

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 16 September 2021 from 7.00 pm - 8.00 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cameron Beart, Simon Clark, Mike Dendor, Tim Gibson (Chairman), James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chairman), Denise Knights, Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Richard Palmer, David Simmons, Paul Stephen, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Billy Attaway, Andy Byrne, Philippa Davies, Cheryl Parks, Emma Wiggins and Jim Wilson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Ghlin Whelan.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Monique Bonney and James Hall.

### 286 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 287 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 August 2021 (Minute Nos. 197 – 201) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 288 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 289 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

#### PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended.

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO 20/503665/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Demolition of existing car/motorbike sales and repair workshop and erection of a building consisting of 20no. residential flats and 1no. retail unit with associated access and parking.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 87-100 West Street Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 1AS		
<b>WARDS:</b> Chalkwell	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Tait <b>AGENT</b> Model Projects Ltd

The Major Projects Officer introduced and outlined the application for Members. He made Members aware that he was proposing two additional conditions to be added and sought delegated authority to do so. The first condition was to restrict the

opening hours of the proposed commercial unit to not operate after 11pm and to not open before 7am. The second condition was to prevent over-looking from the balconies to units 5 and 11 by requiring the provision of obscure-glazed screens to the side balconies facing Frederick Street. He also informed Members that there had been an error in the numbering of conditions and as a result there were two fewer conditions than numbered in the report.

The Ward Member spoke against 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 comments raised included:

- Ideal site to build on and was happy to see something happening to the site, however had concerns that it was too close to the A2;
- Concerned about the limited amount of parking;
- development was close to the town centre including transport links;
- concerned with the height of the building in the location;
- the development was the same height as the church tower opposite and adjacent flats;
- the plan did not show enough electric charging ports for the number of dwellings proposed;
- concerned that the electric charging ports may not be up to an acceptable minimum wattage output to charge domestic electric cars, 7 Kilowatts per hour and asked if an amendment could be made to the condition asking for 7 Kilowatt chargers to be installed;
- wanted to see more plants and wildflowers grown on top of the roofs to create a better rooftop garden, rather than the planted area being limited to just a part of the proposed roof;
- concerned that the rooftop garden would overlook neighbouring streets and gardens because the development was relatively tall; and
- were the parking spaces allocated to specific properties or were they unrestricted use?

In response to Members' concerns the Major Projects Officer outlined to Members that the A2 road adjacent to the development and Hawthorn Road were both adopted by Kent County Council (KCC) highways and they had raised no concerns or safety issues for pedestrians with this development. He added that each parking space would have an electric charging port installed and would not see any problem with Members amending the relevant condition so that as well as amending it to refer to the parking spaces, not dwellings it also required the charging ports to provide a minimum 7 kilowatts per hour. He clarified to Members that the allocation of parking spaces could be dealt with by a condition requiring a car parking management plan. The Major Projects Officer informed Members that there was scope to amend the rooftop garden through discussion with the applicant.

***Resolved: That application 20/503665/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (38) in the report and the additional amended conditions as minuted with delegation to officers to finalise the working of these, to negotiate an***

**amended roof design incorporating larger areas of green roof (sedum or wildflower), and the completion of a suitably worded s106 legal agreement in consultation with ward member and chair of planning.**

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO 21/503916/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Full restoration of the clock feature, internal operating equipment and cast-iron structure, including reinstatement of original lanterns with LED lighting.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> The Clocktower High Street Sheerness Kent ME12 1AG		
<b>WARDS:</b> Sheerness	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Sheerness Town Council	<b>APPLICANT</b> Swale Borough Council <b>AGENT</b> Capital Projects Team

The Area Planning Officer introduced and outlined the application for Members. He told Members that there was a late response from Natural England, but they had no further comments to add. He reminded Members that an application for Listed Building Consent was considered by the Committee in July 2021; this application was for the planning consent required for the proposed renovations, which involved dismantling the structure and removing it from the site for a period of time before reinstating the structure. He advised Members that the proposal would reinstate lanterns using LED lighting on the clocktower and that the clocktower was to be re-painted in its original colours of green and gold.

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

Councillor James Hunt spoke in support of the application but had concerns that the LED lighting in the lanterns could be very bright and wanted an extra condition imposed requiring the LED lighting to be soft lighting. He proposed that a condition be included requiring the submission of details for approval in respect of the external lighting and this was seconded by Councillor Paul Stephen.

On being put to a vote the additional condition was agreed by Members.

**Resolved: That application 21/503916/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report and the additional condition as minuted.**

<b>2.3 REFERENCE NO 21/503353/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Proposed first floor extension with two front dormers and rear Juliet balcony.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 12 Kingsborough Drive Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4DN		
<b>WARDS:</b> Sheppey East	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Eastchurch	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr & Mrs Henstock

		<b>AGENT</b> Associates	Woodstock
--	--	----------------------------	-----------

The Area Planning Officer introduced and outlined the application for Members. He stated that the proposed development had no windows on the North East or South East sides of the extension to prevent any overlooking on the neighbouring properties. He explained to Members that the property was located at the end of a cul-de-sac and would not have any significant impacts on the neighbouring properties, that it was subservient in scale to the main building and maintained a two-metre gap to the side boundary in accordance with the Council’s Strategic Planning Guidance.

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 comments raised included:

- Felt that it was a shame to see more and more applications similar to this one come from the same estate and felt the design was poor, but considered there were no planning reasons to refuse;
- considered that the height of the original garage would be only marginally different to the height of the proposed extension; and
- concerned that as more applications like this one came to Committee the estate would lose its rural effect.

**Resolved: That application 21/503353/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (4) in the report.**

**PART 3**

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended.

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO 21/503219/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>			
Erection of a side extension to existing detached garage together with a new roof to create first floor with insertion of 2 dormer windows to provide annexe (Resubmission to 20/505910/FULL).			
<b>ADDRESS</b> 3 Brecon Chase Minster-on-Sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2HP			
<b>WARDS:</b> Minster Cliffs	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Minster-on-Sea	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Cyrous Loghmani <b>AGENT</b> Deva Design	

The Area Planning Officer introduced and outlined the application to Members. He reminded Members that the Committee had refused an application for the same property in April 2021 and explained that the difference with this new application was that the roof height had been lowered by 500mm. He explained to Members that the property sloped down and the proposal would be to extend on top of and to the side of the original garage to create a living space. He explained to Members

that Officers considered that the applicant had not overcome the previous reasons for refusal with the small changes made in this new application.

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

***Resolved: That application 21/503219/FULL be refused for the reason set out in the report.***

## **PART 5**

Decisions by the County Council and Secretary of State reported for information.

- **Item 5.1 – 1 New Houses Broom Street Graveney**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

- **Item 5.2 – 24 St Pauls Court Lynsted**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

- **Item 5.3 – Land adj to 1 Seaview Mews Grove Avenue Leysdown**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

A Member thanked the officers for their work but was disappointed in the decision from the Planning Inspectorate considering an earlier decision for a single dwelling on the site had been refused on the same grounds and dismissed at appeal.

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