
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 18 August 2022 from 7.00 pm - 10.14 pm.

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

OFFICERS PRESENT: William Allwood, Flo Churchill, Emma Gore, Andrew Jeffers, Kellie MacKenzie, Cheryl Parks and Alexis Stanyer.

OFFICERS PRESENT (Virtually): Simon Algar, Billy Attaway, Andrew Lainton and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (Virtually): Councillor Ken Ingleton.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Monique Bonney, James Hunt and Paul Stephen.

245 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

246 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 July 2022 (Minute Nos. 201 – 208) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

247 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Mike Baldock declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of 2.2 21/505544/FULL Hillyfield Hearts Delight, Borden, as he had called in the application. Councillor Baldock advised that he had not made his mind up about the application and was not predetermined.

Councillor David Simmons declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of Agenda 2.1 21/502545/FULL Railway Depot Station Road, Faversham as he was Chair of the Trustees of the Municipal Charities who owned the adjoining recreation ground.

Councillor Carole Jackson declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of Agenda 2.1 21/502545/FULL Railway Depot Station Road, Faversham as she was a Trustee of the Municipal Charities who owned the adjoining recreation ground.

248 **Planning Working Group**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 August 2022 (Minute Nos. 230 – 231) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

21/503124/OUT Land North of Elm Lane, Minster-on-Sea

The Council's Planning Consultant referred to the tabled update which set out responses to questions raised by a Ward Member and which had previously been emailed to Members.

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

A Ward Member, who was also a member of the Planning Committee, thanked Members who had attended the site meeting. He spoke against the application and was disappointed that Kent County Council (KCC) had not responded to some of the questions he had raised. The Member referred to the last paragraph of page three of the update and considered that the report was littered with errors and that the application should be refused.

A Member explained that one of the ward members, Councillor Pete Neal, had hoped to attend the meeting but was unable to.

The Chair invited Members to comment on the application. Members raised points which included:

- Referred to a letter on the planning portal from KCC Flood and Water Management received on 19 July 2022 which pointed out a number of ambiguities in the report from HSP Consulting which the Member also noted was missing a number of appendices. Would that be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage?;
- the update was inaccurate as only one bus service on the Isle of Sheppey was subsidised and that service was currently proposed for withdrawal;
- concerned about the location of the proposed access road, which would result in numbers 65 and 69 Drake Avenue having to endure traffic noise and pollution;
- the development would cross a countryside gap;
- concerned that land used as paddocks was classed as brownfield and that left a lot of land south of the A2 very vulnerable to development;
- it was a shame that the Sheppey Light Railway had been lost;
- had National Highways (NH) been consulted on the impacts to junction 5 of the M2? NH had imposed a Grampian condition prohibiting development that would impact on the A249 Grovehurst Road, Sittingbourne and Stockbury roundabout, until improvements there had been completed;
- outlined the benefits of the application; and
- there were no justified planning reasons to refuse the application.

In response, the Planning Consultant confirmed that a final Flood Risk Assessment could be requested at the Reserved Matters stage. There were legal requirements to consult NH and they had no duty to comment on this development as it did not affect the trunk road network. The Grampian conditions would be lifted by 2024-25 due to the various improvements to Trunk roads and roundabouts.

A Ward Member, who was also a Member of the Planning Committee, referred to the Planning Inspector's decision for a site at Jubilee Fields, Upchurch refused on appeal where the Inspector had commented that the Council's lack of 5-year housing supply was a concern but not "acute". He added that the site was not in a sustainable location. The Planning Consultant stated that particular appeal needed to be read as a whole and had

other landscaping issues that this application did not. Each case needed to be considered on its own merits and the decision did not disapply the tilted balance test.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.1.18(2), a recorded vote was taken, and voting was as follows:

For: Gibson, Henderson, Martin, Rowles and Simmons. Total = 5.

Against: Baldock, Beart, Knights, Darby, Eakin, Hall, Dendor, Jayes, Marchington and Winckless. Total = 10.

Abstain: Jackson and Valentine. Total = 2.

The motion to approve the application was lost.

At this point the Senior Lawyer (Planning) reminded Members that the tilted balance always applied when there was less than a 5-year supply of housing. She clarified that Planning Inspector's reports were not case law or binding, only persuasive. She asked Members to consider when formulating any reason to refuse the application that the Committee's function was to consider the planning benefits, merits and the planning harms. The Committee needed to evidence any harms of the application which outweighed the benefits significantly and demonstrably as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The following reasons for refusal were put forward by Members:

- The access road would affect existing properties at 65 and 69 Drake Avenue in terms of noise and air pollution; and
- impact on the local amenity of residents; and
- loss of open countryside.

In the discussion that followed the Planning Consultant suggested the following reason for refusal: In applying the tilted balance the harm to loss of countryside, and loss of amenity from the construction of the access outweighed the planning benefits.

In response to a question from a Member, the Senior Lawyer (Planning) confirmed that the land was brownfield land as it was within equestrian use and as such, having undergone a change of use, was considered Previously Developed Land.

Councillor Ben Martin moved the following motion to refuse the application: In applying the tilted balance the harm to loss of countryside, and loss of amenity from the use of the access outweighs the planning benefits.

This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson.

The Design and Conservation Manager suggested a slight amendment to the motion, that the word "and use" be included after the word "construction". This was agreed by the proposer and seconder of the original motion.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.1.18(2), a recorded vote was taken, and voting was as follows:

For: Baldock, Beart, Darby, Dendor, Eakin, Hall, Henderson, Jackson, Jaynes, Knights, Marchington, Rowles, Winckless. Total = 13.

Against: Gibson, Martin and Simmons. Total = 3.

Abstain: Valentine. Total = 1.

Resolved: That application 21/503124/OUT be refused on the grounds that in applying the tilted balance the harm to loss of countryside, and loss of amenity from the construction and use of the access outweighed the planning benefits.

249 **Deferred Items**

Reports shown in previous Minutes as being deferred from that Meeting.

Deferred Item 1 REFERENCE NO 21/505461/PSINF		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
The construction of two houseblocks to provide criminal justice accommodation for 120 prisoners, along with a proposed record store, library, office and extension to the existing visitor car park (40 spaces).		
ADDRESS HMP Standford Hill, Church Road, Eastchurch, ME12 4AA		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT MOJ
Sheppey East	Eastchurch	AGENT Cushman & Wakefield

The Major Projects Officer introduced the application and drew attention to the tabled update which included: further comments from Eastchurch Parish Council objecting due to highway safety concerns; further comments from KCC Highways and the Council’s Independent Highway Consultant raising no objection. The Major Projects Officer drew attention to condition (33) of the report which required a Travel Plan and officers concluded that the application should be approved subject to conditions as set-out in the report.

Parish Councillor Kathleen Carter, representing Eastchurch Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Katharine Morgan, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member, also a Member of the Planning Committee, spoke against the application. He said it would have an adverse impact on the local road network and health provision in the area. He asked whether improvements to the already stretched local healthcare could be sought via a Section 106 Agreement, and whether the Swale Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) had been consulted?

The Major Projects Officer said that he was not aware that improvements for local healthcare had been sought for any other applications at the prisons, and it was not something that could be imposed.

The Chair invited Members to debate the application. Members raised points which included:

- Agreed in principle to the application; and
- concerned about the highway impact of the application particularly in Church Road, Eastchurch but the Council’s independent consultant agreed with KCC’s comments so had to support the application.

In response to a query about why prisoners were not included in the Council’s housing numbers when care home residents were, The Interim Head of Planning Services stated there was a fundamental difference between care homes and prisons as prisoners did not have a choice. A Member warned that if prisoners were included in the housing numbers, they would then qualify for housing in the Borough after their release.

Resolved: That application 21/505461/PSINF be approved subject to conditions (1) to (33) in the report.

Deferred Item 2 REFERENCE NO 22/501315/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL 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.		
ADDRESS St Mawes, The Street, Borden, Kent ME9 8JN.		
WARD Borden and Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Borden	APPLICANT Mr Scott Hawkins AGENT Jane Elizabeth Architects

The Development Manager introduced the application and outlined details of the application site. He explained that following discussions with the applicant, black was considered the most appropriate colour for the weatherboarding and would be in-keeping with the area.

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

A Ward Member, also a Member of the Planning Committee, read out the resolution from the meeting on 23 June 2022, as set-out on page 121 of the report, when it was agreed to defer the application. He said that despite it being agreed that Ward Members be approached to “determine an improved design” that did not happen. He raised concern that a resolution of the Planning Committee had not been acted upon. He recommended that the application should be refused as it was not in-keeping with the streetscene.

Councillor Tony Winckless moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow 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 Ken Rowles.

The Design and Conservation Manager said that following the deferral, officers had liaised with the applicant about concerns regarding the design, however the applicant was unwilling to make changes hence why the same proposal was before Members. The Design and Conservation Manager considered that it was a finely balanced application, but it would be difficult to defend refusal of the application, at any subsequent appeal.

A Member suggested that if the applicant was unwilling to make changes the recommendation should be refusal. The Ward Member said he would support referral or refusal.

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.

Deferred Item 3 REFERENCE NO 21/500204/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Demolition of existing public house and erection of a mixed-use building providing a micro pub (54 square metres) and 8 no. flats with associated parking, amenity space and cycle storage.		
ADDRESS old House at Home, 158-162 High Street, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 1UQ		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr M McAllister
Sheerness	Sheerness Town Council	AGENT Kent Design Partnership

The Planner introduced the application and outlined the details of the application site for Members. She reminded them that the application had been deferred at the May 2022 meeting to allow the applicant to improve the design of the proposed building. The applicant had amended the design of the building and submitted an amended site plan which she showed the Committee. The Planner drew attention to the tabled update, previously circulated to Members which provided consultee responses from: Kent Police who requested an additional condition; KCC Highways raised no objection; KCC Flood and Water Management Team raised no further comments; the Environment Agency raised no objection; Swale Borough Council's (SBC) Environmental Health Team raised no objection subject to conditions; Natural England raised no objection; and SBC's Conservation Officer raised no objection subject to a minor amendment to condition (19). The Planner reported that Southern Water (SW) had commented late on the application, and this was tabled for Members. SW had provided some advisories related to drainage and they would be included as informatives to the application.

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

A Ward Member welcomed the amended design and noted that Sheerness Town Council, who had previously objected, now raised no comment.

The Chair invited Members to debate the application, and points raised included:

- Congratulated the applicants on the amended design which he considered was far more suitable and in-keeping with the Conservation Area;
- congratulated officers in achieving an improved design.

A Member moved the following addendum: That on condition (24) in respect of the architectural work, the wording “and where possible retained” be added to the end of the reason. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson.

Discussion ensued and the Design and Conservation Manager advised that it was usual for archaeological items of interests to be photographed, but it would be possible to delegate to officers for suitable wording of the condition. The Interim Head of Planning Services added that the amended wording would need to clearly indicate who would be the depositary for such items.

A Member suggested including the wording “offer to historic societies”. The was agreed by the proposer and seconder of the addendum. On being put to the vote the addendum was agreed.

Resolved: That application 21/500204/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (28) in the report, the additional conditions, amended conditions and informatives as set-out in the tabled updates and the reason for condition (24) be amended to include the words and where possible retained and offered to historic societies.

250 **Schedule of Decisions**

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO 21/502545/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Residential and commercial development comprising of 32no. residential units and 246 sqm of commercial space (Class E Use), with associated parking and amenity areas.		
ADDRESS Railway Depot, Station Road, Faversham, ME13 8GE		
WARD Abbey	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT George Wilson Developments AGENT Hobbs Parker Property Consultants

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined the details of the application site for Members. She drew attention to the tabled updates, the first of which included updates on: developer contributions; access to Jubilee Way; and comments from the Council’s Open Space Manager and had previously been circulated to Members. The

second tabled update which had been received just prior to the meeting, was a letter from Network Rail objecting to the application.

Town Councillor Julian Saunders, representing Faversham Town Council (FTC), spoke against the application.

Josh Wilson, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member, also a Member of the Planning Committee, spoke in support of the application.

The Chair invited Members to debate the application, and Members raised points which included:

- Good design and environmental aspects welcome;
- considered it was a good proposal;
- good use of a brownfield site;
- it was an accessible site;
- appreciated the comments of FTC, however a simple access could be provided;
- there was a pedestrian and cycle route to the recreation ground;
- the site was included in the Faversham Neighbourhood Plan;
- it would be a vast improvement on what was currently there;
- welcomed provision of a medical practice;
- if refused the Council would not be able to win any subsequent appeal;
- welcomed the application and hoped that an additional pedestrian access to Jubilee Way, Faversham would come forward;
- asked officers to ensure that the residential amenity of the residents of Preston Malthouse was protected given the topography of the land which meant some windows were below street level;
- welcomed the affordable housing and design;
- had potential complaints from the noise of the railway been considered?;
- suggested that via a Section 106 Agreement a ramp be provided to allow cycle access to Jubilee Way;
- needed to provide light mitigation measures; and
- Network Rail had not objected to other developments closer to the railway line.

In response the Senior Planning Officer drew attention to condition (28) of the report which requested details of all noise mitigation measures to be submitted. She said that residents should be able to mitigate against any light pollution.

Resolved: That application 21/502545/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (43) in the report and the amended developer contributions as set-out in the tabled update.

2.2 REFERENCE NO – 21/505544/FULL
--

APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Revision to extant planning permission SW/96/0620 for the demolition of 1 bungalow and garage and the erection of 6 no. houses, garages and parking. Widening of Washley Hill, provision of a pedestrian footpath from Hearts Delight Road, closure of existing vehicular access and provision of new, relocated access, along with wildlife enhancements AS AMENDED BY DRAWINGS RECEIVED ON 9 TH FEB 2022 and 10 TH MARCH 2022.		
ADDRESS Hillyfield Hearts Delight Borden Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8HX		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Hillyfield Development Ltd
Borden and Grove Park	Borden	AGENT Alpha Design Studio Limited

The Faversham Area Team Leader introduced the application and outlined the details of the application site for Members. He reported that there were no objections from the statutory consultees and referred Members to page 245 of the report, which set-out the comments of the Council’s Design and Conservation Manager who raised no objection. The Faversham Area Team Leader also drew attention to page 237 of the report, which set-out the sustainable measures incorporated within the site which would not have been included within the original planning approval granted in 1996.

Clive Jenkins, an objector, spoke against the application.

Klaire Lander, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

A Ward Member, also a Member of the Planning Committee, spoke against the application. He raised the following concerns:

- Poor design;
- out-of-keeping with the rural area;
- the Design and Conservation Officer stated that it would not have a significant impact but that view was subjective;
- would have a detrimental impact on Hearts Delight Road;
- the site was often used by dog walkers who would be forced out onto the road;
- would not affect the Council’s 5-year housing supply;
- would have a negative impact on the approach to the village; and
- the footpath was on the wrong side.

The Chair invited Members to debate the application, and comments raised included:

- Many villages developed over hundreds of years, and this was a developing scene;
- supported the application and liked the design; and
- this was a good addition to the area.

In response the Design and Conservation Manager said there was a variation of architectural designs in Hearts Delight Road, Borden. He noted that more landscaping

was planned as part of the application and considered the development would have limited visibility to the Hearts Delight Conservation Area. He appreciated the Ward Member's preference for a more traditional design but said it would be difficult to use that as a reason to refuse the application at any subsequent appeal.

Resolved: That application 19/502484/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (22) in the report.

2.3 REFERENCE NO – 22/500007/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use of former bus depot (Sui Generis) to vehicle servicing and repair business (Class B2) and construction of additional workshop unit.		
ADDRESS Sheerness Bus Station, Bridge Road, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 1RH		
WARD Sheerness	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Sheerness Town Council	APPLICANT WP Commercials Ltd AGENT Kevin Wise Town Planning

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

2.4 REFERENCE NO – 22/502863/FULL & 22/502864/LBC		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Alterations to entrance gates to enable easier and safer vehicular access to the parking area, including the addition of a pedestrian gate for day to day use. Reinstatement of wood burner and flue to main dwelling.		
ADDRESS The Stables Sweepstakes Farm Lower Hartlip Road Hartlip Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7TU		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hartlip	APPLICANT Mr Gary Payne AGENT

The Development Manager introduced the application and outlined the details of the application for Members.

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

A Member did not consider the proposal would be harmful to the area.

Resolved: That application 22/502863/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (4) in the report.

Resolved: That application 22/502864/LBC be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.

2.5 REFERENCE NO – 22/502679/ADV		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Advertisement Consent for 1no. non-illuminated hoarding signage board.		
ADDRESS Manor Farm, Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YU		
WARD Borden and Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Borden	APPLICANT Miss Teresa Rolfe AGENT

The Development Manager introduced the application for Members. He considered that the sign was well screened by existing vegetation and was within the built-up area of Sittingbourne. He drew Members attention to condition (6) on page 286 of the report, which allowed consent for six months only.

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

A Ward Member spoke against the application. He considered it was a premature and an unnecessary sign in the open countryside and went against 4.1 of the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

The Chair invited Members to debate the application and points raised included:

- Had viewed the site and the sign was not obtrusive and screened by trees;
- the sign was unnecessary;
- not sure this should be allowed because it was not obtrusive there had to be a need for the sign and there was not; and
- the Council had approved much larger signs so did not have a problem with the application.

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

The Development Manager explained that under the Advertisement Regulations there were certain issues that could not be considered reasons for refusal. He advised Members that they needed to focus on amenity and highway safety when considering their potential reasons for refusal. He advised that Members might wish to include something regarding impact on the existing streetscene. The Interim Head of Planning Services clarified that advert consent could not be refused on grounds of need or the content of the proposed sign.

Councillor Mike Baldock moved the following motion: That the application be refused due to its visual impact on the existing streetscene and it was against 4.1 of the Council’s SPG. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless.

At this point, and to assist Members in formulating a reason for refusal, the Senior Lawyer (Planning) drew attention to paragraph three of the appeal decision for item 5.9 on page 397 of the report in respect of an advertisement.

Councillor Mike Baldock advised that he would like to include “the impact on the general characteristics of the locality”. This was agreed by the seconder of the motion to refuse.

On being put to the vote the motion to refuse the application was agreed.

Resolved: That application 22/502679/ADV be refused due to its visual impact on the existing streetscene, the impact on the general characteristics of the locality and it was against 4.1 of the Council’s SPG.

2.6 REFERENCE NO – 21/506750/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Construction of a 4 storey (Category B) houseblock for up to 247 prisoners, a new workshop, a staff administration building, extension to existing property store, extension to existing sports store, new 7-a-side sports pitch, new 3G MUGA pitch, extension to the existing car park (80 spaces) and realignment of existing containment fencing at HMP Elmley Category B/C Prison.			
ADDRESS HMP Elmley, Church Road, Eastchurch, ME12 4DZ			
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Ministry of Justice AGENT Cushman & Wakefield	

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined the details of the application site for Members. She referred to the tabled update which had previously been circulated to Members and set-out the further comments of KCC Highways and the Council’s independent traffic consult who both raised no objection. The update also included further conditions requested by KCC Highways & Transportation.

Parish Councillor Kathleen Carter, representing Eastchurch Parish Council had left the meeting at this point so was unable to speak on the item.

Katharine Morgan, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Chair invited Members to debate the application and points raised included:

- Agreed in principal to the application;
- concerned about the highway impact of the application particularly in Church Road, Eastchurch but the Council’s independent consultant agreed with KCC’s comments so had to support the application.
- Sports England were often not flexible on their policy position and usually objected to this type of application;
- introduction of the 3g pitch was a welcomed and sensible solution;
- the design was in-keeping with the streetscene; and
- disagreed with KCC Highways and the Council’s traffic consultant about Church Road.

Resolved: (Subject to Secretary of State Approval) That application 21/506750/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (26) in the report and the additional conditions and comments as set-out in the tabled update, and with authority to amend conditions as may reasonably be required.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO – 22/502498/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Demolition of existing utility and annexe and erection of a two-storey pitched roof rear extension including annexe, a single storey flat roof rear orangery, a single storey side entrance extension with covered refuse and seating area, and a single storey bay window to front. Refurbishment including installation of thermally efficient roof coverings, replacement of external wall cladding and structure with thermally efficient detailed face brick facade, and replacement of windows, doors and ground floor fabric.		
ADDRESS 5 The Wineycock, Newnham, Kent, ME9 0NB		
WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newnham	APPLICANT Mr Colin Hulott AGENT Abstrkt-Dsign

The Development Manager introduced the application for Members. He reported that the two-storey rear extension was 6.7 metres in depth and officers were concerned about the impact it would have on the neighbouring semi-detached property, and would be prominent from Seed Road, Newnham. The Development Manager referred to the Council’s adopted SPG on extensions which stated that “for first floor rear extensions should be no more than a projection of 1.8 metres along a common boundary”. He added that officers raised no objection to the proposed single storey rear and side extensions.

Colin Hulott, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Ward Member, also a Member of the Planning Committee, spoke in support of the application. He acknowledged that the extension was larger than what was permitted but explained it was a unique site at the end of Wineycock. He noted that Newnham Parish Council raised no objection and considered it an improvement, and there were no objections from local residents.

The Chair invited Members to debate the application:

- The proposal did not comply with the guidelines of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Management Plan, namely it did not conserve or enhance the special quality and distinctive character of the AONB;
- the recommendation to refuse the application was correct;
- would be overbearing to the adjacent property; and

- if approved would it set a precedent?; and
- could Policy DM24 be included as an additional reason to refuse?

In response the Interim Head of Planning Services said that planning permission did not set a precedence and each application was considered on its own merits. Policy DM24 could be included but considered that the suggested reason for refusing was strong.

Resolved: That application 22/502498/FULL be refused for the reason outlined in the report.

3.2 REFERENCE NO – 22/502340/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Outline application (all matters reserved except access) for the erection of a single detached self-build dwellinghouse and carport/garage.		
ADDRESS Land Adjacent Westfield Cottages Breach Lane Lower Halstow Kent ME9 7AA		
WARD Bobbing, Iwade and Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Lower Halstow	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Keith Tress AGENT TaD Planning Ltd

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

PART 5

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

A Member congratulated officers in respect of items 5.1, 5.5 and 5.7 which were all delegated decisions. He also congratulated Andrew Byrne (Area Planning Officer) for his work in defending the Council’s position at the Appeal for item 5.2 despite the disappointing decision.

- **Item 5.1 – 310 Minster Road Minster**
APPEAL DISMISSED
DELEGATED REFUSAL
- **Item 5.2 – Land west of Greyhound Road Minster**
APPEAL ALLOWED
COMMITTEE REFUSAL
- **Item 5.3 – 15 Horsham Lane Upchurch**
APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.4 – 1 Woodland Cottages Highsted Road Sittingbourne**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.5 – 118 High Street Eastchurch**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.6 – 33 The Willows Newington**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.7 – 2 The Myrtles Summerville Avenue Minster**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.8 – 1 Donemowe Drive Sittingbourne**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.9 – Aldi Foodstore Tetternhall Way Faversham**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

251 Suspension of Standing Orders

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

252 Adjournment of Meeting

The meeting was adjourned from 8.30 pm until 8.40 pm.

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