
Planning Committee

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 10 October 2024 from 7.00 pm - 10.27 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock (Chair), Shelley Cheesman (Substitute for Councillor Hayden Brawn), Simon Clark, Angela Harrison (Substitute for Councillor Kieran Golding), James Hunt, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chair), Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Richard Palmer, Julien Speed, Paul Stephen, Terry Thompson, Angie Valls, Karen Watson and Tony Winckless.

PRESENT (VIRTUALLY): Councillor Hayden Brawn.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Billy Attaway, Joanna Dymowska, Simon Greenwood, Paul Gregory, Ian Harrison, Joanne Johnson, Larissa Reed, Carly Stoddart and Ceri Williams.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Tom Nundy and Chris Palmer.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (VIRTUALLY): Councillor Dolley Wooster.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Andy Booth, Kieran Golding and Claire Martin.

329 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

330 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 September 2024 (Minute Nos.234 - 242) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

331 **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

332 **Deferred Item 1 - 24/500856/REM Land at Wises Lane**

Deferred Item 1 REFERENCE NO 24/500856/REM		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Approval of reserved matters (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, and Scale sought) for levels and earthworks changes for Phase 2F and the Primary School Land pursuant to 17/505711/HYBRID.		
ADDRESS Land at Wises Lane Borden Kent ME10 1GD		
WARD Borden and Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Borden	APPLICANT Karen Dunn AGENT DHA Planning

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report and advised that the applicant had submitted further details about the levelling of the land. The Planning Consultant explained that the provision of open space was a requirement of

the s106 attached to the hybrid planning permission.

Oonagh Kerrigan, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

Resolved: That application 24/500856/REM be granted as per the recommendation in the report.

333 **Planning Working Group**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 4 September 2024 (Minute Nos. 193 – 194) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

24/500508/FULL Camwa Ash, Bull Lane, Boughton-Under-Blean, Faversham, ME13 9AH.

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) introduced the application as set out in the report and advised there were no further updates.

Parish Councillor Sarah Moakes, representing Boughton-Under-Blean Parish Council, spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

Councillor Tony Winckless proposed adding an additional condition that required the hedge to remain on the site permanently. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Palmer and on being put to the vote, agreed.

Resolved: That application 24/500508/FULL be granted as per the recommendation in the report, with the additional condition that the hedge on the site remained permanently.

334 **2.1 - 23/505558/FULL 87 High Street/1-5 Central Avenue, Sittingbourne**

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO – 23/505558/FULL		
PROPOSAL		
Proposed change of use of the existing first and second floor from office use (Class E) to residential (use Class C3), including the erection of an additional third floor and a three-storey rear extension to create a total of 22 self-contained residential flat units.		
SITE LOCATION		
Junction of 87 High Street and 1-5 Central Avenue, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 4AU		
WARD Chalkwell	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Sleek Direct

		London Limited AGENT Ken Judge & Associated Ltd
--	--	--

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

The Chair invited Members to make comments, and these included:

- Sought clarity on how many units would be allocated as social housing?;
- the height of the building was a concern but understood that due to the location of the site, the impact would be minimal;
- could officers ensure that the extension be made with the same materials as the existing building?;
- thought it was good to see the third floor set back from the high street;
- concerned that only four car parking spaces were being proposed and that it would be unnecessary pressure on the town centre car parks;
- could officers ask the developer to fit wastewater heat recovery kits for the showers?;
- the development was the right place to introduce a car sharing scheme;
- why had the proposal not included a green roof rather than solar panels?; and
- were the four car parking spaces Electric Vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces?

The Planning Consultant responded to points raised and said that there were only three units that were allocated as first homes, which meant the price would be capped at 30% below market value/£250,000.

Regarding the car parking spaces the officer said that the location of the site was in a highly sustainable area that did not require the residents to own a car. The four car parking spaces had EV chargers and an informative could be added to make the developer aware of the wastewater heat recovery kits that could be fitted on the showers in each unit.

The Planning Consultant confirmed that the design of the extension would be the same as the existing building and that the developer had agreed to replace all windows of the existing building. The green roof design had been proposed to slow down the wastewater run-off from the site into the sewers, the green vegetation would aid this with the collection of water before it reached the sewerage of the high street.

Councillor Angela Harrison proposed that two extra words be added to the mitigation table for the NHS contributions on page 49, paragraph 5.5 of the report, and it be amended to read: *Towards refurbishment, **facilities, equipment**, reconfiguration and/or extension of existing general practice and other healthcare premises covering the area of development or new premises for general practice or healthcare services provided in the community in line with the healthcare infrastructure strategy for the area.* This was seconded by the Chair and on being put to the vote, agreed.

Resolved: That application 23/505558/FULL be granted as per the recommendation in the report, with the additional wording to be added to the mitigation table as minuted.

335 **2.2 - 22/502692/FULL Land North of Perry Leigh, Grove Road, Selling**

2.2 REFERENCE NO – 22/502692/FULL		
PROPOSAL Section 73 – Application for minor material amendment to approved plans condition 2 (to allow an increase in size and relocation of the building within the site) pursuant to 19/500224/FULL for – Erection of a single storey storage building.		
SITE LOCATION Land North of Perry Leigh Grove Road Selling Kent ME13 9RN		
WARD Boughton and Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Selling	APPLICANT Mr Brian Macey AGENT VLH Associates

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) introduced the application as set out in the report.

Councillor Sue Henderson, representing Selling Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Robin Gardiner, an objector, spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

The Chair invited Members to make comments, and these included:

- What was the number of containers that the original permission in 2019 allowed for?;
- the proposal was not much bigger than what had already been approved;
- what was the purpose of the containers?;
- what was the Area of Natural Outstanding Bodies (AONB) position on the proposal?;
- concerned that if Members were to approve this, they would be rewarding bad behaviour;
- the 2019 condition did not include the storage of pallets on the site, what was the position of the pallets?;
- what was the increase in the height and length of the site?; and
- thought that this was not a suitable location for the storage of containers or pallets.

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) responded to points raised and said that there was no specific number of containers which the relevant condition on the 2019 planning permission allowed, rather it was the dimensions of the building that allowed an assessment of this to be made. He added that the storage of pallets was a matter that the Planning Investigations team were currently dealing with.

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) said that the additional height of this proposal was 1.1 metres, giving it a total height of 4.9 metres and the building would be 32 metres in length. He added that the Kent Downs AONB Unit (now Kent Downs National Landscape) was not consulted on for this application as they were not a statutory consultee and because the site had an extant planning permission.

The Chair proposed that the application be deferred for a site visit, that the Kent Downs National Landscape Unit be consulted and the possibility of biodiversity enhancements on the building be explored. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless and on being put to the vote, agreed.

Resolved: That application 22/502692/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site visit. That the Kent Downs National Landscape Unit be consulted and for biodiversity enhancements on the building to be explored.

336 **2.3 - 22/502086/OUT Land east of Scocles Road, Minster**

2.3 REFERENCE NO – 22/502086/OUT		
PROPOSAL		
Outline application for a residential development of up to 650 units inclusive of a new community hub, landscaping measures and green infrastructure, with all members reserved except for access.		
SITE LOCATION		
Land to the east of Scocles Road, Minster of Sea, Kent		
WARD Sheppey Central	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT MLN (Land and Property Ltd) AGENT Broadgrove Planning and Development

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report.

Councillor Jill Stimson, representing Minster-on-Sea Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Simon Kight, a supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Alan Doughty, an objector, spoke against the application.

Richard Walters, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

A Ward Member, spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Ben J Martin.

The Chair invited Members to make comments, and these included:

- Paragraph 4.4 of the report mentioned a Multi-use Community Hub, but this was not secured in the outline application;
- had no confidence that the developer would deliver on the medical hub;
- concerned with the highway works and the issues it would cause across the Isle of Sheppey;
- the footpath at Scocles Road, Minster, was not wide enough for cyclists and there

- were no proposals to widen it;
- often large coaches would use the Scocles Road junction to get to schools and this made it dangerous for pedestrians to use Scocles Road;
 - if there was further development at Scocles Road then an additional roundabout needed to be considered;
 - the cycle and footpaths would need to be lit so that they could be used in the evenings;
 - there was no mention of youth clubs by Kent County Council (KCC);
 - full Travel Plan should be secured at outline stage;
 - development would harm the Grade II listed Scocles Court;
 - the Kent County Council (KCC) Highways Team said that they would be happy for 300 homes to be built before the Lower Road footpath works commenced but this should be lowered to 100 homes;
 - it was not clear when the funding would be made available for key services and amenities such as a bus service;
 - the Public Rights of Way Officer (PROW) had commented that the development would have a negative effect on the landscape;
 - open spaces, green spaces, play space, sports pitches and allotments should be secured;
 - the location of the care homes was too close to the community areas of the development;
 - the road network was not adequate to accommodate for the development on the Isle of Sheppey;
 - the developer should have done better with the design and communication with parish and ward councillors;
 - it was not clear what level of funding was expected from the development as KCC had provided two different letters that conflicted each other;
 - all funding should be allocated to infrastructure on the Isle of Sheppey;
 - the section 106 requirement for best endeavours to provide pedestrian links was inadequate;
 - Library funding should be allocated to Minster;
 - not clear that EV chargers would be provided;
 - no solar panels were being proposed on the new homes;
 - the allotments were not secured by condition so the developer may not deliver them;
 - impact piling would increase heritage harm to Scocles Court;
 - condition 8 (Landscaping) should specify 10 year period for replacement of landscaping;
 - condition 24 (Highways Works) needed to be amended to read "No more than 100 dwellings..." not 300 as stated;
 - condition 25, (Provision of footway) should not include Scocles Road;
 - condition 26, (Provision of footway) should include wording to ensure it commenced from day one of the development;
 - condition 27, (Provision of shared use footway-cycleway) should include a requirement for the path to be lit;
 - the wording in condition 50 (Sports Facilities) should be "tighted-up";
 - condition 51 (Heritage Interpretation Board) should include wording that the developer would fix any harm to Scocles Court;
 - understood that outline applications were presented to Committee so that Members could secure the relevant details but often got lots of changes from the developers when reserved matter submissions followed;
 - ward members should meet with officers, KCC, developer and other relevant parties to secure improvements to the proposal;

- the timings of the road works and connection to the Lower Road roundabout were key and thought that further discussions were needed with KCC to identify the timing of highways works;
- the affordable housing should be made available to Isle of Sheppey residents before it was made available to others;
- concerned that housing was given to people that lived out of the local area, rather than residents that needed it in the borough;
- thought the Council should have done their own Independent Traffic assessment; and
- the funding for schooling should be allocated to schools on the Isle of Sheppey rather than grammar schools in Sittingbourne.

The Vice-Chair proposed that the application be deferred for Ward Members to meet with the developers to address concerns relating to the application. This was seconded by Councillor Simon Clark.

The Chair invited Members to make comments, which included;

- There were too many aspects of this proposal that were not yet resolved therefore it would be hard to agree it at this stage;
- it was important for the developer to meet with Parish Councils and the Ward Members to secure improvements to the scheme;
- the Scocles Road proposals could be improved to better address impacts on the road network;
- the Ward Members and Parish Councils should have been able to have input into the proposals before it was deferred to the Committee;
- the Housing Association's energy targets were not often that high so it would be good to see a requirement for the new homes to be given a Band B Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating;
- an independent traffic survey was needed;
- the provision of the bus services needed clarifying;
- there was not enough infrastructure on the Isle of Sheppey, and it needed to be clear in the Local Plan on how developers could deliver infrastructure to support new development; and
- the developer needed to provide further clarity with regards to the cycle pathway and youth club provisions.

On being put to the vote, the motion for deferral was agreed.

Resolved: That application 22/502086/OUT be deferred.

337 2.4 - 22/505076/OUT Land at Pheasants Farm, Iwade

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

338 3.1 - 24/503608/PNQCLA 5 Acres Holywell Lane, Upchurch

The Chair referred to the tabled update that had been submitted since the publication of the agenda. On the basis that the scheme complied with all the conditions and requirements, Planning Officers were now recommending that prior approval was not required. Members agreed that in withdrawing the agenda item, they agreed with the officer's recommendation.

Resolved:

(1) That application 24/503608/PNQCLA be withdrawn.

339 Adjournment of Meeting

The Meeting was adjourned at 8.18 pm until 8.36 pm.

340 Extension of Standing Orders

At 10 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