refusal and the following points were made:

- Residential amenity;
- traffic movements in a cul-de-sac; and
- consideration of residents in the property itself.

Councillor Mike Dendor moved a motion to refuse the application on the following grounds: That the application caused harm to the residential amenity, by virtue of noise and disturbance and lack of parking, giving rise to on-street parking, and harm to the users of the highway. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/503080/FULL be refused on the grounds that it caused harm to the residential amenity, by virtue of noise and disturbance and lack of parking, giving rise to on-street parking, and harm to the users of the highway.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/501640/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of polytunnels and water storage tanks. Demolition of redundant concrete fibre building.		
ADDRESS Land North Of Highstreet Road Hernhill Kent ME13 9EJ		
WARD Boughton And Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hernhill	APPLICANT Moneypeak Ltd AGENT Angela Hirst Chartered Surveyors

The Major Projects Officer reported that part of the site (approximately 4.8 hectares) was in Swale and of this, 4.1 hectares would be covered by polytunnels. Conditions (11) and (15) in the report covered the same ground, with condition (15) containing more detail and so he recommended that condition (11) be deleted. The Principal Archaeological Officer had responded to the application and suggested that instead of asking for an Archaeological Watching Brief, a programme of archaeological works condition should be imposed instead. The Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to replace condition (18) with the above condition.

Mr Peter Judge, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to questions, the Major Projects Officer explained that the site was not within a Conservation Area, and with regard to heating on the site, he explained that a condition could be imposed with details of this, prior to the commencement of construction.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

Councillor Tim Valentine moved the following amendment: That prior to the commencement of construction, details of the heating methods be submitted by the Applicant. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

Further information on the heating was subsequently received and it was confirmed that the existing system would generate power on the site. As such, Councillor Tim Valentine withdrew his amendment.

Resolved: That application 19/501640/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (18) in the report, and to replace condition (18) with a condition so that a programme of archaeological works be imposed and condition (11) be deleted, as this was covered in more detail in condition (15).

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/502228/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Extensions to first floor and roof of residential dwelling including installation of solar panels.		
ADDRESS 110 Southsea Avenue, Private Street, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness, Kent ME12 2LU		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Caleb Watson AGENT Wyndham Jordan Architects

The Area Planning Officer reported that three letters of support had been received from the immediate neighbours. One had considered the extension would enhance the property and look pleasing to the surrounding area. The Applicant had also emailed to say that he had worked with the planning department and altered the plans to suit the surrounding area and adhere to the planning officers' suggestions.

The Area Planning Officer explained that he did not think the Applicant had changed the plans sufficiently enough.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to questions, the Area Planning Officer showed Members the before, and after plans, and the streetscene. He also explained that there would be no change in ridge height, but the eaves height would increase from 2.5 metres to 5 metres.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

Members were invited to debate the application and raised points which included:

- This was an improvement, the existing property was old and run-down;
- welcomed the proposed installation of solar panels;
- this could be an improvement, but not where it was located, the bulk and mass of the roof were too large; and
- this did not cause serious harm.

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

Councillor Elliott Jayes moved the following motion: That the application be approved with the appropriate conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney and on being put to the vote, the motion was won.

Resolved: That application 19/502228/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to the appropriate conditions.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – 17 Musgrave Road, Sittingbourne**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED / COSTS REFUSED

- **Item 5.2 – Land at Swanton Farm, Bicknor**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

- **Item 5.3 – Barn Adjacent Bracondale and Newlands, Dargate**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

228 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Meeting was adjourned from 9.20pm to 9.28pm.

229 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