

---

## PLANNING WORKING GROUP

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held at the sites listed below on Tuesday, 1 March 2022 from 10.00 am - 12.58 pm.

**642 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

**643 20/505921/OUT LAND AT HIGHFIELD ROAD, MINSTER-ON-SEA, SHEERNESS, ME12 3BA**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cameron Beart, Simon Clark, Richard Darby, Tim Gibson (Chairman), James Hall, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chairman), David Simmons, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Billy Attaway, James Freeman, Elizabeth Jump and Alun Millard.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Monique Bonney, Mike Dendor, Oliver Eakin, James Hunt, Peter Marchington and Paul Stephen.

The Chairman welcomed the Agent, members of the public and Members to the meeting.

The Planning Officer introduced the application which sought planning permission, all matters reserved aside from access, for 16 residential dwellings and a scheme to include approximately 0.7 hectares of open space and community orchard. She stated that the application was outside of the settlement boundary and fell within an Important Countryside Gap, and that the site was within a sustainable location within walking distance of local amenities and transport links. She referred to the appeal decision for a similar decision at Bartletts Close, Halfway where the Planning Inspector had approved the application and considered that whilst the site was outside the settlement boundary and within an Important Countryside Gap it was acceptable.

Members of the public raised the following issues:

- If the development went ahead there would be hardly anywhere for the wildlife on the Isle of Sheppey;
- the development would cause harm to wildlife;
- the land used to be grazing land and hoped to see it returned to grazing land;
- this 'countryside gap' was essential in maintaining countryside on the Isle of Sheppey;
- feared that the land next to the proposed development would be used in the future to build even more homes on a small site;
- a reservoir nearby was causing leaks to neighbouring properties and this development would make it worse;

- concerned with service and construction vehicles getting to the site as the access road and surrounding roads were not wide enough;
- there were too many blind spots down Highfield Road and it was too small for large vehicles to turn around;
- concerned that Highfield Road would be used as a 'rat run' for vehicles avoiding the main road;
- did the traffic assessment plan take residents parked vehicles into consideration?; and
- Highfield Road was a residential road not a road suitable for construction traffic and extra housing.

The Applicant's Agent made the following points:

- A community orchard and open space would be built to help encourage biodiversity and wildlife to the site;
- transport consultants had undertaken a transport assessment based on 19 dwellings and helped the applicant design access to the site in line with the transport assessment;
- the development would provide enough parking facilities on-site;
- the number of construction vehicles being used on the site was very small and would have little impact on the surrounding roads; and
- landscaping designs had been made to mitigate the impact of landscaping views on the surrounding areas.

A Ward Member thanked the members of public for coming along to the meeting and hoped that Members had taken into consideration the local residents' concerns.

A Member sought clarification from the Applicant's agent on the location of the proposed sites and the Applicant's agent showed the Member the proposed parameter plan of the site.

Members viewed the application site with officers.

**644 21/502609/OUT LAND TO THE EAST OF LYNSTED LANE, LYNSTED, ME9 9QN**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cameron Beart, Simon Clark, Richard Darby, Tim Gibson (Chairman), James Hall, Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chairman), David Simmons, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Philippa Davies, James Freeman, Paul Gregory and Alun Millard.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Lloyd Bowen and Mike Whiting.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Monique Bonney, Mike Dendor, Oliver Eakin, James Hunt, Peter Marchington and Paul Stephen.

The Chairman welcomed the Applicant, a representative from Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council, members of the public and Members to the meeting.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application which sought outline planning permission for up to 10 residential dwellings with associated landscaping and parking. Matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale were reserved, with access to be considered in detail as part of this current application. He said there would be a new access point from Lynsted Lane along the western boundary with the loss of about 45-50 metres of hedgerow. Additional planting, measuring approximately 55 metres, would be planted. Pedestrian access to the site was available next to the joinery which connected the site to the A2. Off-site highway works to increase the width of the footpath along Lynsted Lane from 1.2 metres to 1.5 metres were also proposed. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the site was not allocated for housing in the Local Plan; that there were three listed buildings close to the site and there was an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Teynham. He confirmed that the site was not subject to, or adjoined, a local or national landscape designation. Sixty letters of objection had been received and Teynham Parish Council and Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council had objected to the application. The Senior Planning Officer said that technical consultees including Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation, KCC Ecology and Swale's Environmental Health had raised no objection, subject to relevant conditions. He summarised by saying that the Council did not currently have a 5-year housing supply, it was a sustainable development, close to existing services and facilities and together with conditions and a Section 106 Agreement he considered the application to be acceptable.

A representative from Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council spoke against the application and raised the following issues:

- The proposed pedestrian access through the adjoining joiners yard was a health and safety risk, and the gate was locked at weekends;
- the application had been submitted three times and not approved because it was flawed, this application was flawed as well;
- concerned with how construction traffic would access the site;
- Lynsted Lane would result in a single-file pinch point towards the junction with the A2;
- there were proposals for housing to the west of the site, plus the potential for more on this site;
- the application should be refused as housing was not included on this site in the Local Plan; and
- this was contrary to the identified countryside gap between Teynham and Lynsted.

Members of the public raised objections to the application in respect of:

- The pedestrian right of way going through the joiners yard, this was not viable when the owners were trying to run a business there;
- the mitigation measures proposed for Lynsted Lane impacted sightlines for vehicles travelling to and from the A2, with potential danger to pedestrians and cyclists;
- problems with traffic backing-up on the A2 and Lynsted Lane;
- the footpath was not continuous along Lynsted Lane;
- vehicles which currently parked on Lynsted Lane would be displaced;

- pollution and congestion issues especially at peak travelling times;
- fumes from idling vehicles;
- the traffic movements had been under estimated;
- issues with drainage if access to the site was sloped;
- overlooking onto Lynsted Lane;
- there was already traffic congestion on Lynsted Lane with agricultural vehicles, buses, delivery vans and emergency vehicles, with constant traffic jams and idling vehicles;
- elderly people needed to park outside their houses, not be displaced elsewhere;
- much of Lynsted Lane was single file traffic;
- needed to consider the heritage assets of the three nearby listed buildings and the impact of the development on them;
- the disadvantages of the scheme outweighed any benefits; and
- the environmental impact of cutting down hedgerows, with loss of wildlife.

In response to a specific query, the Senior Planning Officer advised that there would be compensatory parking spaces within the site. He confirmed that the compensatory parking spaces related to vehicles already on the network and therefore this matter did not impact upon the expected vehicle movements generated by the proposed development, as suggested by a member of the public.

The Applicant explained that the variation in levels was 0.5 metres and that drainage measures including attenuation tanks and soakaways would be in place. He explained that the mitigation measures on Lynsted Lane would make the lane more pedestrian and cycle friendly, and the site was sustainable as it was close to the A2 and nearby shops. The Applicant explained that there would be two parking spaces per new dwelling on the site and said that the improvements to Lynsted Lane would not affect the southern end of the lane, and the mitigation measures could not solve all the parking issues.

The Ward Members spoke in objection to the application and raised the following points:

- Access to the site was not suitable;
- it was unfair that residents would be expected to park elsewhere and cross the road to get to a car parking space, especially at night
- this was not a suitable site for development; and
- Lynsted Lane could not cope with the current traffic numbers.

The Senior Development Planner responded to a question regarding the different response to the planning application to the west of the site and he noted that it was of a much larger scale. He said the effect of this application for an additional 10 dwellings, with five vehicle movements expected in each of the peak hours, both morning and evening was not considered to have a material impact on the existing volume of traffic using Lynsted Lane. The Senior Development Planner said the proposed development gave the opportunity to formalise what was in place now and provide mitigation for lost parking. He explained that the proposed pathway varied in width from 1.5 metres to 1.2 metres and this was an improvement to the existing situation that would provide a footpath link from Lynsted Lane to the A2. In

response to a question, he explained that waiting restrictions would be put in place to stop people parking on the footpaths along Lynsted Lane.

Members viewed the application site from Lynsted Lane and were shown the issues along the lane raised by local residents.

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