
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 9 February 2023 from 7.00 pm - 9.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Monique Bonney, Richard Darby, Steve Davey, Mike Dendor, Oliver Eakin, Tim Gibson (Chair), Angela Harrison (Substitute for Councillor Tony Winckless), Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chair), Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Richard Palmer (Substitute for Councillor James Hall), Ken Rowles, David Simmons, Paul Stephen and Tim Valentine.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Peter MacDonald.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Andy Byrne, Flo Churchill, Paul Gregory, Kellie MacKenzie, Cheryl Parks, Ceri Williams and Jim Wilson.

OFFICERS PRESENT (Virtually): Jo Millard.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (Virtually): Councillor Ken Ingleton.

APOLOGIES: Councillors James Hall and Tony Winckless.

645 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

646 **Tribute**

Councillor James Hunt paid tribute to Councillor Cameron Beart who sadly passed away recently. He spoke about how Councillor Beart enjoyed sitting on the Planning Committee and said Cameron always wanted the best for residents on the Isle of Sheppey. Councillor Hunt said that Cameron always put in 100% and was a stickler for detail and that he would be greatly missed.

647 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Peter Marchington declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.3 22/500989/FULL 103 Barton Hill Drive, Minster as he was the applicant. Councillor Marchington left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Elliott Jayes declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.2 22/500989/FULL 103 Barton Hill Drive, Minster. Councillor Jayes left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Richard Palmer declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of item 2.4 22/505611/FULL Burntwick, The Street, Upchurch. Once he had spoken on the item as Ward Member, Councillor Palmer left the meeting during consideration of this item.

648 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 January 2023 (Minute Nos. 573 – 579) and the Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 25 January 2023 (Minute Nos. 609 – 614) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct records.

649 **Deferred Item**

Deferred Item 1 REFERENCE NO 22/503385/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use of the land to use for the stationing of up to 18 holiday caravans, with associated access road and parking areas.		
ADDRESS Wynne Hall First Avenue Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4JN		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs D Wynne AGENT Woodstock Associates

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set out in the report.

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

Resolved: That application 22/503385/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (18) in the report.

650 **Schedule of Decisions**

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO 22/504096/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing derelict cottage and replacement with 2no. detached dwellings with associated cycle and bin stores, parking, and access (resubmission of 22/501068/FULL).		
ADDRESS Thatch Cottage, Staplestreet Road, Boughton under Blean, Kent, ME13 9TJ		
WARD Boughton and Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Dunkirk	APPLICANT Mr Patrick Butler AGENT

The Area Planning Team Leader introduced the application as set out in the report. He referred to paragraph 1.3 of the report and explained that the thatch roof was in fact missing in its entirety.

Parish Councillor Jeff Tutt, representing Dunkirk Parish Council, spoke against 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.

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- This would result in overdevelopment of the site;
- the design was urban and not in-keeping with the rural area;
- there was no justified planning reason to refuse the application;
- two additional houses would make no significant difference at this location;
- the Parish Council should have provided data from their Local Housing Needs Assessment to back-up information set-out in paragraph 4.6 of the report in respect of policies in their Neighbourhood Plan; and
- close-boarded fencing would not sit well.

In response to a question from a Member, the Design and Conservation Manager said that following discussions with Kent County Council (KCC) Archives there were no grounds to support considering the building as a non-designated heritage asset. He considered there were no reasons to refuse the application on heritage grounds.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow officers to discuss improved design options with the applicant. This was seconded by Councillor Tim Valentine.

Members considered the motion and points raised included:

- The design had been discussed with the applicant and officers so should not defer;
- some Members were being “picky” about the design; and
- there was a variation of design styles in Boughton-under-Blean.

The Area Planning Team Leader explained that in terms of design the key consideration was the context of the site. He considered the proposed dwellings were in-keeping with adjoining properties and warned against refusing the application on design grounds. The Area Planning Team Leader said Members could bolster condition (3) to include any specific materials they wished to see included.

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

In response to concerns from a Member about boundary treatment, the Area Planning Team Leader said that planting was proposed along the front boundary of the site, and he referred to condition (4) of the report which required full details of hard and soft landscape works. He advised that to prevent the applicant erecting close boarded fencing the Council could remove the Permitted Development Rights.

Resolved: That application 22/504096/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (20) in the report and an additional condition removing Permitted Development Rights for hard boundary treatment to the site frontage.

2.2 REFERENCE NO – 22/500989/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing bungalow and outbuilding. Erection of 1 no. detached dwellinghouse and 3 no. detached bungalows with alterations to access and car parking.		
ADDRESS 103 Barton Hill Drive, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 3ND		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr P Scurfield AGENT Michael Gittings Associates

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set out in the report and referred to the tabled paper. He recommended the imposition of two further conditions in respect of tree protection measures and site levels.

Parish Councillor Dolley White, representing Minster Parish Council, spoke against the application.

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

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

Ward Members spoke against the application.

In response to a point raised by public speaker Dolley White, representing Minster Parish Council, the Area Planning Officer drew attention to paragraph 5.1 of the report which stated that a 23-signature petition had been received.

Members considered the application and points raised included:

- This was a good sized plot and well laid out development;
- welcomed the proposed bungalows;
- had some highway safety concerns; and
- would be over-intensification of the site.

Councillor Richard Palmer moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to a site meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Darby.

Members considered the motion for a site meeting and the following points were made:

- Already had expert advice on highway safety from KCC Highways and Transportation;
- KCC Highways and Transportation raised no objections so it would be difficult to refuse on highway safety grounds; and
- a site meeting would be pointless.

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

Members discussed the application further and raised points which included:

- Noted no comment in respect of flood water, was there any further information in respect of surface water run-off and would it hit the main sewer?;
- considered officers were right to recommend approval;
- needed to ensure that the roof heights of the dwellings were not high enough for future conversion;
- shame to see green spaces being built on;
- concerned that vehicles entering and leaving the site would not be able to pass which might lead to congestion on Barton Hill Drive;
- there were no planning grounds to refuse the application; and
- how would refuse lorries access the site?

In response the Area Planning Officer said that he was unsure why KCC Flood and Water Management department had been consulted as they usually only commented on Majors and that was probably why they had not responded. He said that waste and water from the application site would be dealt with under Building Regulations, but he suspected that waste would be linked to the existing sewer. The Area Planning Officer referred to condition (19) in the report which removed the ability to carry out roof enlargements under Permitted Development Rights.

In response to highway concerns, the Area Planning Officer explained that vehicles not being able to pass each other was unlikely to be an issue due to the limited number of units proposed on the site, and KCC Highways and Transportation had no concerns. He showed Members where the bin collection point would be located and that refuse lorries would be able to access the bins from Barton Hill Road.

There was further discussion about the pitch height to deter future conversion. The Head of Planning Services said that was best dealt with by removal of Permitted Development Rights.

Resolved: That application 22/500989/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (19) in the report and the imposition of two further conditions in respect of: tree protection measures; and site levels.

2.3 REFERENCE NO – 22/504805/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Conversion of existing committee room to disabled toilet, and creation of new entrance to west elevation to facilitate access for wheelchairs and mobility scooters, including creation of an access ramp.		
ADDRESS Rushenden Club, Rushenden Road, Queenborough, Kent, ME11 5JZ		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Cllr Peter
Queenborough and Halfway	Queenborough	Marchington
		AGENT

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set out in the report.

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

Resolved: That application 22/504805/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) and (2) in the report.

2.4 REFERENCE NO – 22/505611/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of 2no. four-bedroom detached dwellinghouses and 1no. detached garage with associated front canopy, fencing, gates, access and parking (Revision of Planning Application ref: 21/506474/FULL)		
ADDRESS Burntwick The Street Upchurch Kent ME9 7EU		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Upchurch	APPLICANT Mr Steve Straight AGENT Mark Carter Associates

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set out in the report and referred to the tabled update.

A Ward Member also a member of the Planning Committee spoke against the application.

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

In response to questions from a Member, the Area Planning Officer drew attention to paragraphs 7.12 and 7.13 of the report which set out details of the relationship between the proposal and No. 21 The Street. He said that the distance from No. 21 The Street and the flank wall of Plot 2 was 7.5 metres which was a considerable distance between dwellings.

The Design and Conservation Manager said that whilst the development was visible from the church, he considered the design of the properties were acceptable and he drew attention to condition (19) of the report which removed Permitted Development Rights. He considered the design was an improvement on the previous scheme.

Resolved: That application 22/505611/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (21) in the report and the amendment to condition (19) as set out in the tabled update.

PART 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO – 21/502256/OUT

APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline Application with all matters reserved to determine the principle of residential development of up to 64 No 3 and 4 Bedroom dwellings of 1 storey, 1 and half storey, 2 storey, and 2 and half storey dwellings with all associated parking, infrastructure and landscape amenity spaces.		
ADDRESS Land North East of Nelson Avenue, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness, Kent		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Michael Piper AGENT Kent Design Partnership

The Major Projects Officer introduced the application as set out in the report and referred to the tabled paper. He drew attention to page 86 of the report and application 22/3298959 (SBC reference 20/504408/OUT) for residential development of up to 100 no. dwellings at land west of Elm Lane, Minster and apologised that Appendix 1, the appeal decision dismissing the appeal from the hearing held 14 September 2022 was not attached to the report. The Major Projects Officer reported that the Council had successfully argued that despite not having a five-year housing land supply that the significant harm to the landscape (noting that the site was prominently located on a hill) outweighed the benefits in delivering the 100 dwellings.

Parish Councillor Dolley White, representing Minster Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mike Worrall, an objector, who was registered to speak was not in attendance and had not submitted a speech.

A Ward Member spoke against the application.

The Democratic Services Manager read out a statement objecting to the application on behalf of a Ward Member who was not able to attend the meeting.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to resolve that the application would have been refused had an appeal not been lodged, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

Members considered the application and points raised included:

- This was an appalling development which would adversely impact very important green spaces;
- it would have huge detrimental impacts on the residential amenity and visual amenity of the area;
- there were significant air quality and environmental health reasons to refuse the application;
- fully supported the officers' reasons for refusal;
- welcomed the report but should have had it months ago;
- was outside of the settlement area boundary;
- would impact on the local infrastructure and impact bus services and local health care; and

- the tilted balance did not apply because the impacts to the landscape was so significant.

The Major Projects Officer drew attention to the tabled update and the additional putative reason for refusing the application in respect of air quality.

Resolved: That application 21/502256/OUT would have been refused for the reasons outlined in the report and the additional reason outlined in the tabled paper in respect of air quality had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged.

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

This item was withdrawn from the Agenda.

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – Paradise Farm The Stables Lower Hartlip Rd Hartlip**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- **Item 5.2 – Greystone Bannister Hill Borden**

APPEAL DISMISSED – PARTIAL COSTS ALLOWED

AGAINST OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

651 **Record of Thanks**

The Chair advised Members that it was Jim Wilson’s (Major Projects Officer) last meeting as he was leaving the Council at the end of the month. Members thanked Jim for all his hard work over the years and wished him all the best in his new job.

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