

Tabled update for Members - DEFFERED ITEM 1 Land East of Haweswood

Planning Reference: 21/500173/FULL

	REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE
<p>4.9</p> <p>Added</p>	<p>This application was deferred by the Planning Committee on 9th December 2021</p> <p><u>Bobbing Parish Council (Summary)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the impact of traffic – they are not reassured regarding the applicants projection of visitor numbers and parking • Noted that KCC raised concerns – numbers of parking, entrance needs to be 2 way, and further information required regarding 2 and 5 year plans. • Note that KCC Ecological Advice: Have little confidence that the measures proposed will be enacted effectively. • Note that In the spirit of co-operation noise complaints were investigated and discussed, and ways to mitigate these were proposed. • Discussed their concerns about the variance from the local plan: <p><u>The Parish Council have the following reservations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will there be a cap or limit on the number and types of animals; the site probably has a limited capacity? 2. What happens to animal waste and ground water pollution? 3. Is it the start of a visitor attraction generating traffic and parking issues in the narrow lanes? 4. Permitting residential accommodation on agricultural land may set a precedence 5. Changing the use of Agricultural Land <p>Conclusion: Difficult and emotional site on which to comment given the range and variety of issues involved. A decision on whether the site is suitable for an Animal Sanctuary, is better left to the professional officers and planners at Swale Borough Council.</p>
<p>4.10</p> <p>Added</p>	<p><u>Matters dealing with archaeology the Archaeological Officer provided the following response:</u></p> <p>The site is archaeologically sensitive.</p>

	<p>There are First World War trenches for the Chatham Land Front excavated diagonally northwards across the site through the presently cleared area.</p> <p>Now buried these trenches are part of a significant heritage asset that extends through the borough.</p> <p>It is not clear to what extent additional groundworks will be involved.</p> <p>Further clarification is required by the applicant so that they can reasonably assess whether any further impact is likely to arise on archaeology on the site.</p> <p>They seek to ensure that further groundworks avoid impact on the location of the buried trenches and that any other ground work is accompanied by appropriate archaeological works.</p> <p>Given the nature of the development they envisage that this can be achieved but some consideration of the archaeology of the site is needed.</p>
<p>4.11 Added</p>	<p><u>Natural England</u></p> <p>No objection</p>
<p>5.2</p>	<p><u>Consultations</u></p> <p>There has been a further 7 letters of support and 1 letter of objection</p> <p><u>14 Support on the following grounds:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has been derelict for decades and is a suitable use for an animal charity • Brings many benefits to the local community • Biodiversity will be maintained and enhanced • Gates are set back as to not obstruct visibility • Many voiced concerns that they did not understand why the Council would not support such a facility • Objections should be withdrawn from committee item • Do not understand how people living in the countryside can complain about noise • Council has made procedural errors causing further delays • Council has not empathy for animals • Never seen an escaped animal <p>And lastly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No notable increase in traffic
	<p><u>1 Letter of objection</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise escape from the large number of animals • Concerns that the council has allowed the destruction of the land for over 1 year now • Small rural lane can not take anymore traffic • Pollution caused from burning rubbish And lastly • All wildlife present for years has been lost
6.30	<p><u>Environment Agency Update</u></p> <p>The Environment Agency are still awaiting the results from soil testing and analysis.</p> <p>The Ranch was asked to remove the inclusions from the imported hardcore however this has not been done to a satisfactory standard and therefore the case officer will proceed to bring the case to the AE's Enforcement Governance Group to see how they would like to proceed taking into account the environmental risk, reputational risk and the public interest factors.</p> <p>Attached is the last CARE report (00003) which provides a detailed update and explanation of the current situation with the EA. As per the details in the report, the EA had to wait for the deadlines to pass which hadn't been adhered to, before they could begin to take the next steps.</p>
7.4	<p>Based upon the lack of supporting specialist information and plans, and concerns raised from KCC Ecology and KCC Highways who are still not satisfied with the information as submitted, coupled with four (4) registered noise abatement breaches where Environmental Health investigations are ongoing, the Council is not satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to address the previous concerns. For this reason, officers remain of view, as set out in the main report, that the harm arising from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Local Plan (adopted 2017) and NPPF July 2021 and the other material planning considerations, and for this reason I therefore recommend that planning permission is refused the original reasons set out in the main report.</p>