

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 25 APRIL 2019

PART 5

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 5

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

- **Item 5.1 – Sonning Villa, Christopher Row, Lynsted**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

Full support for the Council's decision.

- **Item 5.2 – Land situated at Hole Street Farm, Kingsdown Road, Lynsted**

ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEAL DISMISSED

Observations

Here the Inspector has criticised the drafting of the notice, which had been the subject of legal advice, and fortunately he has used his powers to correct the notice. On that basis he has then fully supported the reasoning behind the notice and the Local Plan policies which aim to prevent residential conversions in remote rural locations where other more economically beneficial uses might be possible. This support for Local Plan policies is in line with recent recommendations of mine, some of which Members have overturned.

- **Item 5.3 – 20 East Street, Sittingbourne**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

Whilst the Inspector noted that the Council cannot currently show that it has a 5 year housing land supply, he concluded that the adverse impacts of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers and existing neighbouring properties would significantly outweigh the small benefit of 4 additional flats.

- **Item 5.4 – Land adjacent to St Giles Church, Tonge**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

Full support for Local Plan settlement policies despite the marginal housing delivery shortfall.

- **Item 5.5 – Great Grovehurst Farmhouse, Grovehurst Road, Sittingbourne**

APPEAL DISMISSED

COMMITTEE REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector noted that the Council currently cannot demonstrate that it has 5 year housing land supply and that the proposal would make a modest contribution to the shortfall. However he considered that this would only be of small benefit here and due to the harm that the proposed development would have on the setting of the adjoining grade 11 listed building he dismissed the appeal.