

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 23 June 2022 from 7.00 pm - 10.55 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, Derek Carnell (Substitute for Councillor James Hall), Oliver Eakin, Tim Gibson (Chair), Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Richard Palmer (Substitute for Councillor Elliott Jayes), Ken Rowles, David Simmons, Paul Stephen, Tim Valentine and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Andy Byrne, Flo Churchill, Philippa Davies, Paul Gregory and Cheryl Parks.

**OFFICERS PRESENT (Virtually):** Simon Algar, Billy Attaway, Terry Hardwick and Jim Wilson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Simon Clark and Mike Whiting.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (Virtually):** Councillors Mike Baldock, Lloyd Bowen and Alan Horton.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Richard Darby, James Hall and Elliott Jayes.

### 138 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 139 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 May 2022 (Minute Nos. 771 – 778) and the Reconvened Meeting held on 16 May 2022 (Minute Nos. 779 – 782) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct records.

### 140 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Richard Palmer declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.3 21/506474/FULL Burntwick, The Street, Upchurch as he felt a fair-minded observer might consider he was pre-determined following comments he had made on the application and on item 2.6 21/504388/FULL Woodland Farm, High Oak Hill, Newington. Councillor Palmer spoke as Ward Member on both items and then left the meeting during consideration of the items.

### 141 **Planning Working Group**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 June 2022 (Minute Nos. 78 - 79) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**21/503749/REM Land on the south east side of Bartletts Close, Halfway, Kent, ME12 3EG**

The Chair advised that as the applicant was amending the proposals as a result of the site meeting and with the application being reassessed by officers with any necessary re-consultation, it would be presented to a future meeting in its amended form for determination.

**142 Deferred Items**

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting

<b>DEF ITEM 1 REFERENCE NO - 21/502609/OUT</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Outline application for the erection of up to 10no. residential dwellings with associated landscaping, road layout and parking. (Access being sought).		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land To The East Of Lynsted Lane Lynsted Kent ME9 9QN		
<b>WARD</b> Teynham And Lynsted	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Lynsted With Kingsdown	<b>APPLICANT</b> Eden Real Estate Group Ltd And FPC Income And Growth PLC <b>AGENT</b> ECE Planning Limited

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that two further objections had been received. These raised concerns with lack of parking spaces, increased pollution and other points which had been previously noted in the report. He explained that it was an outline application for the erection of 10 residential dwellings with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale being reserved matters. Detailed consent was sought for the access to the site from Lynsted Lane. The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that the Council did not currently have a five-year housing supply. He said that following the Planning Committee meeting on 10 March 2022, independent highway advice had been sought and the results of this were attached to the committee report.

Parish Councillor Julien Speed, representing Lynsted-with-Kingsdown Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Jacqueline Langdon-Bassett, an objector, spoke against the application.

Sam Sykes, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

A visiting Ward Member gave his apologies due to illness and was unable to speak at the meeting, but he had advised that he was against the application. Another visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Acknowledged the extension of double yellow lines along Lynsted Lane but still had concerns with the lack of visibility from the development to Lynsted Lane which was a narrow lane;
- road safety issues;
- did not consider the 'tilted balance' approach should be applied on this application;
- the site was not sustainable;
- there was a lack of school places, doctors and bus services in Teynham;
- the site was close to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and this scheme would be detrimental to the air quality;
- the application needed to show that there were measures in place to reduce the impact on air quality;
- the application was deferred for more highway information, and Members did not seem happy with the independent highway advice, but could not use highways as a reason for refusal as the Council would lose on appeal;
- the independent highway advice did not consider the junction of Lynsted Lane with the A2 which was often gridlocked; and
- concerned with visibility issues for vehicles travelling north on Lynsted Lane.

In response, the Senior Planning Officer explained that the priority shuttle scheme was included within the updated highway advice, which he outlined and advised that priority was given to south-bound traffic. He said the junction had been assessed by Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation and they had raised no objection. The Major Projects Officer drew Members' attention to the independent highway advice summary on page 52 of the report where they had concluded that the scheme was considered compliant with relevant national and local highway policies, and had concluded that the application was acceptable.

Further comments from Members included:

- It was difficult to accept that the A2 could sustain any more traffic;
- if the Planning Committee was minded to refuse the application, good planning reasons were needed;
- more clarification sought on what the highway consultees were asked to look at, and whether this included the junction with the A2?;
- if the new advice did include the A2 it would be difficult to refuse on those grounds;
- concerned with the pedestrian access to the site: the proposed footpath along Lynsted Lane and the private access through the adjacent joinery business premises and whether these options were acceptable;
- the proposed development was adjacent to a rural lane, with the loss of native hedgerows;
- there was traffic congestion along Lynsted Lane whenever there were roadworks on the A2;
- there was no affordable housing within the scheme;
- detrimental impact on residential amenity;
- would like to see a condition so the access through the joinery yard was not used, but that would undermine the sustainability of the application;
- concerned that the Council was making a decision prior to the results of the bus consultation;

- the path along Lynsted Lane was very narrow;
- the changes to Lynsted Lane would completely change the landscape;
- the application could not be refused on highway grounds due to the advice from the independent highway consultants and KCC Highways and Transportation;
- the Council did not have a five-year housing supply, this development would help;
- this site had come forward in the Local Plan Review as available for housing;
- considered that if the application was approved, that condition (1) be 'tightened-up' in terms of the footpath;
- loss of residential amenity;
- did not understand how the replacement of a field with dwellings could result in a net gain in biodiversity; and
- did not consider the proposed parking for the development was sufficient.

In response, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the remit for the independent advice had included pedestrian access to the site and this was deemed to be acceptable and compliant. He referred to paragraph 2.11 in the report and said there was an option to amend condition (1) to refer to the need to deter new residents from using that route. The Senior Planning Officer explained that a section of the hedgerow would be removed to allow for visibility splays and there would be replacement landscaping. This had been assessed by, amongst others, KCC Ecology and they had advised that a net biodiversity gain across the whole site could be achieved, and a related condition was recommended. The Senior Planning Officer explained that condition (27) could be not amended as the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was outside of the planning process.

The Conservation & Design Manager advised Members that whilst heritage impact was a material planning consideration with a number of listed buildings close to the site, the nature of those listed buildings and the fact that the proposed development was intended to be set back from the road with a strong green frontage would mean that the heritage impact would be low and as such, a heritage related reason for refusal would likely be difficult to sustain in the event of an appeal.

Councillor Ben J Martin moved the following amendment: That condition (1) be amended to require the reserved matters to demonstrate how use of the joinery yard route would be deterred for future residents. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was lost.

There was some discussion on the reasons for refusal and one Member raised visibility issues and another Member suggested that a new, more adequate highway report, was required. At this point, the Planning Lawyer reminded Members that the statutory consultees advice had stated that the scheme met national and local policies, and the new report had been commissioned by the Council and had addressed points raised by the Planning Committee. If there was a further report, the Applicant could appeal and would likely be successful. She highlighted that two separate consultees had concluded that there were no highway concerns with the application. On developments of 10 or less dwellings, there was no requirement for the developer to include affordable housing. The Planning Lawyer referred to the tilted balance where if the harm did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefit, the application should be approved.

A Member suggested that the site not being sustainably located be used as a reason for refusal. The Major Projects Officer explained that as a new pavement was proposed, that would not be a good reason for refusal. Another Member suggested loss of residential amenity to residents on Lynsted Lane, with loss of parking, hedgerows and countryside; and also inadequate amenity for residents in the proposed dwellings.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds of the detrimental impact on the current residential amenity and that the amenities of the new dwellings were inadequate. This was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

At this point the meeting was adjourned for planning officers to seek advice from the Head of Planning Services and the Planning Lawyer.

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the reasons for refusing the application that had been discussed by the Committee and which officers had assisted in formulating into a proposed Reason for Refusal for the Committee to ratify. The proposer and seconder agreed to withdraw the current motion.

Councillor Ben J Martin moved the following motion: That the application be refused on the grounds that the lack of and reduction of services in Teynham since the adoption of the Local Plan resulted in the development being unsustainable, meaning reliance on the private car to access services and facilities in higher order settlements would be required which was contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in terms of moving to a low carbon future. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

***Resolved: That application 21/502609/OUT be refused on the grounds that the lack of and reduction of services in Teynham since the adoption of the Local Plan resulted in the development being unsustainable, meaning reliance on the private car to access services and facilities in higher order settlements would be required which was contrary to the aims of the NPPF in terms of moving to a low carbon future.***

<b>DEF ITEM 2 REFERENCE NO - 21/506021/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Section 73 - Application for variation of condition 3 (to allow take-away to be open 7 days a week from 16:30 to 22:00) pursuant to SW/06/0575 for - Change of use from retail (Class A1) to take-away (Class A5).		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 21 Chaucer Road, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1EZ		
<b>WARD</b>	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Kishore Dey <b>AGENT</b> Architectural Designs

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application and reminded Members that it had previously been considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 10 March 2022 where it had been deferred due to a request for investigation to be carried out over concerns that

the storage room was being used as sleeping accommodation. This had now ceased. The Area Planning Officer explained that the requested opening times sought were to 10 pm, seven days a week. Following consultation with the Environmental Health team, officers had recommended that the opening hours should remain at 9 pm on Monday to Thursday and be extended to 10 pm on Fridays and Saturdays and on Sunday until 8 pm. The Area Planning Officer considered this to be the right balance to meet operational needs and consider residential amenity.

In the absence of Mr Thamsett, the Agent, the Democratic Services Officer read out his statement, in support of the application.

A visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson.

Councillor Tony Winckless moved the following motion: That the application be granted on a temporary basis for one year and then reviewed. This was seconded by Councillor Carole Jackson and on being put to the vote the motion was lost.

Members voted on the substantive motion which was agreed.

***Resolved: That the recommendation in relation to the variation in opening hours for application 21/506021/FULL remains unchanged and is in accordance with the recommended condition presented to the Planning Committee on 10 March 2022: Monday-Thursday - 11.30 am-9 pm; Friday to Saturday - 11.30 am-10 pm; Sundays 4.30 pm-8 pm.***

143 **Schedule of Decisions**

**PART 2**

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO - 21/502972/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Change of use of land and erection of 35no. light industrial units with allocated parking and associated landscaping.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land South East Of A299 Slip Road Off Thanet Way Highstreet Road Hernhill Kent ME13 9EN		
<b>WARD</b> Boughton And Courtenay	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Hernhill	<b>APPLICANT</b> Barton Bridging Capital <b>AGENT</b> Turner Jackson Day Associates

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO - 21/505936/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of 3no. dwellings to replace those demolished under application 19/501984/DEMREQ		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 19-21 Mount Field Queenborough Kent ME11 5DB		
<b>WARD</b> Queenborough And Halfway	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Queenborough	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Q Searle <b>AGENT</b> Building Drawings

The Area Planning Officer introduced the report and explained that further comments had been received from the Environmental Health Officer requiring a condition to install acoustic protection measures to mitigate impacts arising from the proximity to the railway line. He explained that the dwellings were constructed in 2006, but later demolished as they were deemed un-fit for purpose. This application was to erect dwellings of a very similar design and scale to those previous. The only difference on this application was the addition of a small lean-to added to the rear of the properties. The Area Planning Officer said Queenborough Town Council had raised concern with flooding and sewerage issues, and he advised that the applicant had submitted a new flood risk assessment and that both the Environment Agency and Southern Water (SW) had raised no objection.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

The Ward Members who were also members of the Planning Committee spoke on the site’s sewerage issues, which included an inadequate sewerage pumping system.

Councillor Cameron Beart moved the following motion: That the application be deferred and SW be requested to review the sewerage drains in the vicinity to ensure they were fit for purpose. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

***Resolved: That application 21/505936/FULL be deferred and Southern Water be requested to review the sewerage drains in the vicinity to ensure they were fit for purpose.***

<b>2.3 REFERENCE NO - 21/506474/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of 2no. four bedroom semi-detached dwellings and 1no. detached garage, with associated fencing, gates, access and parking.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Burntwick The Street Upchurch Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7EU		
<b>WARD</b> Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Upchurch	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Steve Smith <b>AGENT</b> Mark Carter Associates

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application and drew Members' attention to the tabled update for this item which set-out details of the small degree of harm to heritage assets identified by the Conservation & Design Manager, since the report was written. This also included proposed amendments to the planning conditions. The Area Planning Officer outlined the details of the application site, which was close to the centre of Upchurch, but technically in the countryside. The site was adjacent to the Upchurch Conservation Area boundary and close to St Mary's church which was a Grade I listed building. He considered the development to be fairly discreet, in a backland location. The Area Planning Officer indicated the proposed access to the site which was shared by the village hall and the pub. He acknowledged the low-level heritage impact, but said that officers believed the site, surrounded by other buildings, could accommodate development of this scale and form. The Area Planning Officer said the site was outside of the defined boundary of the village, but as the Council was not able to demonstrate a five-year housing supply, the tilted balance applied to this application.

Parish Councillor Gary Rosewell, representing Upchurch Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Peter Rippengale, an objector, spoke against the application.

Steven Smith, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Ward Members spoke against the application. At this point, Councillor Richard Palmer left the meeting whilst the application was discussed.

A visiting Member spoke against the application.

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

A Member acknowledged the contemporary design of the dwellings but did not consider it was in-keeping due to the proximity of the conservation area and the listed building, and the differing ground levels.

Councillor James Hunt moved a motion for a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed. Councillor Hunt requested that officers spoke with the Applicant to change the design to one that was more in-keeping with the local area, with more traditional elevations and windows to reflect those buildings within the conservation area.

A Member requested that a cross-section with the heights of the neighbouring properties, with the church included, be made available at the site meeting.

***Resolved: That application 21/506474/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.***

<b>2.4 REFERENCE NO - 22/501315/FULL</b>
--

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

Raising of roof height and insertion of dormer window and roof lights together with two storey front and rear extension as amended by drawing No. 01.22.09C.
--



<b>ADDRESS</b> St Mawes The Street Borden Kent ME9 8JN		
<b>WARD</b> Borden And Grove Park	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Borden	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Scott Hawkins <b>AGENT</b> Jane Elizabeth Architects

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which was to enlarge and re-model an existing bungalow located in the built-up area boundary of Borden. The proposals would increase the main ridgeline of the bungalow by 0.7 metres, and there would be a 4-metre extension to the rear. He considered it to be a significant improvement on the existing dwelling, that it was well designed and would sit comfortably in its surroundings and enhance the conservation area.

Mrs Wendy Esler, an objector, spoke against the application.

A visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

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

The Conservation & Design Manager was invited to speak on the application and explained that the current bungalow had a neutral impact on the conservation area. He acknowledged the concerns raised but said the test was whether the development would preserve or enhance the appearance of the conservation area. The Conservation & Design Manager said that it was neither a change for the better or for the worse, but that it broadly preserved the character and appearance of the conservation area. There was a wide variety of building materials used in the local area, and the weather boarding was not out of character. He summarised by saying the overall impact was a neutral one.

Members considered the application and points raised included:

- The black cladding did not fit in with the streetscene and did not contribute to the conservation area;
- this needed to be a good design; and
- the proposed changes did not suit the neighbouring property.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer explained that the gap between this property and the neighbouring one was 6.7 metres in total, with the proposed dwelling being 4.5 metres from the boundary fence.

Other points raised included:

- The distances between the dwellings were acceptable in planning terms, but needed to consider what rooms would be overshadowed; and
- the design was good, but did not suit the streetscene.

The Area Planning Officer advised that this property was on the northern side of the neighbour to the south, so the potential for loss of light was limited.

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow for further discussion with Ward Members to determine an improved design and look at any potential loss of light issues with the neighbouring properties. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney. On being put to the vote, the motion was agreed.

***Resolved: That application 22/501315/FULL be deferred to allow for further discussion with Ward Members to determine an improved design and look at any potential loss of light issues with the neighbouring properties.***

<b>2.5 REFERENCE NO - 22/501387/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Installation of a Dropped Kerb to accommodate a front driveway			
<b>ADDRESS</b> 2 All Saints View Seasalter Road Graveney Faversham Kent ME13 9EB			
<b>WARD</b> Boughton And Courtenay	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Graveney With Goodnestone	<b>APPLICANT</b> AJE Properties	<b>AGENT</b>

The Area Planning Officer introduced the item and explained that KCC Highways and Transportation raised no objection to the application and noted that it would mean the removal of a parked car from the road. Graveney-with-Goodnestone Parish Council raised objection on the grounds that a vehicle would be reverse exiting from the property onto a busy road.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

A Member raised concern with a vehicle having to reverse out onto a busy road and the Area Planning Officer explained that it was a classified road, with good visibility and reversal onto the road could be carried out safely with caution.

***Resolved: That application 22/501387/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.***

<b>2.6 REFERENCE NO - 21/504388/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of a permanent agricultural dwelling with associated parking.			
<b>ADDRESS</b> Woodland Farm High Oak Hill Iwade Road Newington Kent ME9 7HY			
<b>WARD</b> Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Bobbing	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Jy Stedman	<b>AGENT</b> Consilium Town Planning Services Limited

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application for the erection of a permanent agricultural dwelling which would replace the existing mobile home. He explained that the farming business was well established and there was a need for on-site presence. The main consideration had been the scale and visual impact of the proposed dwelling. The scale had now been reduced and the applicants had advised that part of the dwelling would be used for the operation of their business which included an office and boot room.

The Area Planning Officer referred Members to paragraph 8.8 in the report which set-out that the current NPPF was less explicit in terms of the scale of the dwelling in relation to the size of the business than was the case with former advice in Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7). He explained that the proposed building would be 212 square metres, but out of that, 168 square metres would be used as the living area. The Area Planning Officer added that the site was not visible from nearby footpaths or from the church because of the topography of the area and screening and as such he considered the proposal to be acceptable.

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

Andrew Street, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

A Ward Member spoke against the application. At this point, Councillor Richard Palmer left the meeting whilst the application was discussed.

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

Members considered the application and points raised included:

- Initially concerned with the scale of the dwelling;
- it would have an impact on an area of high landscape value;
- this could end up being a purely residential dwelling with no link to the land;
- the immediate setting was rural and the proposed dwelling did not enhance it;
- sympathetic to the need for accommodation on the site, and the continued use of the mobile home was not acceptable;
- there needed to be on-site presence; and
- this was more like a family home than farm accommodation.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following amendment: That a condition be added to control the use of external lighting. This was seconded by Councillor David Simmons. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Members made additional comments which included:

- Welcomed conditions (18) and (19) which were very important;
- the application, for the size of the farm, was not out-of-keeping and was for the use of the farmer and his family; and
- the proposed dwelling was a standard size for a working farm.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer explained that condition (17) in the report required the existing mobile home to be removed from the site within three months of the new dwelling being occupied.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following amendment: That a Section 106 Agreement be secured to tie the agricultural use of the dwelling to the land. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**Resolved: That application 21/504388/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (19) in the report, an additional condition to control any external lighting and a Section 106 Agreement to tie the agricultural use of the dwelling to the land.**

**PART 3**

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO - 22/501078/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Retrospective application for a change of use of agricultural land to residential and erection of detached double garage.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Cripps Farm Plough Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 4JH		
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey East	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Minster-On-Sea	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr David Buckley <b>AGENT</b> Wyndham Jordan Architects

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that the garage had not been built where it should have been and was slightly larger than what had been granted. He explained that the garage had not been built within the residential curtilage and it encroached into the open countryside and as such was not supported by policy.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

Members considered the application and points raised included:

- This was outside the built-up boundary;
- enforcement action should be taken;
- disappointed that it was a retrospective application and not built where agreed; and
- the new site of the garage was in fact in a better position for the neighbouring resident, and it was less visible from the road.

**Resolved: That application 22/501078/FULL be refused for the reason given in the report.**

**PART 5**

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

- **Item 5.1 – 11 Challenger Close, Sittingbourne**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

- **Item 5.2 – Iris Cottage, Elmley Road, Minster**  
**DELEGATED REFUSAL**  
**APPEAL DISMISSED**
  
- **Item 5.3 – Kemsdale Stud Farm, Kemsdale Road, Hernhill, Faversham**  
**DELEGATED REFUSAL**  
**APPEAL DISMISSED**
  
- **Item 5.4 – New Acres Spade Lane Hartlip**  
**DELEGATED REFUSAL**  
**APPEAL A ALLOWED**  
**APPEAL B DISMISSED AND COSTS REFUSED**

Members welcomed the results.

**144 Adjournment of Meeting**

The Meeting was adjourned from 8.22 pm until 8.43 pm.

**145 Suspension of Standing Orders**

At 10 pm and 10.30 pm Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders in order that the Committee could complete its business.

Chair

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