

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

**MINUTES** of the Virtual Meeting held via Skype on Thursday, 10 December 2020 from 7.00pm - 8.43 pm.

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

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Simon Algar, Billy Attaway, Claire Attaway, Rob Bailey, Philippa Davies, Andrew Jeffers, Kellie MacKenzie, Cheryl Parks and Jim Wilson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Steve Davey, Bill Tatton and Ghlin Whelan.

### 327 INTRODUCTION

The Chairman explained that the meeting would be conducted in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panel (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Policy and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 No. 392.

In welcoming all Members and members of the public, the Chairman explained which Swale Borough Council officers were in attendance.

### 328 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 November 2020 (Minute Nos. 239 – 248) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

The Minutes of the Reconvened Meeting held on 16 November 2020 (Minute Nos. 249 – 253) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendment: Councillor Cameron Beart declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.8 19/502969/FULL Land to the East of Queenborough Road, Queenborough.

### 329 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Tim Gibson (Chairman) declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.1 20/502524/FULL Land adjacent to 6 St Michaels Close, Sittingbourne. Councillor Gibson left the meeting during consideration of this item.

### 330 DEFERRED ITEMS

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

---

<b>Def Item 1 – REFERENCE NO 18/504562/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION</b> Alterations and extensions to existing residential care home to provide 12no. bedrooms and 2no. self-contained two-bedroom units with associated facilities. Erection of a single storey building to provide 4no. supported living self-contained apartments, a new workshop building and associated landscape works		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Ellens Court, Lady Margaret Manor Road Doddington ME9 0NT		
<b>WARD</b> East Downs	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Doddington	<b>APPLICANT</b> Inspire Care Outreach Ltd <b>AGENT</b> Adam Woodbridge Architects

The Major Projects Officer introduced the application. He reminded Members that at the meeting on 15 October 2020 they had deferred the application to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on-site. However, due to the current health and safety risks involved with a physical site meeting, officers recommended that video footage of the site be presented to Members, Ward Members, residents/objectors and the applicant/agent at a remote meeting of the Planning Working Group. The minutes from that meeting would then be considered at the Planning Committee meeting on Thursday 7 January 2021.

Lee Davison, an objector, spoke against the proposal to hold the Planning Working Group meeting remotely.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation for a meeting of the Planning Working Group to be held remotely and this was seconded by Councillor Roger Clark.

The Ward Member appreciated that holding a physical site meeting was not feasible during the current Covid-19 pandemic but considered it was a unique remote site with a narrow access and was not suitable for the development proposed.

In response to a query from a Member, the Major Projects Officer stated that the application was already over the 13-week determination target and the applicants could take the application to appeal on non determination grounds if they were minded to.

Members were invited to consider the proposal for a remote Planning Working Group meeting and raised comments which included:

- Understood residents concerns but Members would still be able to view the site by video so could see no harm in holding a remote meeting;
- suggested that dash-cam footage showing the narrow access to the site could also be shown at the virtual meeting;

- important to consider whether it was reasonable under the current Covid-19 pandemic restrictions to delay having a virtual meeting when nobody knew how long the restrictions would be for;
- Members could always visit the site individually; and
- supported the proposed remote meeting but would like dash-cam footage to be made available at the meeting.

In response to a query from a Member, the Democratic Services Officer stated that the meeting could be held at 10am on Monday 21 December 2020.

**Resolved:** *That due to the current health and safety risks involved for the Planning Working Group to meet on site, video footage of the site including dash-cam footage for application 18/504562/FULL be presented to a remote Planning Working Group meeting.*

<b>Def Item 2 – REFERENCE NO 20/500490/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION</b> The replacement chalets are of an appropriate scale and design and as such will not cause harm to visual or residential amenities. The agent has agreed to a minimum reduction of 35% in emissions.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Seaview Holiday Camp Warden Bay Road Leysdown Sheerness Kent ME12 4NB		
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey East	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Leysdown	<b>APPLICANT</b> Wickland (Holdings) Ltd <b>AGENT</b> Forward Planning and Development Ltd

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application. He reported that the agent had emailed further comments responding to comments and concerns raised by Members which he summarised as follows: with regard to overlooking and density concerns there was no material change to the density and pattern of the units in the area, there was no difference to the degree of privacy that the neighbouring units currently enjoyed; in fact the units replacing the caravans were now further away from the chalets opposite them; the density for this application was reduced by one unit (10%); there were typically no closed-off spaces around the each chalet, they were designed for central grounds maintenance; as noted by planning officers; the replacement chalets were of an appropriate scale and design; orientation and increase in unit size, the change in orientation of some of the units took them further away from the units opposite than they currently were; the chalets were approximately 25% bigger than their predecessors, the majority of that increase was in the length of the unit increasing from 7.4m to 10m and only 0.3m added to the width; **parking** - generally there were no parking issues on the site, earlier this year 27 additional parking spaces were added to the site; with this application they had included an additional six new parking spaces and removed one unit; there was parking available generally around the site, there were no dedicated parking spaces; it was a private site, the site owners had a vested interest in the occupiers of the site so parking concerns were always addressed as it would be

counterproductive for them not to do so; **sustainability** - they had looked carefully at sustainability and concluded that the increased level would be very difficult to achieve without making the unit size bigger and the cost would be disproportionate to the aim of these low cost units; however, they respected the thinking of Members on this, and worked with the officers and the local authority building control department to make changes to provide an improvement of 35% as set-out in the report; **increase in people living in the area** - there would be a mix of purchasers buying the units; it should be noted that these were replacement units, not new ones, so there was no increase in use or occupancy. The Area Planning Officer further advised that with regard to proximity concerns in respect of chalet 49 to an existing chalet, the agent had offered to either amend the layout or delete chalet 49 entirely should Members so wish.

Faye Wright, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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 comments which included:

- Considered the replacement chalets were better than what was currently on the site;
- could not insist that the applicant reduced the size of the decking;
- should approve the application as it stood;
- concerns about the applicant replacing the 10-month occupancy caravans with chalets for 12 month occupancy on a piecemeal basis;
- these were chalets not park homes;
- could not see any material considerations to refuse the application other than the proximity of chalet 49;
- would be happier to support the application if chalet 49 was removed; and
- concerned about the loss of green space due to construction of decking which could set a precedent for the whole site.

In response the Area Planning Officer said that if Members still had concerns about the proximity of chalet 49 they could explore an amendment to either the layout or removing chalet 49 as part of the scheme to replace further chalets on that row. He stated that officers also had concerns about the loss of caravans on the site, however they had lost an appeal to replace caravans with chalets on the park and would not be able support that as a reason for refusal at any subsequent appeal. He added that there were no occupancy restrictions on the chalets at the site.

Councillor Tony Winckless moved the following addendum: That plot 49 be removed from the application. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

The Area Planning Officer suggested the following wording be added to the addendum: to delegate authority to officers to approve the application subject to deletion of the proposed replacement chalet on plot 49 and amending the spacing between the remaining 3 chalets.

The Lawyer (Planning) suggested that any delegation included amendments to relevant conditions.

The original proposer and seconder agreed to include these comments in the addendum. On being put to the vote the addendum was lost.

**Resolved: That application 20/500490/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report.**

<b>Def Item 3 – REFERENCE NO 20/503571/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION</b> The replacement of four existing chalet units at plots 51, 51A, 53 and 60.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Seaview Holiday Camp Warden Bay Road Leysdown Sheerness Kent ME12 4NB		
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey East	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Leysdown	<b>APPLICANT</b> Wickland (Holdings) Ltd <b>AGENT</b> Forward Planning and Development Ltd

The Area Planning officer introduced the application.

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

**Resolved: That application 20/503571/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (5) in the report.**

**331 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS**

**PART 2**

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO 20/502524/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of 1no. two-bedroom end of terrace dwelling.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land Adjacent To 6 St Michaels Close, Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 3DH		
<b>WARD</b> Chalkwell	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Robert & Mrs Sheila Dooley

The Vice-Chairman took the chair for this application.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application.

Members were invited to debate the application and comments included:

- Did not consider that the proposal would be detrimental to the setting of St Michaels church;
- the proposal would fit in well with the existing terraced houses;
- would not cause any overlooking issues to neighbouring properties;
- agreed with officers that as it was so accessible into the high street parking would not be an issue;
- visitors could park in the car park nearby;
- could see no material reasons to refuse the application; and
- was in accordance with the Council's recently adopted parking standards and was in a sustainable location.

The Conservation & Design Manager reported that from a conservation area point of view he would have preferred for the area to remain green, but considered the impact on the conservation area would be minimal. He suggested the conditions in the report be tightened-up slightly, so they were inline with application 17/503011/FULL which had been approved in 2017 at the site, and the removal of permitted development rights. The Area Planning Officer suggested the following addendum to the motion to approve the application: to impose a condition seeking removal of normal domestic permitted development rights.

A Member raised concern that the occupiers of the proposed dwelling might be affected by noise from delivery vehicles to adjacent shops, he asked whether a condition requiring triple glazing to the rear windows could be imposed? The Area Planning Officer advised that the Council's Environmental Health Officer had raised no objection in respect of noise, however such a condition could be imposed if Members felt it would be an issue.

Councillor Simon Clark moved the following addendum: that an additional condition be imposed requiring that the rear windows had triple glazing. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless. A Member said that she did not think that noise was likely to be a problem as any occupiers would be mindful that it was close to the town centre.

On being put to the vote the additional conditions were agreed by Members.

***Resolved: That application 20/502524/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (10) in the report and two additional conditions, one seeking removal of domestic permitted development rights and the other requiring that the rear windows were triple glazed.***

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO 20/500169/FULL</b>
--

<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>
-----------------------------

Conversion of existing detached two-storey garage into a two-bedroom dwelling together with a single-storey extension.
--

<b>ADDRESS</b> 37 London Road Newington Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7NS		
<b>WARD</b> Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Newington	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Ross Webb

Parish Councillor Stephen Harvey, representing Newington Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Ross Webb, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

In response to points raised by the public speakers, the Area Planning Officer reminded Members that the advertising board was a separate issue and not material to the application.

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

- This was on the edge of the built-up boundary and could see no reason why a house could not be built;
- concerned that the photograph being shown did not seem to correspond with the block plan with regard to parking and turning areas;
- concerned about where the occupants would collect their bins;
- had visited the site and did not think it was detrimental to the area;
- the current footprint would not change so could not see any material considerations for refusing the application;
- what landscaping was planned?;
- the frontage needed to be replaced with hardstanding so it was more in-keeping with the area; and
- a soft and hard landscaping condition was needed.

In response to questions raised by Members, the Area Planning Officer stated that there appeared to be adequate parking and turning for vehicles. With regard to bin collection, he explained that this would be a private matter for the occupants of no. 37. The Area Planning Officer stated that advertisements were dealt with under separate advertisement legislation and confirmed that the Council's planning enforcement team were investigating the issue.

There was some discussion about the frontage of the proposed dwelling and the Area Planning Officer stated that landscaping could be explored with the applicant and the standard landscaping condition could be imposed, ensuring that any landscaping did not interfere with turning within the site. The Area Planning Officer considered it would be prudent to impose a condition regarding provision and maintenance of adequate visibility splays.

The Area Planning Officer agreed to amend his recommendation to approve the application as follows: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the imposition of standard landscaping conditions and a condition

requiring the provision and maintenance of visibility splays. This was supported by Members.

**Resolved:** *That application 20/500169/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report, the imposition of standard landscaping conditions and a condition requiring the provision and maintenance of visibility splays.*

**PART 3**

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO 20/504000/FULL</b>				
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Creation of a driveway with a dropped kerb.				
<b>ADDRESS</b> 178 Minster Road, Minster-on-sea, Sheerness, Kent ME12 3LL				
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey Central	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Minster-on-Sea	<b>APPLICANT</b> Tenwick	Mrs	Emma

The Area Planning Officer introduced 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 points raised included:

- Access straight onto a main road was inappropriate;
- would be out-of-keeping with the streetscene;
- there were double yellow lines opposite the site so cars parking both sides was not an issue; and
- there was no turning circle so allowing the dropped kerb would require the applicant to either reverse in or out of the drive which was not safe.

**Resolved:** *That application 20/504000/FULL be refused for the reasons outlined in the report.*

**PART 5**

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

- **Item 5.1 – Churchfields The Street Eastling**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

- **Item 5.2 – 17 Neames Forstal Selling**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

- **Item 5.3 – Land at 20 Hustlings Drive Eastchurch**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

A Member referred to a meeting of the Planning Working Group at the site previously, and that Members had noted the total disregard for the open character of the estate. He totally supported the officers and appeal inspector in refusing the application.

- **Item 5.4 – 2 Millers Cottages Belvedere Road Faversham**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**COMMITTEE REFUSAL**

- **Item 5.5 – Noreview Warden Road Eastchurch**

**APPEAL WITHDRAWN – COSTS DECISION – COSTS AWARDED AGAINST THE COUNCIL**

**NON-DETERMINATION**

A Member said it was confusing and disappointing that costs were awarded given the Inspector's comments that it could have easily been dealt with.

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