
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 9 December 2021 from 7.00 pm - 11.18 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock (Substitute for Councillor Paul Stephen), Cameron Beart, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Oliver Eakin, James Hall, James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chairman, in-the-Chair, to be referred to as 'Chairman' for the rest of these minutes), Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Lee McCall (Substitute for Councillor Monique Bonney), Ken Rowles (Substitute for Councillor Tim Gibson), David Simmons, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Billy Attaway, Andy Byrne, Rebecca Corrigan, Philippa Davies, James Freeman, Paul Gregory, Corinna Griffiths, Clare Lydon, Jo Mapp, Julie Oates, Cheryl Parks, Larissa Reed, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Nicholas Hampshire, Alan Horton (remotely), Ken Ingleton (remotely), Pete Neal, Hannah Perkin (remotely), Roger Truelove (remotely), Mike Whiting (remotely) and Corrie Woodford.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Monique Bonney, Simon Clark, Tim Gibson and Paul Stephen.

497 **EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

498 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 November 2021 (Minute Nos. 425 – 430) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

499 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ken Rowles declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 3.1 21/500173/FULL, Land east of Hawes Woods, High Oak Hill, Iwade Road, Newington. Councillor Rowles remained in the Council Chamber with an open mind and intended to debate and vote on the item.

Councillor Mike Baldock declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 3.1 21/500173/FULL, Land east of Hawes Woods, High Oak Hill, Iwade Road, Newington. Councillor Baldock remained in the Council Chamber with an open mind and intended to debate and vote on the item.

Councillor James Hunt declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 3.1 21/500173/FULL, Land east of Hawes Woods, High Oak Hill, Iwade Road, Newington, and had previously made comments on the application. Councillor

Hunt left the Council Chamber during the discussion and as such did not debate or vote on the item.

500 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 November 2021 (Minute Nos. 448 – 449) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

21/504571/FULL GREYSTONE, BANNISTER HILL, BORDEN, ME9 8HU

The Area Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the tabled update for this application, which included comments from Borden Parish Council, an update on highway matters and comments from local residents. Borden Parish Council had considered that there were badgers on the site, however the applicant said there was no evidence of badgers and had asked an ecologist to investigate. The ecologist had also said there was no evidence of badger setts or activity on the site. Kent County Council (KCC) Highways & Transportation had no objection on highway grounds.

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

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 raised concern with the impact of the development on existing neighbours. The Ward Member considered the principle of development to be acceptable at this location, but suggested a bungalow be built, rather than a house. He said it was over-development, there were issues of increased traffic and it would have a significant impact on the Conservation Area.

In the debate that followed, Members raised the following points:

- Concerned with the access road in terms of visibility;
- Plot 4 was very close in proximity to the neighbouring properties;
- a bungalow would be a better option;
- acknowledged that the development would have an impact, but the distance from neighbouring properties was over the minimum distance required;
- whilst some trees had been removed, this had added more light to the site;
- highway issues were an existing problem;
- this was not within the conservation area;
- a single-storey building would not alter any highway issues;
- this was over-development; and
- impact on the conservation area.

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

There was some discussion on the possible reasons for refusal which included: overdevelopment; the impact on neighbouring properties; impact on the conservation area; and highway visibility.

In response, the Conservation & Design Manager explained that the degree of harm to the setting of the conservation area was quite low as the properties were set back on the site, and with some trees on the site it was questionable as to whether this reason would stand-up at any appeal. The Area Planning Officer advised that over-development was not a good reason as the site was large and it was not a dense development.

Some Members noted that comments from KCC Highways & Transportation and the Consultant had concluded that highway issues were not an issue on this development.

Councillor Mike Baldock moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds of over-development in terms of the over-bearing impact on neighbouring properties and the detrimental impact on the setting of the conservation area. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 21/ 504571/FULL be refused on the grounds of over-development in terms of the over-bearing impact on neighbouring properties and the detrimental impact on the setting of the conservation area.

501 DEFERRED ITEMS

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

Def Item 1 REFERENCE NO - 21/504571/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Demolition of existing property and erection of 2no. five bedroom dwellings with associated parking and private amenity space as amended by drawing no's. 21.29_PL_11 Rev A, 21.29_PL_12 Rev B, 21.29_PL13 Rev B, 21.29_PL14 Rev A and 21.29_PL_20.			
ADDRESS Greystone Bannister Hill Borden ME9 8HU			
WARD Borden And Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Borden	APPLICANT Ashbyrne Homes Ltd	
		AGENT Kent Design Partnership	

This item was withdrawn from the agenda and the above application was considered under the Planning Working Group.

DEF ITEM 2 REFERENCE NO - 21/501740/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Erection of a nurse accommodation building, car park and outdoor event space for Demelza. Erection of 30 private residential dwellings, together with associated access, parking, highway works, drainage and landscaping.			

ADDRESS Land At Hill Farm Rook Lane Keycol Hill Bobbing Kent		
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bobbing	APPLICANT Esquire Developments & Demelza Hospice Care For Children AGENT DHA Planning

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application which had previously been considered by the Planning Committee in October 2021. She explained that it was an enabling development to fund Demelza House hospice facilities. The current application included revised developer contributions, with greater Section 106 contributions, additional housing and significant highway improvements. The Senior Planning Officer referred to paragraphs 3.22 to 3.27 of the report which outlined the benefits for the hospice.

Mr Andrew Wilford, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

In the debate that followed, Members raised the following points:

- Welcomed the work carried out by the developer and officers which resulted in increased Section 106 Agreement contributions;
- disappointed with the lack of affordable housing on the site;
- this was over-intensive development and did not consider the site was large enough for 30 dwellings;
- the design of the housing was poor;
- concerned that the 2018 permission had commenced, despite viability arguments;
- three of the nurse units could be considered as affordable housing as key worker accommodation;
- welcomed the junction improvements;
- the air quality issues had now been addressed;
- the enabling aspect of the application outweighed the lack of affordable housing;
- the viability assessment indicated that affordable housing would not have been delivered; and
- the design was much better now.

A Member sought clarification on the 5-year housing supply and the Head of Planning Services advised that it was not currently possible to give a precise figure, but it was hoped this could be given before Christmas this year.

On being put to the vote, Councillor Mike Baldock requested that it be recorded that he voted against the application.

Resolved: That application 21/501740/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (44) in the report and the completion of a suitably-worded Section 106 legal agreement, and with authority to amend the wording of the legal agreement and the planning conditions as reasonably required.

502 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

PART 1

Any other reports to be considered in the public session

1.1 Land at Spade Lane, Hartlip

The Area Planning Officer introduced the report and said that an Article 4 Direction was served at the site in August 2021, removing permitted development rights for temporary uses of land. This remained in force for six months and was due to expire on 12 February 2022 unless confirmed.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

Resolved: That the Article 4 Direction made on 12 August 2021 be confirmed and delegated authority be given to officers to undertake, in consultation with Mid-Kent Legal Services, the preparation of any necessary documentation including site and press notices and that officers carry out any required notification to interested parties and the Secretary of State.

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/503120/REM		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Reserved Matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for erection of 171 dwellings on land at Parcel G pursuant to outline application SW/13/1455.		
ADDRESS Parcel G Land At Harps Farm Land Off Larch End And Lavender Avenue Minster-on-sea Kent		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Jones Homes (Southern) Ltd AGENT

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application. He drew attention to paragraph 2.3 of the report which set-out the dwelling mix for the development, where the figure for two-bedroom dwellings was incorrect. It should be 34 such units as set-out in paragraph 8.6 on page 172 of the report. The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that this was a reserved matters application with 171

dwellings, built in a traditional style, including features such as front-facing gables and bay windows, among other architectural features.

Parish Councillor John Stanford, representing Minster Parish Council spoke against the application.

Matthew Blythin, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

A Ward Member who was also a member of the Committee, spoke against the application. He spoke on the adjacent 60mph road, lack of footpath, lack of infrastructure and dangerous position of the emergency access.

The Chairman moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Baldock.

There was some discussion on the merits of a site meeting and what would be achieved. The Senior Planning Officer drew attention to paragraph 8.22 on page 174 of the report in relation to the footpath and explained that as this was a reserved matters application this did not give the scope to provide any additional off-site footpath at this stage. He explained that this application did provide for footpath linkages into Scocles Road, and details were also shown of a nearby development which benefitted from planning permission and which, under the terms of that permission, secured footpaths along Scocles Road. As a result, the Senior Planning Officer considered that this development provided a convenient route for pedestrians and cyclists to access the services and facilities in Thistle Hill.

On being put to the vote the motion for a site meeting was lost.

In the debate that followed, Members raised the following points:

- There needed to be a condition to ensure there was a wooden farmers fence at the emergency access, rather than metal, to be more in-keeping with the setting;
- the local infrastructure had improved since the outline application;
- it was good that a representative from Minster Parish Council had spoken on the application;
- concerned with the parking fronting the properties and lack of landscaping; and
- land to the front of the dwellings should be saved for a future footpath.

In response, the Senior Planning Officer explained that there was no boundary treatment proposed at the moment along the Scocles Road frontage of the development, but he drew Members' attention to condition (2) in the report and suggested that it could be amended to require details of the boundary treatment in this part of the site. He confirmed that in general between every four parking

spaces there were gaps for landscaping, such as trees and shrubs which also gave bio-diversity benefits. The Senior Planning Officer considered the landscaping scheme would help to ‘soften’ the development, and in terms of the southern part of the Scocles Road frontage was more beneficial than having a footpath in that position which would not connect to any other footpaths.

Resolved: That application 19/503120/REM be approved subject to conditions (1) to (17) in the report, with condition (2) being amended to include details of the boundary treatment along the Scocles Road frontage, including the emergency barrier.

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 21/504219/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Section 73 - Application for minor material amendment to approved plans conditions 1 and 2 (to allow alterations to the internal layouts, elevations and materials of plots 1-7) pursuant to 20/505833/FULL for - Section 73 - Application for Minor Material Amendment to approved plans condition 2 (amendments to plot 1, including raising ridge height, removal of hip end and erection of 4no. dormer windows to garage roof, changes to garage door and additional window in rear elevation of garage, and site layout plan, replacing parking barns with open parking spaces) and Variation of condition 21 (to remove reference to parking barn) pursuant to 17/506294/FULL for - demolition of existing agricultural buildings and erection of 8 no. three and four bedroom detached and semi-detached dwellings with associated garages, parking, landscaping and improvement of existing vehicular access.		
ADDRESS Scocles Farm Phase 1 Scocles Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 3RU		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Michael Withers AGENT Penshurst Planning Ltd

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application. He explained that the development was now completed, but the dwellings had not been built in accordance with the approved plans and planning conditions in terms of elevational treatment, finishes and detailing. The Area Planning Officer said the dwellings had been built with simplified elevations and with less architectural quality than was given permission. He said that although the dwellings were of less quality than approved, he did consider them to be in-keeping with the surrounding development at Thistle Hill. The site was 50 metres away from Scocles Court, a Grade II listed building, but on balance the development was not harmful to the setting of the listed building, taking into account that permission had also been granted for development on land between the site and the listed building.

Parish Councillor John Stanford, representing Minster Parish Council spoke against the application.

Mr Peter Cooper, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

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 spoke on the poor quality of the completed dwellings.

In the debate that followed, Members raised the following points:

- The application that had been granted was a good design;
- UPVC rather than wood was not acceptable;
- needed to ensure the nearby proposed development was a better quality;
- the Council should not accept a different design to that agreed;
- the fenestration needed to be changed;
- the original drawings were more in-keeping than the actual build;
- the developer had applied for one design and built completely differently;
- this was completely different to the Thistle Hill development and did not fit in with the setting of Scocles Road;
- the original application which was approved was aesthetically pleasing;
- changes should be made to return the development to that approved;
- the planning conditions had not been met;
- this could set a precedent;
- needed to think that if this came forward as a proposal, would we accept it?;
- the Council tried to make sure the development as approved was appropriate for the setting of a listed building;
- this did not fit the character of the area;
- this was hideous to what had been agreed; and
- paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) set-out the build quality of dwellings.

In response to some of the points raised, the Conservation & Design Manager referred to paragraph 135 of the NPPF which related to concerns Members had on this application. He said it was sensible to work with the developer to try and improve the quality of the design.

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

Councillor Mike Baldock moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds that the finished product did not meet the original approval, and was contrary to guidance set out in paragraphs 126, 130 and 135 of the NPPF and Policy CP4 of the Local Plan, requiring good design. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt and on being put to the vote, the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 21/504219/FULL be refused on the grounds that the finished product did not meet the original approval, and was contrary to guidance set out in paragraphs 126, 130 and 135 of the NPPF and Policy CP4 of the Local Plan, requiring good design.

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 21/504250/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Section 73 - Application for minor material amendment to condition 2 (to allow alterations to the internal layouts, elevations and materials of Plots 8 and 9) and variation of condition 8 (external finishing materials) pursuant to 18/506573/FULL for - Erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings as replacement for the dwelling permitted on Plot 8 of planning permission 17/506294 granted on 2nd July 2018, with associated parking and landscaping.		
ADDRESS Scocles Farm Phase 1 Scocles Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 3RU		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Michael Withers AGENT Penshurst Planning Ltd

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which was part of the same development as item 2.2 and was for similar retrospective changes to the elevations and detailing of the buildings.

Parish Councillor John Stanford, representing Minster Parish Council spoke against the application.

Mr Peter Cooper, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

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 spoke on the poor quality of the completed dwellings.

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 that the finished product did not meet the original approval, and was contrary to guidance set out in paragraphs 126, 130 and 135 of the NPPF and Policy CP4 of the Local Plan, requiring good design. This was seconded by the Chairman and on being put to the vote, the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 21/504250/FULL be refused on the grounds that the finished product did not meet the original approval, and was contrary to guidance set out in paragraphs 126, 130 and 135 of the NPPF and Policy CP4 of the Local Plan, requiring good design.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 21/500173/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Retrospective application for change of use of land from agricultural to animal rescue including new stock fencing and gates, mobile field shelters, small animal houses, shipping containers for storage, associated boundary treatment and stationing of a mobile caravan for use as a residential unit for staff.			
ADDRESS Land East Of Hawes Woods High Oak Hill Iwade Road Newington Kent ME9 7HY			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL The site is subdivided by Parish Council boundaries. The front section to the east is located within Bobbing Parish Council and immediately to the west towards the rear section of the site sits within the remit of Lower Halstow Parish Council.	APPLICANT The Happy Pants Ranch AGENT	

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application. She explained that this was a retrospective application for a change of use of land from agricultural to animal rescue. The application was within the countryside and outside the built-up area boundaries. The Senior Planning Officer said that although it was in the postal district of Newington, the site was within the parishes of Bobbing and Lower Halstow. Members were shown photographs of the site, in context with the 15-metre buffer of Hawes Wood, and its proximity to ancient woodland. The entrance to the site was off Iwade Road which was a designated Rural Lane. The Senior Planning Officer said that during the summer months, waste material was imported onto the site and Swale Borough Council (SBC) Environmental Health officers had visited the site. A noise abatement order had been issued in relation to noise from animals and a generator on the site. The Senior Planning Officer said that there had been many letters of support for the application and explained that SBC was not against the principle of the scheme, but had concerns, among other issues, against its siting within the 15 metre buffer of Hawes Wood.

In the absence of Julia Bell, a supporter, her speech was read-out by the Democratic Services Officer, in support of the application.

Amey James, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

A visiting Ward Member spoke in support of the application.

In the debate that followed, Members raised the following points:

- There were a lot of challenges with this application;
- needed to bear in mind that this was already agricultural land;
- there was often a range of agricultural buildings in this type of setting in any case;
- there could have been animals on the land if it was being used as a farm, with associated noise issues;
- considered most of the reasons for refusal, and issues, could be addressed with conditions, such as restoration of the buffer zone to the ancient woodland, a fencing condition, a temporary permission could be given, restrict occupation of caravans to the use of animal care, removal of the excess waste;
- benefits of the scheme outweighed the harm;
- the opportunity to receive land like this for a charity was rare, as in many instances cost of land would be prohibitive;
- the Applicant had applied for pre-application advice, the timing and scope of this were queried;
- there was a lack of land coming forward for this type of enterprise; and
- sympathetic to an animal sanctuary but planning considerations could not be overridden.

In response to questions, the Major Projects Officer explained that responses from KCC Highways & Transportation to issues set-out in paragraph 6.4 of the report were included in the tabled paper for this item. The Environment Agency (EA) were in regular contact with SBC officers in terms of the imported waste on the site, and had visited the site earlier in the week. The EA had their own powers, under separate legislation, which they could pursue, regardless of the decision made by the Planning Committee on the application. The Major Projects Officer referred to paragraph 180 of the NPPF which referred in turn to the deterioration of ancient woodland, and that once damaged, was irreplaceable. Paragraph 180 stated that such applications should be refused unless there were exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy. The Major Projects Officer said the key issue was that the application site adjoined an ancient woodland with irreplaceable habitats.

Members made further comments which included:

- The application did not give a bio-diversity net gain;
- needed to take into account material planning considerations;
- acknowledged that some of the issues could be overcome by conditions, but other issues could not;
- there were outstanding issues that the Applicant had not resolved, so even if conditions were added, they would need to be checked for compliance;
- a scheme like this was beneficial to the Borough;

- it seemed as though the application was premature, sympathy with the Applicant but perhaps more input from planning experts was required;
- there were still outstanding issues and not enough information to make a decision;
- there were more questions than answers;
- since work had been carried out on the site there was increased flooding on the rural lanes in the vicinity; and
- the access point needed to be re-located so that it did not affect the 15 metre buffer zone to the ancient woodland.

Councillor Tony Winckless moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site. This was seconded by Councillor Carole Jackson. On being put to vote, the motion was lost.

Debate continued on the substantive motion and the following points were made:

- Concerned that it seemed that waste was still being imported onto the site;
- the Applicant had carried out works on the site that had given rise to officers recommending the application for refusal; and
- what legal action could be taken to address the destruction that had already taken place?

In response, the Planning Lawyer referred to paragraph 180 of the NPPF and explained that an Inspector would take degradation of ancient woodland very seriously. She explained that there would need to be a compensation and/or restoration strategy if the application were to be approved, and work would have to cease straight away. It might be possible to use conditions to secure that if the strategy was not implemented the permission would fall away. The Head of Planning Services advised that if Members were minded, they could defer the application, to allow officers to have further discussions with the Applicant and to allow the Applicant to provide further information requested by officers and the Committee to address their concerns. The application could then be reported back to Committee subsequently, with the updated information including any amended plans/documents and subject to a set of detailed conditions in the event officers felt that sufficient information had been provided to adequately deal with all of the concerns raised in the report and during the Committee's consideration of the application.

In response to questions, the Environmental Enforcement Manager explained that an Abatement Notice had been served on the site earlier in the year, as a result of complaints about the noise of the animals and the generator. Her team had regular contact with the Applicant and had visited the site and were happy with the noise issues at that time, although this would continue to be monitored. The animals in question had been moved to the rear of the site and some had been re-homed. There continued to be reports of noise issues.

Further comments from Members included:

- Sympathetic to the Applicant, but there had been an irreplaceable impact and damage to the setting of the ancient woodland;

- the biodiversity impact of this scheme had been disastrous;
- the Committee needed to be sure they were not rubberstamping the destruction;
- the application could be deferred and the Council work with the Applicant;
- a more suitable location should be found; and
- if the application was deferred, a management plan should be sought.

There was some discussion on the reasons for a deferral.

Councillor Mike Dendor moved the following motion: That the application be deferred for further negotiation with the Applicant and officers to include:

a limited deferral of three months; a management plan; the land to be returned to agricultural use when it was no longer an animal sanctuary; appropriate gating/screening/fencing to be installed; restoration of the 15-metre buffer, with a compensation strategy; restrict occupation of caravans to the use of animal care; satisfactory plans to address the issues outlined in the report, including structures currently sited in the 15-metre buffer to be re-located elsewhere on the site; and the harm to the ancient woodland to be addressed and reported back to consultees for further comments.

In the event that permission be granted in due course, consideration be given to a two year temporary permission for open days and their impact to be monitored. This was seconded by Councillor Oliver Eakin and on being put to the vote, the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 21/500173/FULL deferred for further negotiation with the Applicant and officers to include: a limited deferral of three months; a management plan; the land to be returned to agricultural use when it was no longer an animal sanctuary; appropriate gating/screening/fencing to be installed; restoration of the 15-metre buffer, with a compensation strategy; restrict occupation of caravans to the use of animal care; satisfactory plans to address the issues outlined in the report; the harm to the ancient woodland to be addressed and reported back to consultees for further comments. In the event that permission be granted in due course, consideration be given to a two year temporary permission for open days and their impact to be monitored.

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 21/504369/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Change of use of land and the siting of 4no. specialist residential mobile homes for occupation by persons over 55 as well as associated works to provide infrastructure, access and landscaping.		
ADDRESS Land North of Warden Road Eastchurch Kent ME12 4EN		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mrs Pearson AGENT

		DHA Planning
--	--	--------------

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application and drew attention to the tabled update for this item. He said the application had been submitted as a residential development of park homes style units and explained that the site had previously been used for grazing and had open countryside to the south and east. The Area Planning Officer referred to the Interim Park Homes policy set-out in paragraph 8.23 of the report and said the policy could only be given negligible weight in planning terms.

John Collins, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

In the debate that followed, Members raised the following points:

- This was a suitable location for this type of development;
- this helped to address the need for accommodation for the over-55s and those with mobility issues;
- there was no local objection to the development;
- the site was sustainable;
- there was safe access to the village;
- any harm from the development was out-weighted by the need for housing for the over-55s;
- this site would not be approved for a dwelling;
- the Interim Park Homes policy had not been tested yet;
- the road was very busy and the only safe access to the site was by vehicle;
- if this was approved it could set a precedent for the nearby holiday parks;
- this could result in the Council allowing any type of development in the countryside; and
- the Council was opening itself up to a lot of problems if the application was approved.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer referred to the second reason for refusal and said that a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) payment had not been sought as the application was recommended for refusal. However, if the application was supported then the payment could be requested.

Resolved: That application 21/504369/FULL be refused for the reasons set-out in the report.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – 6 Elm Way Eastchurch**

DELEGATED REFUSAL

APPEAL DISMISSED

A Member congratulated officers.

503 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Meeting was adjourned from 8.32 pm until 8.38 pm and from 10.06 pm until 10.16 pm.

504 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10 pm, 10.30 pm and 11 pm 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