

APPENDIX B

Planning Committee - 18 July 2019

Item 2.4

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber - Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 18 July 2019 from 7.00 - 10.38 pm.

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 18/503057/FULL
APPLICATION PROPOSAL

Erection of a 3 storey, 66 bed care home for older people with associated access, car park and landscaping.

ADDRESS Land At Perry Court Ashford Road Faversham Kent ME13 8YA

WARD Watling

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL
Faversham Town

APPLICANT LNT Care
Developments & HDD
(Faversham) Ltd
AGENT LNT Construction
Ltd

The Major Projects Officer referred to the tabled paper for this item.

Jo Kemp, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

A Member noted the increase from 60 bed (approved as part of outline planning consent) to 66 bed and asked what increase in percentage would be a material change. He also considered that 20 car parking spaces were not enough for 40-50 FTE, 66 residents and visitors, and asked what nature of care was being offered, noting that there was a critical shortage of dementia care. The Major Projects Officer explained that although there was a change in the number of rooms, the floorspace was less than in the 2017 outline application. He advised that KCC Highways and Transportation had no objection to this increase, and there would be no material change to traffic impacts. The Major Projects Officer explained that the staff use of the car park would be staggered over 24hours, and the development was close to public transport links, and KCC Highways and Transportation had raised no objection to the parking figures. He added that the care would be for older people with dementia, and KCC had welcomed the proposal.

A Member asked whether there were both single and double rooms available, and considered the design of the buildings could be improved. The Major Projects Officer explained that all the bedrooms were single bedrooms, but that KCC had been happy with the internal layout. He considered it to be a good design, and the application included hard and soft landscaping conditions.

APPENDIX B

In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer explained that drainage issues would be addressed by conditions (17) and (18) in the report.

A Member asked how much of the roof would be covered by solar panels, considered parking was 'tight' and queried whether the bland design fitted the local vernacular. The Major Projects Officer referred the Member to the renewable energy measures within condition (9) in the report, which gave the applicant flexibility to agree a package of measures. He explained that condition (8) required the building to be constructed to Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREAAAM) 'Very Good' standard. The Major Projects Officer said that KCC Highways and Transportation had confirmed that 20 car parking spaces were acceptable. The Conservation and Design Manager gave an overview of the finish of the building. He explained that it would be mainly brickwork, with rendered sections, and some projecting bays, with yellow brickwork. The render was similar to the nearby houses and supermarket, and the cladding used was similar to the hotel and supermarket. He explained that the overall finish of the care home provided a transition between the hotel and supermarket developments and the housing.

A Member welcomed the renewable energy aspect of the development, but emphasised the need for the building to generate electricity from photovoltaic panels. He stated that as a result of climate change, the residents would be vulnerable to warmer summers and he asked how the building was designed to safeguard residents from the heat. He also sought clarification as to whether it was a 3-storey or 2-storey building. The Major Project Officer suggested that condition (9) could be amended to include a target for renewable energy, and also refer to photovoltaic panels. He acknowledged the vulnerability of the residents and advised that together with the design incorporated by the agent, building regulations would ensure the building was appropriately built. The Major Projects Officer confirmed that it was a 3-storey building, however it sat lower than the road at the front to decrease the visual impact.

A Member asked why only 15% solar paneling was being installed. The Major Projects Officer explained that this was the figure mentioned by the Applicant, but re-iterated that there was a condition where a package of energy measures could be agreed.

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

Members debated the application and raised points which included:

- The proposed building looked bland, and did not match the local vernacular;
- some over-hangs were needed to help shade the south facing windows;
- the design needed to be improved;
- 15% solar energy seemed low for this development;
- lack of car parking, especially with increase in residents;
- this was a mish-mash design;

APPENDIX B

- photovoltaic roof tiles, rather than panels should be installed, and that would increase solar energy coverage;
- this building, plus supermarket and hotel would be clearly visible;
- suggest green living walls instead, and green roofs, and this would help water drainage;
- condition (9) needed to include the wording 'reach and attain 15% renewable energy' and 'seek and enhance biodiversity';
- there needed to be a new condition to ensure sustainable habitats and wildlife areas were provided;
- nothing wrong with the design, but it could be improved;
- the development should not be looked at until the junction of the A2 and the A251 was improved;
- design needed to be softened;
- increase in size was a material consideration despite the fact that the building was being dug down; and
- needed to resolve where we were pitching the level of renewable energy figure.

Councillor Benjamin Martin moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to review the design, and the renewable energy measures, and officers discuss these further with the Applicant and Agent. This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt.

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

Resolved: That application 18/503057/FULL be deferred to review the design, and the renewable energy measures, and officers discuss these further with the Applicant and Agent.