

---

## Planning Committee

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 6 November 2025 from 7.00 pm - 9.20 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mike Baldock (Substitute for Councillor Monique Bonney), Andy Booth (Chairman), Hayden Brawn, Ann Cavanagh, Shelley Cheesman (Substitute for Councillor Kieran Golding), James Hunt, Peter MacDonald, Peter Marchington, Claire Martin, Ben J Martin, Julien Speed, Paul Stephen, Terry Thompson and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Ian Harrison, Joanne Johnson, Kellie MacKenzie and Carly Stoddart.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (VIRTUALLY):** Councillor Dolley Wooster.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Monique Bonney, Simon Clark and Kieran Golding.

### 440 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chairman outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 441 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 September 2025 (Minute Nos. 302 – 311) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 442 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Ann Cavanagh clarified that item 2.1 25/501437/REM Phases 3 & 4 Wises Lane, Sittingbourne was in her Ward, however as it was adequately represented, she would be considering the item as a Member of the Council where she represented the whole of Swale.

Councillor Mike Baldock declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 2.1 25/501437/REM Phases 3 & 4 Wises Lane, Sittingbourne as he was a member of Borden Parish Council, but he had not taken part in discussions when the Parish Council had considered the application.

### 443 **2.1 - 25/501437/REM - Land at Wises Lane, Borden, Kent, ME10 1GD**

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO – 25/501437/REM</b>	
<b>PROPOSAL</b> Approval of reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale sought) for Phases 3 and 4 for the development of 160no. dwellings including affordable housing, together with associated access, parking, landscaping, open space, equipped play and infrastructure, pursuant to 17/505711/HYBRID.	
<b>SITE LOCATION</b> Land at Wises Lane, Borden, Kent, ME10 1GD	
<b>WARD</b> Borden and Grove Park	
<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Borden	
<b>APPLICANT</b> Amy Tamplin	<b>AGENT</b> DHA Planning

Parish Councillor Lee Small, representing Borden Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Gaynor Aspin, representing Borden Wildlife Group, spoke against the application.

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

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Hayden Brawn.

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report. She reported that since the report had been published, a response had been received from Kent Police advising they had no further comments. She referred to the tabled update and apologised that the incorrect location plan had been published. A corrected location plan was tabled for Members, however that was slightly incorrect and she included the correct location plan within her presentation of the application to Members.

The Chairman sought clarification from officers to points raised by the public speakers in respect of: this could increase fly-tipping; condition (37); light pollution; and badgers.

The Planning Consultant reported that whilst she was aware that there had been issues with fly-tipping in the area, this was not a matter for the Planning Department to get involved with. She considered that the application followed good urban design principles which could help deter fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour. Condition (37) referred to highway details which the applicant would need to provide before construction commenced. The Council's Environmental Protection Team and Kent County Council (KCC) Ecology and KCC Highways and Transportation had raised no objection to the proposed lighting, and would be consulted further, once an application to discharge the condition had been submitted, to ensure that the levels of lighting were appropriate. With regard to badgers, the Planning Consultant advised that KCC Ecology had at the hybrid stage acknowledged that badgers would be displaced because of the development, but were satisfied with the conditions imposed to protect badgers. She referred to condition (59) which required that the applicant submitted an updated badger survey prior to commencing each phase of the development.

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

- Frustrated by KCC Ecology's 'desktop' approach by not visiting sites;
- the applicant could provide buffers to protect the nature reserve;
- concerned regarding Southern Water's comments in respect of insufficient water drainage information;
- how would the conditions proposed to protect wildlife be enforced?;
- Cryalls Lane, Sittingbourne was a rural lane so why was the Council's Policy on Rural Lanes not referred to within the report?;
- made no sense to remove a road that provided direct access to the nature reserve, but instead directed visitors through the estate and back out again. Suggested the application be tweaked so that Cryalls Lane be maintained as a rural lane;
- concerned that the proposed dwellings would be close to the nature reserve;
- concerned regarding the proposed housing mix and the lack of affordable housing provision;

- the foul drainage system needed to be assessed and a strategy provided;
- concerned about the lack of one-bedroom dwellings;
- pleased that 12% affordable housing was being provided, when they were only required to provide 10%;
- noted that most of the consultees had no issue with the application;
- this application had been agreed four years ago by the Planning Inspector, and the Council was limited on how they could amend the application;
- the flooding and foul sewage drainage provision was essential as part of the application;
- Cryalls Lane should remain open;
- drew attention to an error on paragraph 5.10 on page 18 of the report, and that 19 affordable units were proposed not 9 as stated;
- there had been issues with securing Registered Providers (RP) with developments, could an advisory condition be imposed requiring that should the applicant be unable to secure a partner RP that they utilised the Homes England (HE) Section 106 Affordable Housing Clearing Service to secure a partner?;
- morally disappointed about how the developer had functioned and that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was a failure;
- Cryalls Lane was not a rural lane, and the area had changed; and
- considered the hybrid plan was worse than this application.

In response, the Planning Consultant considered that the applicant had taken account of all of the impacts of the development, and officers were happy with the design and layout. With regard to skylarks, she was aware that the local government ombudsman was happy with the protection measures provided. The Planning Consultant advised that the closing off of Cryalls Lane had been considered and agreed as part of the hybrid application. With regard to affordable housing, a specific housing mix had not been agreed and secured under the hybrid application, and the mix specified within the report was borough-wide. She confirmed that drainage and flooding had been considered and agreed with suitable conditions at the hybrid stage. The applicants had been successful in securing RPs, however an informative could be imposed requiring developers utilised the HE Section 106 Clearing Service to secure a RP if they had not been able to do so.

In response, to questions regarding Southern Water's (SW) concerns regarding lack of information in respect of foul drainage and flooding, the Planning Manager (Planning Applications) referred to condition (10) of the hybrid permission. He said SW were not a statutory authority for a reserved matters application.

***Resolved: That application 25/501437/REM be granted as per the recommendation in the report.***

444 **2.2 - 25/500935/FULL - Land Rear of The White House, Eastling Road, Eastling, Kent, ME13 0AN**

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO 25/500935/FULL</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b> Erection of 1 No. two storey 4 bedroom detached chalet style residential dwelling.
<b>SITE LOCATION</b> Land Rear of The White House, Eastling Road, Eastling, Kent, ME13 0AN
<b>WARD</b> East Downs
<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Eastling

<b>APPLICANT</b> Hadley Polhill and Prentis Polhill Studio Limited	<b>AGENT</b> Alpha Design
---	---------------------------

Parish Councillor Julia Bailey, representing Eastling Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Stuart Wharf, an Objector, spoke against the application.

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

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Hayden Brawn.

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

- This was not within a sustainable location;
- this could set a precedent for similar applications;
- this was not the sort of housing which would enable local residents to remain within the village;
- this would be detrimental to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) now known as National Landscapes;
- needed to build more properties suitable for the elderly in villages;
- this was within the built-up area boundary of Eastling;
- the design was in-keeping with the AONB;
- this would not set a precedent;
- the application for a family home would help to keep numbers up at the local school;
- this was just infilling and should be approved;
- there were no reasons to refuse this;
- the Council needed to ensure that future built-up area boundaries applications should not include gardens; and
- noted the report did not refer to the application as 'finely balanced'.

***Resolved: That application 25/500935/FULL be granted as per the recommendation in the report.***

#### 445 3.1 - 25500821/FULL - Ten Acres, Breach Lane, Lower Halstow, Kent, ME9 7DD

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO 25/500821/FULL</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b> Demolition of existing brick outbuilding and erection of 3 detached self-build dwellings with associated works.
<b>SITE LOCATION</b> Ten Acres, Breach Lane, Lower Halstow, Kent, ME9 7DD
<b>WARD</b> Bobbing, Iwade and Lower Halstow
<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Lower Halstow
<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr & Mrs Keith Tress <b>AGENT</b> Benchmark Design Build Ltd

Keith Tress, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report. She referred to the two tabled updates which included: the Strategic Access management

and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) contribution update; details of a numbering error to paragraphs 7.10.7 and 7.10.9; and one letter of support. Following the update regarding the SAMMS payment, the second reason for refusal as set out in paragraph 7.13 of the report had been removed. She reported that officers considered the application was not self-build as it did not fit the definition.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Brawn.

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

- The Council would not be able to support any subsequent appeal by the applicant;
- this would enhance the area and be an improvement on what currently existed;
- it was 'deceptive' to say this was self-build;
- this would not be harmful to the area;
- if approved it could set a precedent for the rest of the site;
- considered it to be infill on a brownfield site and there were no substantial grounds to refuse;
- could defer the application and look at in the outline stage;
- would be offset from the main road;
- this was not out-of-keeping with other dwellings in the area;
- what was the difference between custom build and self-build?; and
- this should have been an outline planning application.

The Planning Manager (Planning Applications) advised that the NPPF did not separate out the definition of custom build and self-build. The Planning Consultant confirmed that Lower Halstow Parish Council had not commented on the application.

The Chairman said that Members could not pre-determine whether the applicant would appeal if the application was refused.

***Resolved: That application 25/500821/FULL be refused as per the recommendation in the report.***

#### 446 Part 5 applications

**Item 5.1 Land on either side of Vigo Lane and Wrens Road, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME9 8LA**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED**

**Item 5.2 Land at Hill Top Farm, Elverland Lane, Ospringe, Faversham, Kent ME13 0SP**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

A Member welcomed the decision.

**Item 5.3 Land at The Yard, Beckenham Park Industrial Estate, Otterham Quay Lane, Sittingbourne ME8 7UX**

**PINS Decision: Appeal A: APP/V2255/C/25/3366417 NOTICE QUASHED Appeal B : APP/V2255/W/25/3366416 APPEAL ALLOWED Costs Application REFUSED**

**5.4 91 Chaffes Lane, Upchurch, Kent ME9 7BG**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

**Item 5.5 The Lodge, Hawks Hill Lane, Bredgar, Kent ME9 8HE**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED**

**5.6 Land rear of 6 Coastguard Cottages, Plough Road, Eastchurch, Sheerness, Kent ME12 4JH**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

A Member said it was a 'perfect' result.

**Item 5.7 2 Parsonage Chase, Minster-on-Sea, Kent ME12 3JL**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

A Member said it was a 'perfect' result.

**Item 5.8 Pear Tree House, Otterham Quay Lane, Upchurch, Kent ME8 8QW**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

A Member congratulated officers and said it was a good decision.

#### **447 Adjournment of Meeting**

The meeting was adjourned from 8.38 pm until 8.40 pm.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel