
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 7 November 2019 from 7.03pm - 11.44pm.

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: Tracey Beattie, Philippa Davies, Colin Finch, James Freeman, Andrew Jeffers, Benedict King, Ross McCardle, Alison Peters, Rebecca Walker and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Simon Fowle and Roger Truelove.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Nicholas Hampshire, Carole Jackson, Benjamin Martin and Eddie Thomas.

349 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

350 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 October 2019 (Minute Nos. 288 - 295) and the Minutes of the Reconvened Meeting held on 14 October 2019 (Minute Nos. 296 - 299) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as correct records.

351 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Monique Bonney declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest in respect of items 2.5 (19/501212/FULL) and 2.6 (19/502176/FULL), Land at Stones Farm, The Street, Bapchild. Councillor Bonney spoke as Ward Member and then left the chamber. Councillor Bonney also declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 2.4 (19/504649/FULL), Spirit of Sittingbourne Regeneration Site, Site 4, Block A – Cinema, St Michael's Road, Sittingbourne, in her role as Cabinet Member for Property and Economy and left the chamber for this item.

Councillor Paul Stephen declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 2.2 (19/503258/FULL), 105 Bell Road, Sittingbourne as he knew the applicant. Councillor Stephen left the chamber for this item.

352 DEFERRED ITEMS

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

Def Item 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, withdrew from speaking.

Mr Davis, 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.

Members thanked the applicant and officers for working together to reach a satisfactory conclusion to the application.

Resolved: That application 19/501570/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.

353 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/504467/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Conversion and extension of existing garage to garden room and single storey side extension to form new garage.		
ADDRESS 7 Turnstone Close Iwade Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8TU		
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade	APPLICANT Mr David Hawkins AGENT Jane Elizabeth Architects

Mrs Amanda Hurrell, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked whether there would be loss of light to the neighbouring property as a result of this development? The Senior Planner explained that the existing garage roof would be converted to a flat roof and the existing garage would be replicated within the driveway space.

A Member asked whether the proposed work would result in a terracing effect? The Senior Planner advised that as a gap would remain at first floor level, there would be no terracing effect, and the house would look similar to the next door property.

A Member asked for clarification on the positioning of the electricity meters and that the edge of the property would be on the boundary line. The Senior Planner confirmed that it was directly on the boundary, and potentially the meter box would be over the boundary line. He added that right of entrance to the meters was a private legal matter, but that it could be possible to delete the electric meters from the plan, and the applicant could be asked to submit an amended drawing showing the removal of the boxes. The Senior Planning Solicitor explained to Members that whether a planning permission could practically be built was not a planning matter, and if an agreement could not be obtained from the neighbour for access, then in practice the permission would not be able to be implemented, but that did not affect Members' consideration of the planning issues.

A Member sought clarification on the exact positioning of the new roof slope and whether it would obscure the neighbour's upstairs side window? The Senior Planner indicated the position of the window, which was roughly central on the wall, and was set adjacent to the back downward slope of the garage.

A Member asked whether there were similarities with the proposed extension, and other dwellings along the street? The Senior Planner explained that both neighbouring properties had garages which projected forward and wrapped around the front elevation of those houses, and this development would be less prominent as it was not wrapping around at the front as well.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application.

There was no debate.

Resolved: That application 19/504467/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/503258/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling following the demolition of existing shed and greenhouse		
ADDRESS 105 Bell Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 4HG		
WARD Woodstock	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Wood AGENT Kent Design Studio Ltd

The Senior Planner explained that there was an error on page 19, paragraph 2.1, and it should read **3** bedroom detached dwelling. He said that the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Scheme (SAMMS) payment would be added to the recommendation, if the application was approved. He showed Members photographs which indicated aspects of the application.

Mr Peter Court, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Derek Conway, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member sought clarification on any parking restrictions in Northwood Drive. The Senior Planner advised that there were no parking restrictions.

A Member asked if the garden for the new dwelling met the Council's standards? The Senior Planner referred the Member to paragraph 2.4 in the report which stated that the new garden would be 16.8 metres x 6.4 metres, and although this was side-on, it met the Council's standards.

A Member requested that there be a condition to prevent vehicles from reversing out from the new dwelling onto Northwood Road. The Senior Planner explained that this could not be enforceable, and referred to paragraph 6.1 under the first bullet point that cars already reversed onto the highway from the commercial premises opposite, and as such this would not be an alien manoeuvre within the context of this area.

A Member suggested a turntable be added to the property to enable vehicles to turn whilst stationary. The Senior Planner advised that this was not a reasonable and relevant request and one not requested by Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation.

A Member asked about potential issues of access to the site and manoeuvrability, bearing in mind the parked cars nearby, lorries delivering to the commercial site opposite, and perceived safety issues. The Senior Planner explained that KCC Highways and Transportation had no objection to the application. He explained that the application did not meet the criteria for a response from KCC Highways and Transportation, and no formal response had therefore been received. The Principal

Transport & Development Planner added that manoeuvrability of this type was not unusual to this area.

A Member referred to paragraph 6.1 in the report and that the application did not meet the requirement of involvement from KCC Highways and Transportation and queried that the officer had stated that KCC had had no objection. The Senior Planner explained that officers had anticipated questions, and the KCC officer had informally commented, as set-out within the report.

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

At this point Councillor Mike Dendor declared that he had prepared a speech as a Visiting Member, not a Member of the Committee, and following legal advice stated that he was pre-disposed, but not pre-determined on the application and said that he would not vote. He raised points which included:

- Understood the need for additional housing, but this was inappropriate;
- highway safety concerns;
- issues with access;
- this was sited opposite the loading bay for the commercial premises;
- there would be a loss of parking for The Parade;
- the bus stop was immediately adjacent to the access point;
- lack of sight lines;
- loss of mature trees;
- overlooking;
- issue with positioning of the refuse bins;
- the side garden was not large enough;
- lack of ventilation in the kitchen, the venting would go straight to no. 107 Bell Road;
- the development was overbearing, particularly to no. 107 Bell Road;
- the development was interrupting the building line; and
- the application caused adverse harm.

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

- Concerned with the traffic, especially around the bend; and
- the road needed to be made safer.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be deferred so that the planning working group could meet on site. This was seconded by Councillor Roger Clark. There was some discussion on the benefits, or not, of having a site meeting. On being put to the vote, the motion for the site visit was lost.

The Senior Planner advised that contrary to the submitted drawings, there would be no first floor side windows on the proposed dwelling, and so there would be no overlooking from the property. He explained that vehicle parking on either side of the access point was unlikely to happen, as there was another adjacent access with a dropped kerb preventing parking.

Members made further comments which included:

- Traffic at this location was chaotic at many times of the day;
- there were HGV deliveries opposite the site;
- this should be refused on highway safety grounds; and
- not happy with the entrance to the property, it would not blend in.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following amendment: That a Section 106 Agreement be issued with the addition of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), with appropriate contributions from the developer, so that the bus stop be improved and traffic restrictions be implemented, to help mitigate highway safety concerns. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

Members made the following comments on the proposed amendment:

- Improvements to the bus stop markings, and addition of parking restrictions would improve visibility;
- the consequences from the amendment could displace parking elsewhere;
- effects of lights on the new dwelling from HGV deliveries opposite;
- there was no back garden, it was very imposing on no. 107 Bell Road;
- there was no amenity value to the residents of the new dwelling;
- this was being squeezed into the space;
- the dwelling needed to be smaller;
- visibility onto Northwood Drive was not good, with a constant flow of traffic; and
- concerned with how residents would get in and out.

On being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

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

There was some discussion on the reasons for refusal.

Councillor Simon Clark moved the following motion: That the application be refused, and delegated to officers to finalise the precise wording, on the grounds of overdevelopment; overbearing to no. 2 Northwood Drive; conflict with the movement of commercial vehicles opposite; and worsening of the existing parking issues. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/503258/FULL be refused, and delegated to officers to finalise the precise wording, on the grounds of overdevelopment; overbearing to no. 2 Northwood Drive; conflict with the movement of commercial vehicles opposite; and worsening of the existing parking issues.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/503553/FULL
--

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing detached dwelling. Erection of two buildings comprising of 10no. flats (4no. one bedroom flats in a two storey building & 5no. one bedroom and 1no. two
--

bedroom flat in a three storey building) including parking, external areas and extension of existing vehicular access.		
ADDRESS 125 London Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1NR		
WARD Homewood	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Ms Jasmine Friend AGENT Alpha Design Studio Limited

This item was deferred to the next Planning Committee meeting on 5 December 2019.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 19/504649/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Minor material amendment to condition 2 of application 14/505440/FULL (proposed mixed use development - on six parcels of land - of 212 residential apartments (use class C3), 3158 sq m of retail space (use class A1), A 308 space multi storey car park, 1713 sq.m cinema (use class D2), 2320 sq.m ground floor restaurant units (use class A3), first floor D2 use and the re-alignment of St Michael's road with amendments to the road network and the creation of a new public square in Sittingbourne Town Centre, in front of the railway station). The changes sought relate to site 4, incorporating amendments to the design of Block A (including façade amendments to the Station Road elevation, a reduced height to Block A overall, reconfiguration of Block A ground floor to create 6 restaurant units (with increase in restaurant space within Block A from 1787sqm to 1865 sqm), and provision of additional outdoor seating areas to Block A.		
ADDRESS Spirit Of Sittingbourne Regeneration Site Site 4 - Block A - Cinema St Michaels Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 3DU		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT U + I AGENT The Harris Partnership

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

Rob Sloper, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member requested more information as to who had been monitoring the build to check that it had been constructed correctly. The Major Projects Officer explained that the Regeneration Team had been working closely with the other partners, and would have been aware of the discrepancies. He explained that the development was not completed, and that the changes were not substantial, but minor material amendments. He referred the Member to pages 51 and 52 in the report which set out the main changes, and he considered the changes to be acceptable. After further discussion the Member was advised that the points that he was raising should not be considered at this time.

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

There was no debate.

Resolved: That application 19/504649/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (45) in the report and with the inclusion of the following informative: This decision must be read in conjunction with the deed of agreement made pursuant to s.111 of the Local Government Act 1972 and s.1 of the Localism Act 2011 entered into by and between Swale Borough Council, Kent County Council, Network Rail infrastructure Ltd and Spirit of Sittingbourne LLP dated 19 May 2017, a copy of which is appended to this Decision Notice.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 19/501212/FULL

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Minor material amendment to 14/501588/OUT (Hybrid application (part outline, part approval of detail) consisting of: Outline application for the development of 550-600 houses and all necessary supporting infrastructure including roads, open space, play areas, neighbourhood shopping/community facilities (up to 650 sq m gross) and landscaping. All detailed matters are reserved for subsequent approval except (i) vehicular access to A2 Fox Hill; (ii) emergency access to Peel Drive; (iii) landscape buffer between housing and countryside gap and (iv) layout, planting, biodiversity enhancement and management of countryside gap.) to allow alterations to the configuration of 3no. off-road parking areas in front of 19 to 49 Fox Hill.

ADDRESS Land At Stones Farm The Street Bapchild Kent ME9 9AD

WARD West Downs

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL
Bapchild

APPLICANT Mrs Katherine Putnam
AGENT

The Major Projects Officer said that the wording of condition (5) on page 92 of the report needed to be corrected in respect of the final plan, which should be Revision P11, not P01. He sought delegated authority to do this. Swale Footpaths Group had nothing to add to their original comments. The Major Projects Officer explained that a Deed of Variation was required to tie-in the new consents into the requirements of the original Section 106 Agreement. He explained that the terms of the original Agreement would not be changed in any other way. He also advised that Section 73 applications did not allow the planning merits of the approved scheme to be re-visited, including the merits of the development as a whole, the nature and amounts of money to be secured for developer contributions such as healthcare, highway implications (other than directly related to the car parking scheme for Fox Hill) foul drainage, or air quality concerns. Instead, the evaluation of the application needed to focus on the matters that each application proposed to amend.

Parish Councillor Richard Bush, representing Bapchild Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Julian Moat, on behalf of the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked for further clarification on the status of the Section 106 Agreement. The Major Projects Officer explained that with the minor material amendment, the Deed of Variation would tie-up any new approval into the original Section 106 Agreement. The Section 106 Agreement was not being changed, just the new approval being tied to the existing Section 106 Agreement. The Senior Planning Solicitor explained that when the original permission was issued it was tied to a Section 106 Agreement, and the Section 73 allowed the new planning application to be tied to the existing Section 106 Agreement. He referred the Member to paragraphs 7.9 and 7.10 in the report which set-out legal advice on this matter.

A Member asked for more detail of the application. The Major Projects Officer explained that the hatched areas on the plan were areas that needed to be kept clear for vehicles to manoeuvre, and there had been 20 car parking spaces originally, now there were 24 spaces. The Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that there had been issues with visibility with the parking bays to the west, but now the bays were positioned altogether.

A Member asked if Bapchild Parish Council had been consulted on the changes and the Major Projects Officer confirmed that they had.

A Member asked if there were resident parking restrictions in the parking bays? The Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that the bays were not in a controlled parking zone and so there were no restrictions.

A Member asked if a cycle track was provided and the Major Projects Officer confirmed there was.

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

The Ward Member spoke against the application and raised the following points: concerned with the changes that were being made; there was a deficit of Clinical Commissioning Group payments; this was an unsustainable agreement; there needed to be resident parking permits for the bays; this application did not work for the residents; and the cycle way was incomplete.

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

- The changes being made were beneficial;
- the cycle routes were in the wrong position, they went across the entrance to the bays;
- the cycle lane was being 'squeezed out' near the layby, the cycle lane needed to follow the footpath, to the south of the parking bays;
- cyclists should not be an afterthought;
- this application should be deferred so that the issues could be cleared-up; and

- the bus stop should be made into a layby.

Councillor Angela Harrison moved the following motion: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to consideration of possible amendments to the cycle lane and to the addition of the parking bays being restricted to residents only, in consultation with the Ward Member and Cabinet Member for Environment. This was seconded by Councillor Elliott Jayes and upon being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/501212/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to consideration of possible amendments to the cycle lane and to the addition of the parking bays being restricted to residents only, in consultation with the Ward Member and Cabinet Member for Environment, conditions (1) to (32) in the report, amendments to the drawing numbers as noted above and to the signing of a Deed of Variation.

2.6 REFERENCE NO - 19/502176/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Minor Material Amendment to 14/501588/OUT (Hybrid application (part outline, part approval of detail) consisting of: Outline application for the development of 550-600 houses and all necessary supporting infrastructure including roads, open space, play areas, neighbourhood shopping/community facilities (up to 650 sq m gross) and landscaping. All detailed matters are reserved for subsequent approval except (i) vehicular access to A2 Fox Hill; (ii) emergency access to Peel Drive; (iii) landscape buffer between housing and countryside gap and (iv) layout, planting, biodiversity enhancement and management of countryside gap, as amended by drawings 5257/OPA/SK001 Rev J (new red line plan), D119/52 (Swanstree Avenue Plan) and D119/53 (junction layout plan) - to accommodate changes to the detention basin, the ecological bunds and to show the location of the end poles for the powerlines.		
ADDRESS Land At Stones Farm The Street Bapchild Kent ME9 9AD		
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bapchild	APPLICANT Mrs Katherine Putnam AGENT

The Major Projects Officer said that the wording of condition (5) on page 109 of the report needed to be corrected in respect of the final plan, which should be Revision P11, not P01.

Parish Councillor Richard Bush, representing Bapchild Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Julian Moat, on behalf of the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked whether there would be a condition to ensure as a statutory duty, Southern Water connected to the new housing? The Major Projects Officer referred the Member to paragraph 6.4 on page 104 of the report where Southern Water had stated no comments and the Major Projects Officer explained that there was no scope within this application to look at other issues, over and above those minor material amendments for which approval was sought, such as an additional condition.

A Member asked for further details on where the end poles for the powerlines would be positioned and the difference in size and depth of the attenuation pond. The Major Projects Officer explained that the three proposed poles would be positioned on the edge of the site to allow connections to existing networks, and then the cables would be positioned underground to serve the rest of the development. In terms of the pond, he reported that the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority had not objected to the application. The pond was in the same location and was the same size as approved under the original application.

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

The Ward Member spoke against the application and raised the following points: concerned with potential flooding issues on the site; issue as to whether the attenuation pond had the capacity to cope with heavy rainfall; the cables were going to be positioned underground, but now they, and poles, were proposed above ground, near gardens; and it was important to understand the consequences of the attenuation pond and whether the threat of flooding would increase.

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

- Needed to recognise that potentially no attenuation pond was capable of dealing with floods;
- not convinced that the attenuation pond would mitigate flood issues; and
- concerned that the poles, and some cables, were overground.

Resolved: That application 19/502176/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (32) in the report, amendments to the drawing numbers as noted above and to the signing of a Deed of Variation.

At this point Councillor Angela Harrison moved the following motion: That as it was nearly 10pm, the meeting be adjourned to continue its business. This was seconded by Councillor Elliott Jayes. There was some discussion on the motion and in accordance with Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Simon Clark, Tim Gibson, Angela Harrison, Elliott Jayes, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless. Total equals 6.

Against: Councillors Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, Roger Clark, Mike Dendor, James Hunt, Peter Marchington, David Simmons, Paul Stephen and Ben J Martin. Total equals 9.

Abstain: Councillor James Hall. Total equals 1.

The motion to adjourn the meeting was lost.

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 19/501921/FULL

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Full planning application for the erection of 153 No. dwellings, including open space together with associated access, parking, infrastructure, landscaping and earthworks.

ADDRESS Land At Belgrave Road Halfway Kent ME12 3EE

WARD Queenborough
And Halfway

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

APPLICANT Keepmoat
Homes Ltd

AGENT Miss Rosie Cavalier

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to the tabled paper for this item. He reported that Queenborough Town Council had re-stated their objection to the application which was first noted on page 122 of the report. They had new concerns with HGVs using unsuitable routes to get to the site during construction, and to visibility splays where Belgrave Road met Queenborough Road. The Major Projects Officer sought delegated authority to tighten-up the wording in condition (28) in the report which dealt with affordable housing to ensure that it met the Council's requirements. He concluded by stating that delegated authority was sought to approve the application subject to the tabled condition, and the signing of a suitably worded Section 106 Agreement.

Thijs Bax, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked for clarification on how Belgrave Road would be widened, and the status of the affordable housing. The Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that the grass verge on the western side of the road would be taken-up with the widening, and there would also be a two metre footpath. The Affordable Housing Manager explained that the affordable housing was shared ownership tenure, and was seen as being a positive aspect in the light of the Local Plan setting-out that on the Isle of Sheppey, the affordable housing percentage sought was 0%.

A Member sought clarification on the widening of Belgrave Road and the timescales required for the work to have been completed. The Major Projects Officer drew the Members' attention to the tabled update which explained the reasoning for the 100th dwelling trigger, and suggested this could be earlier if Members requested. In response to concerns that the junction was already over capacity, and the decision was being made premature to the appeal decision on the Barton Hill Drive application, the Mayor Projects Officer explained that Highways England (HE) had advised that as planning permission had been refused, the available capacity at the junction could be divided up between other housing sites that would result in additional vehicle movements through the junction. This would also allow some

housing development to be delivered before the contract to improve Junction 5 of the M2 had been let.

A Member asked for confirmation that the site was within the Local Plan and that the application site was the same as covered in the Local Plan.

The Major Projects Officer explained that Policy A13 in the Local Plan required a minimum of 140 dwellings on the site, this application was for 9% more dwellings than that. He considered it to be a good mix of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom housing.

A Member asked whether there were any tandem car parking spaces? The Major Projects Officer confirmed that there was a mix of tandem and independently accessible spaces, and pointed some of these out on the car parking drawing. KCC Highways and Transportation had stated that it was an acceptable mix and the quantum of spaces was sufficient for the amount of dwellings on the site.

A Member referred to condition (17) in the report and sought clarification on the ecology and bio-diversity measures. The Major Projects Officer drew the Member's attention to pages 130-131 in the report which set-out reports from the relevant experts who had not objected to the application, subject to conditions. He added that Policy DM28 which required a net gain in bio-diversity was covered by conditions (16), (17), (18) and (19), plus a hard and soft landscaping condition, which could provide invaluable habitats. The Major Projects Officer stated that with the open space and open pond, there was every prospect of securing a net gain in bio-diversity. The Member asked about the affordable housing tenure, and the Affordable Housing Manager explained that there was a range of products known as known as 'intermediate' housing including shared equity, shared ownership, and some rental. Therefore, the wording of the planning condition would be tightened-up so that these homes were delivered as shared ownership tenure.

A Member asked what had changed in the site's history in terms of its status within the Local Plan. The Head of Planning explained that there had been changes due to the Local Plan process.

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

A Ward Member spoke on the application and raised the following points: not happy with some of the changes on the tabled paper; it looked better than what was submitted at the Design Panel; this was a nice development, but in the wrong location; the road was a single track; and improvements needed to be done to the road.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved a motion for a site meeting and this was seconded by Councillor Elliott Jayes. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/501921/FULL be deferred to allow the planning working group to meet on site.

2.8 REFERENCE NO - 18/500257/EIFUL**APPLICATION PROPOSAL**

Proposed development of 155 dwellings (8 x 2-bed houses, 77 x 3-bed houses, and 70 x 4-bed houses) together with associated new access road, car parking, linear park with acoustic barrier to the A249, dedicated LEAP, allotments, areas of surface water drainage attenuation and ecological enhancement, and new planting, including an area planted in the style of an orchard.

ADDRESS Land Adj To Quinton Farm House, Quinton Road, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 2DD.

WARD The Meads

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL
Bobbing Parish Council
(northeastern corner only).

APPLICANT Redrow Homes
AGENT Judith Ashton
Associates

The Senior Planner reported that Bobbing Parish Council maintained their original objection and raised further concerns regarding delivery of schools and GP facilities. The Senior Planner advised that the two schools were being provided on the adjacent site, and this scheme provided £133,920 towards enhancement of local NHS facilities.

The Senior Planner advised that he would be adding the Section 106 Agreements to the recommendation, and this amounted to £2,290,073.10.

The Senior Planner advised HE confirmed they had no objection to the application.

The Senior Planner informed the Committee that the Council had very recently been successful on its Housing Infrastructure Fund bid, securing funding for necessary upgrade works to Grovehurst and Keycol roundabouts. He explained that this was excellent timing as the improvement works tied-in with HE's requirements for development in Sittingbourne as a whole, and would ensure that the strategic highways network would not be seriously affected as a result of development on this site and the wider allocation parcel.

Additional information had been received in respect of air quality. The Council's Environmental Health Manager had reviewed this and suggested the current on-site mitigation measures needed to be supplemented. The Senior Planner awaited a response from the applicant. He added that the Council's Environmental team did not object in principle on air quality grounds, it was only the level of mitigation which needed to be finalised.

The applicant had submitted an amended enclosures plan which showed the fencing for plots 1 – 10 moved away from the boundary with Coleshall Cottage. The developer had also come to an agreement with the owner of that property to sell him the intervening sliver of land so that he had control over the existing trees. The owner of Coleshall Cottage had emailed to confirm that this removed his objections to the scheme, as he would now have control over the privacy and screening of his property.

Judith Ashton, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member was surprised that a masterplan was not required for this site, and questioned how it linked-up the adjoining development? The Senior Planner explained that this development acted like a 'cornerstone' to the larger allocated site, and would link-up to the adjacent site with roads and footpaths, and inform the development of the wider allocation parcel. The Member had concerns with the access onto Quinton Road and the Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that road safety audits would be carried out, and that there would be a new mini roundabout at the junction with Sonora Way.

A Member asked whether there was a pavement on the north side of Quinton Road. The Principal Transport & Development Planner confirmed there was a pavement, and there would be a gateway feature to help reduce speeds over the bridge.

A Member sought clarification on mitigation measures in the St Pauls Air Quality Management Area. The Senior Planner explained that he had gone back to the applicant for additional mitigation measures, and explained that although the Environmental Protection Team Leader did not object to the application, the measures needed to be bolstered-up. The Mid-Kent Environmental Health Manager advised that the measures included cycle facilities, electric vehicle charging, and landscaping, but advised that ecological inspections should be removed from the calculations, and that clarification was sought on the landscaping, which needed to be specific to air quality issues.

A Member asked about the status of the green areas and whether they would remain as green areas in perpetuity? The Senior Planner explained that condition (29) in the report secured this.

A Member asked about the parking provision and layout. The Senior Planner explained that there was a mixture of tandem and independently accessed parking, with two spaces per dwelling. There were no visitor spaces, and no parking courts.

A Member asked about the tenure of the affordable housing on the site. The Affordable Housing Manager explained that there would be 10% affordable housing on the site. The affordable housing tenure split would be according to planning policy, with 90% affordable rent tenure and 10% as shared ownership.

A Member asked whether the layout could be changed to maximise south facing aspects and increase solar panels, and also to look at more sustainable ways of heating, rather than gas boilers? The Senior Planner explained that it could be possible to change the layout, but it would be very difficult to change the layout to secure more south facing dwellings in a manner that remained viable for the developer. Gas boilers were under the remit of building control. The Member asked for details of the nearest public transport facilities. The Principal Transport & Development Planner explained that there were two bus stops on Quinton Road, and two bus shelters would be provided by the developer. Kemsley station was the nearest railway station and £250 travel voucher would be given to the residents on the development, and this was included in the travel plan.

A Member asked where the refuse bins would be stored, and the Senior Planner explained that there was side access at each dwelling to enable them to go in the garden/garage.

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

The Ward Member spoke on the application, and raised the following points: there had been a lot of changes to the application; overall it was a good development; the linear park was well thought out; the design of housing was good; tandem spaces were wider than usual; heritage concerns, but now there was a buffer zone; traffic implications; unclear road layout near the entrance; mitigation was needed on the local road layout, especially Sonora Way where the junction needed to be widened; secure and safe cycle lanes were needed; needed to consider the whole allocated site, and it need to be 'joined-up'; impact on Junction 5 of the M2; and no decision had been made on the Barton Hill Drive appeal, and this would have implications on traffic movements.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be deferred until the Barton Hill Drive appeal had been decided and contracts had been signed to secure works to M2 junction 5. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following amendments:

- No construction access for the development hereby permitted should be taken via Sonora Way at any time, nor Sheppey Way during the periods 08:00 to 09:00 and 14:30 to 16:00 during school term time. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.
- To condition (3) add; viii – measures to satisfy the implementation of condition 'x' (above) to include appropriate signage and communications.
- Condition (37) amendment to read; No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until two zebra crossings have been provided on Sonora Way in accordance with a design and specification to first be approved by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interest of highway safety (specifically in relation to policies MU1 (7f) and para 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework).
- Changes as needed to condition (8), to ensure that any trees within plots 1-8 are replaced at any time and not just within five years. In the interests of residential amenity and impact on heritage assets.

These were seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

In response, the Senior Planner advised that the access issue could not be done as a planning condition, but it could be added into condition (3) with details of where delivery vehicles could go. He explained that the developer was not keen to have two zebra crossings, as KCC Highways and Transportation had not raised this as an issue. The Senior Planner said that the condition (8) amendment might be

difficult as the land would be signed-over to Quinton Cottage, who were likely to maintain the trees anyway. The Senior Planning Solicitor suggested a Tree Preservation Order could be put on the trees.

Resolved: That application 18/500257/EIFUL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (38) in the report, to update condition (2) to reflect the amended drawings and add in a number of drawings that were left off the list, to agreement of the air quality mitigation contribution, re-routing of traffic condition, two zebra crossings, and consideration of TPOs for the trees next to Quinton Cottage.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – Land and Buildings at Woodgate Lane, Danaway, Sittingbourne**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

- **Item 5.2 – Oak Barn Farm, Yaugher Lane, Hartlip**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

354 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Meeting was adjourned from 7.57pm to 8.03pm.

355 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm, 10.30pm, 11pm and 11.30pm 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