
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 9 January 2020 from 7.00pm - 11.05pm.

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

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

APOLOGIES: Councillors Simon Clark and Peter Marchington.

425 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

426 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 December 2019 (Minute Nos. 384 – 390) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman, subject to an amendment to the resolution of application 3.1, 18/506225/OUT, Land to the south of School Lane, Lower Halstow, ME9 7ES. The resolution to be amended so that the application be delegated to officers in discussion with the Chairman and Ward Members.

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 17 December 2019 (Minute Nos. 391 – 397) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

427 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Elliott Jayes declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 2.4, Sheerness Holiday Park, Halfway Road, Minster-on-Sea, ME12 3AA, as he had previously sat on Minster Parish Council.

428 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 6 January 2020 (Minute Nos. 407 – 408 and 409 - 410) were taken as read, approved and signed by Chairman as a correct record.

19/500866/OUT, Land at Swale Way, Great Easthall, Sittingbourne, ME10 3TF

The Area Planning Officer said that he had reviewed the conditions in the original committee report, and advised that a further condition was required relating to the submission of a noise assessment and detailed mitigation measures at the point of the reserved matters application.

In response to a question raised at the Planning Working Group visit on 6 January 2020, regarding whether the haul road would be removed, the Area Planning Officer explained that the haul road came under permitted development whilst construction was ongoing. He explained that part of it crossed a play area, required by the original permission. The Green Spaces Officer had advised that the trigger point for provision had passed some time ago, and he had advised that the Council had taken the pragmatic approach that the wider estate had the benefit of two play areas and a recreation ground. With the removal of the haul road resulting in construction traffic being routed through residential areas, provision of the play area and removal of the haul road were not being insisted upon. The Green Spaces Officer envisaged the play area being provided towards the completion of the entire development, and he was mindful that discussions were ongoing regarding alternative uses of this site.

The Area Planning Officer also reported that since the site meeting, the Applicant had appealed against non-determination of the application. He explained that they had requested a public inquiry, and that the Council had 24 hours to advise which appeal procedure would be appropriate and why. The Area Planning Officer advised that determination of this application now fell to the Planning Inspectorate, and the Planning Committee were required to advise how it would have determined the application had the appeal not been submitted.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked that if the application was approved this evening, would the Applicant withdraw the appeal? The Area Planning Officer explained the appeal process and advised that the Planning Inspectorate had seven days to validate the application, so if it was approved, the appeal could be withdrawn. He said that if Members were minded to approve the application, the Planning Inspectorate would be advised, along with submission of the minutes and list of conditions, and then it would be down to the Planning Inspectorate to make the final decision.

A Member asked about the noise and pollution on the application site due to its position in the vicinity of a large industrial site and the nearby community hall. The Area Planning Officer explained that a noise assessment had been submitted, and as noted in the Committee report, the Environmental Health Manager was happy with the assessment and confident that the noise levels fell within an acceptable level. The layout of the development at the reserved matters stage would require a further acoustic report to be submitted.

A Member asked about the status of the barrier to the community hall, potential parking issues and further clarification on the dip of the site and whether there were any flood mitigation measures? The Area Planning Officer explained that surface water mitigation would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. He said that the

barrier would have to be removed to allow access to the site. It could be re-located, but that could effect the amount of car parking spaces at the community hall.

A Member asked how the site could be improved as it was the entrance to the whole development? The Area Planning Officer said that the reserved matters stage of the application would enable high quality design and good layout to be achieved.

A Member asked about the dip of the land and how this would accommodate the new dwellings? The Area Planning Officer explained that this would also be dealt with under reserved matters.

In response to questions about the original intended use of the land, the Area Planning Officer explained that it had been allocated for a health centre. The developer had offered the land to the NHS twice, but the NHS had not taken up the offer. The developer's obligations had been met, and the land was not reserved for any particular development, nor allocated for any development in the Local Plan. He said it was undeveloped land within the built-up area of Sittingbourne.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He raised concern with the lack of facilities on the development, and considered a health centre was required on the site, instead of housing. He said that acoustic measures to mitigate noise from the community hall funnelled the noise onto the application site, and he considered this to have grave consequences on the longevity of the community hall. The Ward Member said the application was detrimental to the amenity of the area.

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

- The application site dipped down and concerns with potential flooding issues;
- this was not an appropriate use for the entrance to a major development;
- sympathetic to the lack of facilities on the Great Easthall Estate, but there were no material planning considerations to refuse the application;
- the site was scrubland at the moment, this needed to change;
- if there was not going to be a health centre, there should be another community facility instead, rather than housing; and
- was the Environmental Health Manager aware of the noise being funnelled from the Community Hall onto the application site?

At this point, Councillor Tim Valentine moved the following motion:

That, should the application be approved, the following energy efficiency condition be added:

"The dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed and tested to achieve the following measures:

At least a 50% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate compared to the target fabric energy efficiency rates as required under Part L1A of the Building Regulations 2013 (as amended);

A reduction in carbon emissions of at least 50% compared to the target emission rate as required under Part L of the Building Regulations.

Prior to the construction of any dwelling, details of the measures to be undertaken to secure compliance with this condition shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details."

This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Members continued to debate the substantive motion and raised the following points:

- Disappointed the site was not being used for a community use;
- inclined to support shops on ground floor, with flats above, rather than large scale housing; and
- any noise limiter on the community hall could be detrimental to hiring the hall out.

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

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

- Loss of amenity to the larger site;
- the 'tilted balance' was not tilted far enough regarding the housing because of the loss of amenities for the wider estate;
- disturbance from the community hall which was not considered by the Environmental Health Manager;
- flooding issues;
- detrimental to amenity;
- over-development;
- last bit of open space on Great Easthall Estate;
- shared access to the community hall resulted in parking issues and loss of amenity for residents, and conflict with the community hall;
- site should demonstrate greater amenity use, through mixed use;
- impact on community hall and entrance;
- noise issues from the community hall;
- reference to paragraph 92 of the NPPF; and
- if residents could not park at the community hall, they would park outside the new houses instead.

In response to the suggested reasons for refusal, the Area Planning Officer made the following comments: the site was not reserved or allocated for any particular type of development; it was undeveloped land in the built-up area, so any reason

for refusal based on the desirability of an alternative use of the land would not be defensible on appeal; the land was not in a flood risk area, and the application proposed drainage mitigations in any case; and Members would need to demonstrate any harm to amenity, and any over-development.

Councillor Benjamin Martin moved a motion to refuse the application on the following grounds: That it had not been demonstrated that noise and general disturbance from the adjacent community hall would not give rise to harm to the amenities of residents in the proposed development; the loss of a community facility; overdevelopment giving rise to a cramped appearance with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area; parking/overspill issues and harm to highway convenience and amenity due to the combined access of the community hall and the application site. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

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

For: Councillors Monique Bonney, Roger Clark, James Hall, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes, Benjamin Martin, Paul Stephen, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless. Total equals 9.

Against: Councillors Cameron Beart, Mike Dendor and James Hunt. Total equals 3.

Abstain: Councillors Ken Rowles, Tim Gibson, David Simmons and Eddie Thomas. Total equals 4.

The motion to refuse the application was won.

Resolved: That application 19/500866/OUT be refused on the grounds that it had not been demonstrated that noise and general disturbance from the adjacent community hall would not give rise to harm to the amenities of residents in the proposed development; the loss of a community facility; overdevelopment giving rise to a cramped appearance with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area; parking/overspill issues, and harm to highway convenience and amenity due to the combined access of the community hall and the application site.

19/504412/FULL, Oyster Bay House, Chambers Wharf, Faversham, ME13 7BT

The Area Planning Officer referred to the tabled paper for this item, which he summarised for Members: the Applicant had stated that the height of the proposed building could not be decreased as it needed to see over nearby trees and lighting; the diameter of the dome could be reduced from 4 metres to 3 metres; the building would be completely separate from the existing garage; the windows facing nearby houses could be deleted; and the proposed building would be considerably reduced in bulk. The Area Planning Officer referred to the Conservation Officer's comments on the application. She acknowledged the changes to the application, but still considered the building, and the solar panels, to be intrusive.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked for confirmation of what the overall height of the proposed building was, in comparison to the Oyster Bay House, and whether it was intrusive? The Area Planning Officer explained that the height of the proposed building was 11.6 metres, and the Oyster Bay House was 16 metres high. He said that the Oyster Bay House was an inherent part of Faversham's nautical history, whereas this scheme was the Applicant's personal project. The Member asked about the solar panels which he thought the Council promoted, and what would happen to the building if the Oyster Bay House was sold on. The Area Planning Officer agreed that the Council supported the use of solar panels, but explained that there were other ways they could be installed, such as on the ground, or as tiles on the roof. He said it would be unusual to tie the scheme to the Applicant, and the building be demolished, as it was a permanent structure.

The Conservation and Design Manager explained that the solar panels on this application were retrofit, onto an existing slate roof. He reminded Members that the application site was adjacent to a Listed Building, and within a Conservation Area. He said there was a better way of installing the solar panels, such as replacing the existing slate tiles with solar panels, or panels which sat more flush to the roof. He added that the site was very visible from the public footpath.

A Member asked whether the idea that the dome be painted green to blend in with the surroundings, could be a condition on the application? The Area Planning Officer confirmed that this was possible.

A Member asked if detail of the solar panels could be added to the conditions? The Area Planning Officer explained that a condition could be added to state they be flush to the roof.

Councillor Mike Dendor moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to enable officers to pursue a final design of the proposed building. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless.

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

- Considered the original design to be better than the amended one;
- the original design was 'quirky' and more suited for a maritime setting, and was a similar structure to a building on the opposite site of the creek;
- the solar panels should be added as roof tiles;
- the height was not too much of an issue in comparison to the Oyster Bay House;
- the staircase was too bulky, the new design had a lighter connection with the garage;
- the materials should be natural and soft and sensitive to the surroundings;
- welcomed the new design, having the staircase underneath was a better option;
- preferred the option of solar tiles on the roof;
- should consider copper or zinc for the dome;

- needed to consider whether the structure would be there in perpetuity; and
- defer the application and Members speak to officers on their preferred design options.

There was some discussion on whether to delegate to officers or defer the application.

Resolved: That application 19/504412/FULL be deferred to enable officers to pursue a final design of the proposed building.

429 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 17/500921/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Removal of condition 1 of previously approved application: SW/13/0011 (Change of use of land for the siting of one static mobile home for a gypsy family with associated utility block and parking for vehicles and two touring caravans).		
ADDRESS Dinky Cot, Sunset Close, Eastchurch, Kent, ME12 4JW.		
RECOMMENDATION Grant		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mrs D. Gray AGENT Heine Planning Consultancy

The Area Planning Officer reported that two additional letters and an email had been received from two neighbouring residents. They had raised the following concerns: potential anti-social behaviour from future occupants; the site was not sustainable, with limited opening times at local shops and a difficult walk to Eastchurch; and a further temporary permission should be issued to deal with any future anti-social behaviour (ASB) from future residents. The Area Planning Officer reminded Members that planning permission went with the land, not the occupant, and that ASB from residents was not a material planning consideration.

Mrs J Hursey, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked whether the Applicant was in breach of the original planning application. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that she was, and also that she did not meet the Government definition of a gypsy and traveller.

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 and raised points which included:

- No reason to support this, except to meet the 5 year supply of deliverable sites, but this was only one pitch in any case; and
- considered this would not be detrimental to the site.

On being put to the vote, the motion to approve the application was lost, with the Chairman using his casting vote.

There was some discussion on the reasons for refusing the application which included that the overall need for accommodation for gypsy and travellers was outweighed by the unsustainability of the site.

The Area Planning Officer responded and stated that there was already a 5-year supply. It was better to refer to the fact that it was in an unsustainable location, and whether it was an acceptable site for a gypsy and traveller site.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved a motion to refuse the application on the following grounds: That the site was unsustainable as it was remote, and away from local amenities. This was seconded by Councillor Benjamin Martin and on being put to the vote the motion was won, with the Chairman using his casting vote.

Resolved: That application 17/500921/FULL be refused on the grounds that the site was unsustainable as it was remote, and away from local amenities.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/502204/FULL

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for one gypsy family with 2no. caravans, including laying of hardstanding and erection of an ancillary amenity building.

ADDRESS Land West Of Greyhound Road, Minster-on-sea, Kent, ME12 3SP.

WARD Sheppey Central

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL
Minster-On-Sea

APPLICANT Mr Levi Cooper
AGENT Philip Brown
Associates

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer acknowledged that there were already similar sites in the area, but said that that each application had to be considered on its own merits. He stated that the site was generally acceptable.

A Member asked if there were touring or static caravans on the site. The Area Planning Officer referred the Member to condition (4) on page 30 of the Committee report, which stated one static and one touring caravan on the site.

A Member asked about the appeal history of the sites in the vicinity. The Area Planning Officer explained that following an appeal in 2015/16, the Planning Inspectorate had stated that due to the location of the Thistle Hill development, sites in this vicinity were sustainable.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer confirmed that none of the trees on the site were protected trees, and the site was not within a Conservation Area.

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 and raised points which included:

- This site was sustainable;
- the Council now had its 5-year supply of gypsy and traveller sites, where did we draw the line?
- additional sites caused upset for the settled community;
- this would set a precedent for vacant plots to be filled between this site and other sites;
- lots of trees had been removed, making the site very visible; and
- there would be an impact on the settled community.

In response to the points raised, the Area Planning Officer said that government guidance stated that gypsy and traveller sites should not overwhelm the settled community. He said that in this location, the number of gypsy and traveller sites exceeded settled community sites in the street, but that there was no definition as to what constituted the settled community in the vicinity of the site. Members needed to decide whether the site was acceptable. The Area Planning Officer added, in response to a further question, that the site was outside the built-up area, and a house would not be allowed to be built on the site as the policy for gypsy and traveller sites was different to the settled community.

A Ward Member spoke against the application.

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

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds of its negative impact on visual amenity, due to its design and layout, on the local area; cumulative impact on the settled community; and over-intensity of gypsy and traveller sites in the vicinity. This was seconded by Councillor Elliott Jayes.

Member debated the motion and made the following comments:

- The number of sites on Greyhound Road, Minster was now dominating the settled community; and
- impact on the streetscene, this was not tucked away.

Resolved: That application 19/502204/FULL be refused on the grounds of its negative impact on visual amenity, due to its design and layout; and the cumulative impact on the settled community due to an over-intensity of gypsy and traveller sites in the vicinity.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/503528/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing garage, outbuilding and boundary wall. Erection of 3no. detached, three bedroom dwellings with associated landscaping, parking and access.		
ADDRESS The Vicarage Church Lane Newington Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7JU		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newington	APPLICANT Mr Julian Hills AGENT John Bishop And Associates

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 17/505657/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of replacement security lodge. (Retrospective)		
ADDRESS Sheerness Holiday Park Halfway Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 3AA		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Cosgrove Leisure AGENT Barron Edwards Ltd

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

Resolved: That application 17/505657/FULL be approved subject to condition (1) in the report.

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 19/505850/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of single storey rear extension.		
ADDRESS 63 Newton Road Faversham Kent ME13 8DZ		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Mr Rob Bailey AGENT Wyndham Jordan Architects

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

Resolved: That application 19/505850/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/504625/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Demolition of existing garage and erection of replacement garage building (as approved under 17/501081/FULL but with minor amendments) and associated car parking. First floor to be used as holiday accommodation. (Resubmission of 19/503604/FULL)			
ADDRESS Elm Tree Cottage Butlers Hill Dargate Faversham Kent ME13 9HG			
WARD Boughton And Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hernhill	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Marsh AGENT Peter S. Ferguson-McCardle	

The Area Planning Officer reported that Hernhill Parish Council had written in, supporting the revised proposal, including the external stairwell, and they supported the change of use. The Area Planning Officer explained that the Applicant had got in touch to discuss design changes, but any changes to reduce the eaves height would have compromised the function of the application. As a result there were no changes and reason 2 on page 63 of the report still stood.

William Shenow-Brady, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Michael Pearce, an objector, spoke against the application.

Paul Marsh, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked to view the plans, how the height compared with that of the cart lodge and whether the proposed building was visible from the road? The Area Planning Officer explained that the different heights were difficult to assess because of the slope on the site, and he advised that the building was not visible from the road.

A Member sought clarification on the policy relating to this type of development as other developments similar to this had been approved. The Area Planning Officer explained that this application sought to erect a brand new building as a holiday let, rather than using an existing building.

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

Councillor Tony Winckless moved a motion for a site meeting which was seconded by Councillor Ken Rowles. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

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

- Holiday lets were good to have, but needed to balance with the impact on everything else;
- this was not acceptable in a Conservation Area;
- the building was not visible from the road, so there was no visible amenity issues;
- planning permission had already been given to improve the building;
- did not accept that one single let was unsustainable;
- this would be a useful addition, and not too far from the local public house;
- the setting of the listed building needed to be protected; and
- the appearance of the building would change and it would be visible from a public footpath.

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He considered the change of use to be a critical issue.

Resolved: That application 19/504625/FULL be refused for the reasons stated in the report.

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 17/505019/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Retrospective application for Change of use of land to a mixed use site, to continue the equestrian use and add residential use for three Romani Gypsy families. Site to contain three static caravans, three touring caravans, parking for 6 vehicles with associated development		
ADDRESS Ridgedale Riding School Halstow Lane Upchurch Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7AB		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Ball AGENT BFSGC

The Area Planning Officer reported that a further letter of support had been received from a resident of Upchurch, which raised the following points: the site was unobtrusive; the views to it were screened; the site had less of an impact than other sites that had been given permission; more suitable landscaping could be planted, via condition; the family had integrated well into the community; the site was tidy; there were no ASB issues; and what else would the land be used for?

The Area Planning Officer said that the report set-out details of the impact of the site, and ASB issues were not a material planning consideration. He explained that the condition which granted temporary permission on the site had lapsed, and the land should return to grazing land.

Joseph P Jones, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Joseph G Jones, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked if the site was within a flood zone? The Area Planning Officer advised that it was at risk and that the caravans were on stilts, which made them more prominent, although some were masked by landscaping.

A Member asked if the permission could be tied to the family? The Area Planning Officer explained this this was only usually done when there were extenuating circumstances and he was not aware of any in this case.

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

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

- The site was difficult to find, and not visible;
- it was kept clean;
- the residents were part of the community;
- did not see the harm of this application;
- they needed to stay where they were;
- needed to consider the family's circumstances;
- the family was established here, the decision was between policy or morals; and
- many sites had been given temporary permissions because of the shortfall in a 5-year supply of sites, now that there was a 5-year year supply, the Council needed to follow the officer recommendation, otherwise the 'floodgates' would open.

In response to the comments, the Area Planning Officer acknowledged the sentimental aspect of the application, but stated that the harm, as outlined in the report, out-weighed the personal circumstances of the Applicant.

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

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

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be delegated to officers to approve on a personal basis. To also include relevant conditions, including a landscaping condition for planting to enhance the area, and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) payments, and for officers to impose, if necessary, conditions restricting the use of touring caravans within the site. This was seconded by Councillor Benjamin Martin.

Resolved: That application 17/505019/FULL be delegated to officers to approve as a personal permission. To also include relevant conditions, including a landscaping condition for planting to enhance the area, and SAMMS payments and for officers to impose, if necessary, conditions restricting the use of touring caravans within the site.

3.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/504833/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a pair of semi-detached 2 bed cottages (self-builds) together with associated access and parking.		
ADDRESS Land Adjoining Miles Cottages Butlers Hill Dargate Kent ME13 9HH		
WARD Boughton And Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hernhill	APPLICANT Ms P and Mr R Leak AGENT Rebus Planning Solutions

The Area Planning Officer referred Members to paragraph 5.3 on page 88 of the Committee report. Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation had requested amended drawings showing sight lines. The amendments resulted in the sight lines going beyond the application boundary and so they could not be secured by a planning condition. The Area Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the reason for refusal outlined on page 93 of the report and noted that the site was on a rural lane, was remote and unsustainable and safe access was difficult to achieve without significant adverse impact on the amenities of the rural lane.

Mrs Vanessa Leak, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Felix Krish, an objector, spoke against the application.

Ryan Leak, 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.

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

- There was a need for local housing;
- could not see how this could be approved in its current form;
- more self-builds like this were needed;
- taking the hedgerow out on the rural lane to form sight lines would change the area too much; and
- add a condition so that the housing remained with local families.

A Ward Member was sympathetic to the scheme, but considered this would open the 'floodgates' and thought the scheme would change the character of the area. He said the scheme should be instigated through the English Rural Scheme instead.

In response to comments made, the Area Planning Officer explained that there were options to develop affordable rural housing through established housing procedures. He said this was not the right location, it needed to be accessible, and to be affordable in the long-term, rather than for an individual.

Resolved: That application 19/504833/FULL be refused for the reason stated in the report.

At this point the meeting was adjourned from 9.50pm to 10pm for a comfort break.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – Sheerness Holiday Park, Halfway Road, Minster**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

A Member welcomed the decision.

- **Item 5.2 – Land situated at Goldstone, Augustine Road, Minster**

ENFORCEMENT APPEAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

A Member welcomed the decision.

- **Item 5.3 – 8 Salmon Crescent, Minster**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL ALLOWED

430 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Meeting was adjourned from 9.50pm to 10pm.

431 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm, 10.30pm and 11pm 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