
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 6 February 2020 from 7.00pm - 10.27pm.

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey, Philippa Davies, Paul Gregory, Andrew Jeffers, Benedict King, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Alan Horton, Richard Palmer, Roger Truelove and Ghlin Whelan.

498 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

499 CHANGE IN COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Ben J Martin who had replaced Councillor Eddie Thomas on the Committee.

500 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 January 2020 (Minute Nos. 425 - 431) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to an amendment on page 537, item 2.2, 19/502204/FULL, Land west of Greyhound Road, Minster-on-Sea, to read that the site was **unsustainable**.

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 27 January 2020 (Minute Nos. 478 - 485) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

501 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Simmons declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.3, 19/506013/OUT, Brogdale Farm, Brogdale Road, Ospringe as his wife was a member of Ospringe Parish Council who had made representations on the application.

502 DEFERRED ITEMS

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

DEFERRED ITEM 1 - REFERENCE NO - 19/501789/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a pair of semi detached houses with associated driveways and parking.		
ADDRESS Land East Of 11 Southsea Avenue Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 2JX		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Batten AGENT Prime Folio

The Area Planning Officer reported that the approved dwellings to either side had changed slightly, to the west they had moved forward by just over a metre and to the east, again by just over a metre. These changes had not made a material difference to the acceptability of the proposal.

There were no questions.

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

Resolved: That application 19/501789/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (11) in the report, and to a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) payment.

DEFERRED ITEM 2 - 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 Senior Planner referred to the tabled update for this item.

Philip Healy, an objector, spoke against the application.

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

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member sought clarification on whether Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation were accepting funds from two developments for one highway scheme. The Senior Planner explained that this was not a contribution for the Halfway traffic lights junction but it was the requirement for the works to be carried out for a junction improvement scheme. He referred the Member to condition (9) in the Committee report which outlined this requirement. The Member asked about the £20,000 agreed previously, and the Senior Planner advised that this was for

highway mitigation for the Barton Hill Drive scheme, but was unrelated to the Belgrave Road proposal. The Major Projects Officer confirmed that the £20,000 was to discourage use of the local side roads as a rat-run, but this was solely related to the scheme at Barton Hill Drive.

A Member referred to paragraph 2.2 on page 21 of the report and sought clarification on whether the £100 contribution from the developer was for each occupier, or each dwelling. The Senior Planner advised that on reading the Agent's comments in paragraph 2.2, it would appear that the £100 contribution was for each occupant. The Major Projects Officer said he believed it was per dwelling. The Senior Planning Lawyer commented that he believed the sentence could be read either way.

A Member sought further details on the funding of the junction and referred to the Barton Hill Drive contribution of a fixed sum of £20,000. She sought clarification on the Grampian condition, and she asked which developer was doing what at that junction and who was paying. The Senior Planner advised that the fixed sum was for other highway improvements relating to the Barton Hill Drive scheme and not this development. The Halfway Traffic Lights junction improvements were the same works for both the Barton Hill Drive and Belgrave Road scheme and had been modelled on the basis of the impact from both developments. The Member asked what would happen if one of the schemes did not move forward. The Senior Planner explained that if only one application was approved, then that developer would need to deliver the scheme. The Member then asked what would happen if both schemes got approved, and the Senior Planner explained that whichever scheme got to the trigger point in the development that they needed to comply with that condition, then they would be required to do the works. The Member referred to the £100 voucher for bus travel/cycle equipment and asked how that figure was arrived at. The Senior Planner explained that without the £100 contribution, mitigation measures for the scheme were considered acceptable, so anything above that was an additional benefit.

A Member asked for details of the Travel Plan referred to in paragraph 2.2 and the Senior Planner explained that the detail would be in the Section 106 Agreement. The Member asked for details of a generic travel plan and where the evidence base in relation to these mitigating measures came from and how successful they were. The Senior Planner referred the Member to paragraph 2.4 in the report and explained that KCC Highways and Transportation commented that schemes like this were used nationwide.

A Member asked whether the off-site works outlined in condition (9) could be implemented prior to the occupation of the 10th dwelling, rather than the 50th as noted in the report. The Senior Planner advised that this trigger point was reached as a result of KCC Highways and Transportation's technical analysis, however, there was potential for this trigger to be amended if Members considered this appropriate.

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

A Ward Member spoke on the junction with Queenborough Road and did not agree with KCC Highways and Transportation's comments, and considered the proposed measures would increase highway danger. Another Ward Member referred to condition (9) in the report and KCC Highways and Transportation's modelling, and said the junction was already over capacity even if nothing was done.

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

- Welcomed the scheme's 10% affordable housing; and
- the £100 for each dwelling was a welcome initiative.

Councillor Ben J Martin moved the following amendment: That £100 be given to each occupant, calculated as £100 per bedroom, rather than each dwelling. This was seconded by Councillor Tim Valentine and upon being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

Councillor Ben J Martin moved the following further amendment: That condition (9) be amended to state that agreed off-site highway works be implemented prior to the occupation of the 2nd dwelling. This was seconded by Councillor Elliott Jayes.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following amendment: That condition (9) be amended to state that agreed off-site highway works be implemented prior to the occupation of the 1st dwelling. This was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin. On being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following further amendment: That subject to agreement with the applicant, a Travel Plan be included in a Section 106 Agreement. This was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin. On being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

The Senior Planner clarified that if the application was approved then it would be done so on the basis that it was subject to the amendments as agreed.

Further comments included:

- Concerned with the tandem parking, and the layout, on the development;
- residents needed to be aware of how they could access the £100 voucher scheme; and
- since amendments following the last meeting, everything was now according to Policy and the application should be approved.

In response, the Senior Planner advised that there were 172 tandem spaces on the proposed development, and at the request of KCC Highways and Transportation, visitor parking had been added to offset any parking issues. He added that KCC Highways and Transportation had given detailed formal advice on the layout. The Senior Planning Lawyer advised that KCC Highways and Transportation had responsibility for the layout of roads whether they were adopted or not.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken on the substantive motion, with amendments and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Roger Clark, Simon Clark, Mike Dendor, Tim Gibson, James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Benjamin A Martin, Ben J Martin, David Simmons, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless . Total equals 11.

Against: Councillors Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, James Hall, Elliott Jayes, Peter Marchington and Paul Stephen. Total equals 6.

Abstain: 0.

The motion to approve the application was agreed.

Resolved: *That application 19/501921/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (35) in the report, £100 voucher for bus travel/cycle equipment to be given to each occupant (calculated as £100 per bedroom), condition (9) amended to state that agreed off-site highway works be implemented prior to the occupation of the 1st dwelling, and a Travel Plan to be included in a Section 106 Agreement.*

503 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 18/506328/OUT			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Outline Application for the erection of 20 residential dwellings (access being sought, all other matters for future consideration).			
ADDRESS Land Lying To The South Of Dunlin Walk Iwade Kent ME9 8TG			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade	APPLICANT BDW Kent AGENT	

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/506053/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Change of use of existing garage block to holiday let, including demolition of existing log store and insertion of a side dormer, as clarified by drawing 711-06 which defines the curtilage of the building for the purposes of this application.		
ADDRESS Broadoak Farm Broadoak Road Milstead Sittingbourne Kent ME9 0RS		
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Milstead	APPLICANT Mr Matt Brown AGENT Nicholas Hobbs Associates

The Area Planning Officer referred Members to paragraph 2.3 in the report. He explained that the plan had recently been amended to provide better access from the accommodation to the south-west facing garden area. He said this had now been widened to two metres. The Area Planning Officer said that drawing number 711-06 in condition (2) needed to be deleted and replaced with the revised drawing number.

Mrs Lena Jordan, representing Milstead Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Dr Stewart Aaron, on behalf of the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked how far away the application site was from the Kent Science Park (KSP) and the Area Planning Officer confirmed that it was half a mile away, and that both the KSP and this site had access onto Broadoak Road.

A Member asked about any further garaging on the site and the Area Planning Officer explained that if the application was approved, there would no longer be a garage facility on the site.

A Member asked if there were any guarantees that the building would remain as a holiday let. The Area Planning Officer referred the Member to condition (7) on page 119 of the report which stipulated its use as holiday accommodation, and for use by any person or group for no longer than four weeks in any calendar year.

A Member asked whether there were any proposals to re-locate the parked cars and workshop. The Area Planning Officer explained that there were currently no proposals to replace the garage, and in any case this could be done under Permitted Development Rights.

A Member asked for further clarification of the building's use as a holiday let. The Area Planning Officer explained that the Applicant wanted some additional room for extended family to stay and had gone down the route of change of use to holiday lets. The Member requested there be a condition to let the property out for a minimum period as a holiday let. The Area Planning Officer advised that it was not possible to do that.

A Member asked whether there were any Permitted Development Rights on the building. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that there were, and added that this was a large site, and the building was not near the road.

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

The Ward Member spoke against the application. She said that Policy permitted holiday lets in redundant buildings. This was a substantial house, and the removal of the garage was wrong in this case. She wanted the Permitted Development Rights to be removed, and considered the application effected the visual impact and the amenity value of the property.

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

- This was straightforward – it was not a new building;
- the surrounding land was large enough to accommodate any parked vehicles;
- removing Permitted Development Rights from within the red boundary would not change anything;
- needed to remove Permitted Development Rights from the entire site;
- severe reservations as the holiday let being could be used as an annex to the main house; and
- condition (7) needed to be enforced.

In response to the comments, the Area Planning Officer said that condition (8) could be amended to refer to land in the main curtilage of the house. He added that Class E Permitted Development Rights could be included (garden buildings and pools). The Senior Planning Lawyer advised that the effect of this amendment would be that any further development would require planning permission.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following amendment: That Permitted Development Rights be removed from within the curtilage of the main house on the site plan and Class E be added to condition (8). This was seconded by Councillor Tim Valentine and on being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

Resolved: *That application 19/506053/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (8) in the report, that Permitted Development Rights be removed from within the curtilage of the main house on the site plan, and Class E be added to condition (8) and to the SAMMS payment.*

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/506013/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline Application with scale matters sought for proposed visitor information and learning centre to replace existing accommodation at Brogdale Farm.		
ADDRESS Brogdale Collections Brogdale Farm Brogdale Road Ospringe Faversham Kent ME13 8XU		
WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ospringe	APPLICANT Brogdale Collections AGENT Mr Tom La Dell

The Area Planning Officer referred to the tabled paper from Ospringe Parish Council.

Mr Tovey, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Tom La Dell, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked for confirmation that the site was a greenfield site and the Area Planning Officer confirmed that it was. The Member also asked whether there was a masterplan for the whole site. The Area Planning Officer gave some background to the planning history of the site and explained that there was a masterplan, 'of sorts', of what the trust wanted to achieve. The Member referred to condition (10) in the report which he considered to be restrictive and asked whether there were any restrictions in hours of use of the building. The Area Planning Officer said that the nature of the use of the building meant that it might be open in the evenings as well, but Members could ask for time restraints for the opening hours if they wished. He added that within the restrictions of condition (10) other uses could also be included so long as they were ancillary to the proposed use.

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

The Ward Member stated that the fruit collection was important, but the appeal to the general public was limited, and he questioned whether the benefits of the application outweighed the harm.

Councillor David Simmons moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

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

- Hours of use needed to be included within the conditions;
- arrivals and departures of coaches to the site needed to be conditioned, and set away from nearby houses;
- the site was run-down and did not attract visitors;
- there was a lot of space in the car park, there could be a roundabout for the coaches to turn around; and
- local residents should be considered and hours of use should not be too late.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following amendment: That a condition be added for details for coach drop-off and pick-up to be submitted and approved by the Planning Authority before the building was used, plus an additional condition setting-out opening times. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

There was some discussion on what the opening hours should be. The Area Planning Officer suggested 8am to 8pm, so that it was not too restrictive. Councillor Hunt as proposer, and Councillor Beart as seconder were happy that the timings be delegated to officers to agree in consultation with the Ward Member. On being put to the vote the two additional conditions were agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/506013/OUT be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (11) in the report, a condition be added for details for coach drop-off and pick-up to be submitted and approved by the Planning Authority before the building was used, plus an additional condition setting-out opening times, to be agreed in consultation with the Ward Member.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 18/506274/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Redevelopment of workshops and offices with change of use to C3 residential creating 4 no. 2 bed Flats with amenity space, bicycle storage and parking. (Resubmission of 17/505382/FULL) (Resubmission of 17/505382/FULL)		
ADDRESS 19 Albany Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1EB		
WARD Homewood	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Structural & Weld Testing Services Ltd AGENT John Burke Associates

The Area Planning Officer explained that this application was the subject of an appeal against non-determination, and as such the Committee were required to decide how it would have determined the application had the appeal not been submitted. He reported that two additional letters of objection had been received, and he summarised their comments, which included consideration that the application would cause increase in noise, and existing parking issues would get worse, and suggested that six additional off-street parking spaces were required.

Mr Matthew Mills, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr John Burke, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member sought clarification on the amount and type of dwellings that were to be developed, and also the parking provision. The Area Planning Officer explained that originally the application had been for seven one bedroom flats, but this had been amended to four two bedroom units. Three were houses and one was a bungalow. He said there were two unallocated parking spaces for the four properties.

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

A visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

A Ward Member who was also a member of the Planning Committee spoke against the application. He considered the scale; type and size of dwellings was out-of-keeping with the area, and that it would have an impact on the residents' parking scheme.

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

- Concerned with the lack of amenity space provided;
- clarification was needed on exactly how many objections to the application had been raised, as there was some inconsistency in the report; and
- the site needed to be improved.

Resolved: *That application 18/506274/FULL would have been refused for the reasons stated in the report had an appeal for non-determination not been submitted.*

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/504872/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of car sales showroom and car preparation workshop.			
ADDRESS Marshlands Farm Lower Road Eastchurch Kent ME12 3ST			
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Marshlands Lettings Ltd	
		AGENT Woodstock Associates	

There were no questions.

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 proposed development was not out-of-keeping with nearby buildings;
- this was a high quality showroom;
- the height was needed so that the business could operate without having to use a pit;
- this would have a visual impact on the area;
- the whole site was an industrial area, that was the nature of the estate, there was no significant harm;
- this was not in the countryside;
- there was a large housing estate nearby; and
- existing landscaping in front of the building would screen it.

In response to comments, the Area Planning Officer stated that the proposed building was 6.5 metres high, compared to a nearby building at 6.2 metres high, and the proposed building was located forward of the main building. He stated that the application site was not within the built-up area boundary, but was in the countryside, as set-out in the Local Plan, and Members had to have regard to policy set-out to protect the countryside.

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

A Ward Member suggested the application be delegated to officers to decrease the height of the building. The Area Planning Officer explained that officers had already

had discussions with the Applicant regarding this, and also reminded Members that the Applicant had advised that the operational requirements of the development also meant the height could not be reduced.

There was some discussion on the reasons to approve the application and also what conditions to attach to the permission.

Members suggested the following conditions on renewable energy, hours of use; building materials that fitted in with the rural environment; and noise attenuation measures, especially on the side facing the residential development.

Councillor Benjamin Martin moved the following motion: That the application be delegated to officers to approve due to the employment opportunities it offered to the rural area and due to its sympathetic design. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney. Upon being put to the vote the motion was agreed. The conditions were also delegated to officers, and included hours of working on the vehicles to be agreed in consultation with the Ward Members and the Environmental Health Team; renewable energy; vernacular building materials that fitted in with the rural environment; and noise attenuation measures if necessary, especially on the side facing the residential development

Resolved: That application 19/504872/FULL be delegated to officers to approve due to the employment opportunities it offered to the rural area and due to its sympathetic design. To also include relevant conditions, including hours of working on the vehicles to be agreed in consultation with the Ward Members and the Environmental Health Team; renewable energy; vernacular building materials that fitted in with the rural environment; and noise attenuation measures if necessary, especially on the side facing the residential development.

3.3 REFERENCE NO - 19/506127/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Demolition of the existing bungalow and 2no. outbuildings, and erection of a replacement four bedroom family home with attached garage.		
ADDRESS Starborne Oak Lane Upchurch Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7BB		
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Bodycomb AGENT The Complete Oak Home

Gary Rosewell, representing Upchurch Parish Council, spoke in support of the application.

John Bodycomb, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member asked to view the plan to see where other properties were along the road. The Area Planning Officer indicated on the plan that there were no nearby properties, and that there was a gap between the site and the built-up area of Upchurch.

A Member asked for confirmation of what was in the vicinity of the application site, and the Area Planning Officer confirmed what the Member had noted. The Area Planning Officer explained that there was no justification for a 1.5 storey dwelling just because there were 2-storey dwellings in Upchurch.

A Member asked about Permitted Development Rights on the existing building. The Area Planning Officer explained that there were currently none, as the property was not in current use as a dwelling. He showed Members the plans on what the Applicant considered could be added to the existing dwelling, but said that an appropriate replacement dwelling was more feasible. The Area Planning Officer explained that the application was contrary to the Local Plan, and being left derelict was not a good reason to approve any development.

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

A visiting Ward Member spoke in support of the application.

A visiting Ward Member, who had called-in the application, spoke in support of the application.

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

- Agreed with Ward Member, and did not object to this;
- the site was an eyesore;
- this site was surrounded by non-rural aspects;
- the proposed property was a good scale, and with some good conditions, including landscaping it would be appropriate;
- residents were fed-up with looking at the burnt-out derelict building on the site;
- the proposed dwelling was set back from the road and would not be visible;
- needed to do the right thing; and
- should approve the application and include biodiversity measures, landscaping, energy efficiency and natural building material conditions.

In response, the Senior Planning Lawyer reminded Members that the site was outside the built-up area, and referred then to policy DM11 of the Local Plan as noted on page 147 of the report.

The Area Planning Officer stated that Members needed to set-out valid reasons why the application should be approved when it was against policy. He suggested that the potential harm from Permitted Development Rights outweighed the harm from the new dwelling and the consequent increase in size, and advised that although he did not consider this to be likely, Members were entitled to take a different view.

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

There was some discussion on the conditions that should be added to the application.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the usual conditions, including landscaping, and the removal of Permitted Development Rights to ensure the building did not get any larger. He invited Members to add to this, as below:

- Energy efficiency condition:

(The dwelling 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 the 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.)

- bio-diversity and landscaping to exceed the current level;
- ecology;
- energy performance;
- use of natural building materials in the building and landscaping;
- standard conditions; and
- delegate to officers any other relevant conditions.

The motion was seconded by the Vice-Chairman and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved: That application 19/506127/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to the removal of Permitted Development Rights to ensure the building did not get any larger, conditions in relation to energy efficiency, as above; bio-diversity and landscaping to exceed the current level; ecology; energy performance; use of natural building materials in the building and landscaping; plus the standard conditions and any other relevant conditions.

PART 5

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

-
- **Item 5.1 – Harrow House Shottenden Road Sheldwich**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEALS DISMISSED (planning and listed building)

- **Item 5.2 – Seaview Holiday Park Warden Bay Road Leysdown**

APPEAL AGAINST CONDITIONS

APPEAL ALLOWED

Members were disappointed with the decision.

- **Item 5.3 – Land adj to Ambleside Maidstone Road Borden**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

504 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Meeting was adjourned from 8.50pm to 8.58pm.

505 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm 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