

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 18 July 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 – Land Rear of Lord Stanley Bungalow, Upchurch**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

Full support for the Council's decision to refuse permission for this housing scheme in the countryside.

- **Item 5.2 – 32 The Broadway, Minster-on-sea**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**COMMITTEE REFUSAL**

**Observations**

The Council won the appeal, but only on the specific grounds that it had not been demonstrated that the SAMMS payment required would adequately mitigate against harm to the SSSI, despite numerous other Inspectors finding precisely the opposite.

- **Item 5.3 – 20 Hustlings Drive, Eastchurch**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

**COMMITTEE REFUSAL**

**Observations**

Members may recall that I recommended this for approval.

- **Item 5.4 – 12 Laxton Way, Faversham**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

Full support for the Council's decision.

- **Item 5.5 – 1 Boughton Field Cottages, Faversham**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

Full support for the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for new housing outside the Local Plan defined built-up area boundary of Faversham.

- **Item 5.6 – 240-248 High Street, Sheerness**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

This decision results in permission being granted for a poorly designed and visually harmful development.

- **Item 5.7 – 240-248 High Street, Sheerness (ADVERT CONSENT)**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

Full support for the Council's decision to refuse consent for these intrusive signs.

- **Item 5.8 – Lodge Farm, Old House Lane, Hartlip**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

This appeal related to an agricultural occupancy condition, which the appellants sought to have deleted.

The Inspector shared the Council's concerns regarding its removal, specifically that the dwelling had only been approved in the first instance due to an agricultural need, and that although ineffective at present, the condition would become effective when the property was sold to a new occupier. The Inspector agreed with the Council that there were no cogent grounds for its deletion.

- **Item 5.9 – Land Rear of Unit 5, Stickfast Farm, Bobbing**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Observations**

The Inspector gave weight to the previous use of the site, which they considered likely to be lawful. This is despite the fact that the Council provided clear evidence to demonstrate that the site did not have a lawful use and that the threat of enforcement action in the past had caused the unlawful use of the site to cease.