

SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 2 - Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended.

2.1	SW/14/0225	(Case 24976)	Dunkirk
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Retrospective planning permission for a Change of Use of land to Wood Yard with Temporary Consent for Container Building for General Storage of Equipment and Small Tools and Mobile Office with associated access hardstanding, and as amended by drawing number 7479_400_00 received 16 May 2014.			
ADDRESS Forewood, London Road, Dunkirk, Faversham, Kent ME13 9LR			
WARD Boughton & Courtenay	APPLICANT Mr Brice	AGENT Breena Coyle	

The Area Planning Officer reported that the wooden screen referred to in condition (5) in the report had been removed, so that condition could be amended to reflect this. KCC Highways raised no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions to address parking/turning areas, completion of access and a bound surface for the first five metres of the access. The Area Planning Officer advised that as the proposal was for temporary permission, these conditions were not necessary. No comments had been received from the County Archaeological Officer. The Environmental Health Manager had requested a noise assessment report due to the proximity to residential properties, however, the Agent had confirmed that the nearest property was 240 metres from the site.

The Area Planning Officer explained that the wood chipper on the site appeared to be the main source of noise nuisance on the site. He suggested that a condition be added to address this by means of straw bales around the chipper when it was being used.

The Area Planning Officer sought delegation to amend condition (5) as above, and add a further condition to address the wood chipper noise issue.

Councillor Jeff Tutt, representing Dunkirk Parish Council, spoke against the proposal.

Mr Brice, the Applicant, spoke in favour of the proposal.

A Ward Member spoke in favour of the proposal. He considered it was the perfect location for the proposed use. The Ward Member acknowledged the concerns of the site having a residential use as well.

Members made comments which included: support diversification in the countryside; not happy with application being retrospective; the applicant needed to be aware of the conditions imposed and adhere to them; happy that steps were being taken to mitigate any noise nuisance; question whether straw bales would be sufficient to mitigate noise problem; and support the principle of the proposal.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following addendums, that condition (5) be amended to state that the fence cannot be re-erected; that storage be limited to timber/timber products/machinery; and that a condition be added to limit hours of use of the machinery to

precisely that which the applicant had requested in paragraph 2.06 in the report, as these were potential issues for noise nuisance as well as the wood chipper.

The Area Planning Officer reminded Members that this was a temporary permission, with conditions to reflect this. He advised that permission would be needed in any case to re-erect the fence.

Councillor Mike Henderson withdrew the first addendum, and Councillor Andy Booth seconded the other two addendums. On being put to the vote, the addendums were agreed.

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was agreed.

Resolved: *That application SW/14/0225 be delegated to Officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (8) in the report with the amendment to condition (5) as requested by the Officer, an additional condition to address the noise issues from the wood chipper, a condition to limit the storage to timber/timber products/machinery, and a condition to limit hours of use of the machinery to precisely that which the applicant had requested in paragraph 2.06 in the report.*

2.2 SW/13/0700 and SW/13/0701 (Case 16489)		Faversham
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
SW/13/0700: Demolition of outbuildings and development of 8 new dwellings and conversion of existing stable building/cold store, and as amended by drawings received 28 August and 6 November 2013, and by drawings received 30 January 2014 and by drawing 2510/1d dated May 2014, and		
SW/13/0701: Listed building consent for demolition of outbuildings and development of 8 new dwellings and conversion of existing stable building/cold store, and as amended by drawings received 28 August and 6 November 2013, and by drawings received 30 January 2014 and by drawing 2510/1d dated May 2014.		
ADDRESS 20 Ospringe Street, Faversham, Kent, ME13 8TL		
WARD Watling	APPLICANT Ms Hilary Barkaway	AGENT Mr Anthony Hyde

The Area Planning Officer reported that KCC Highways had suggested that condition (16) in the report be amended to add ‘and physical measures’, after ‘signage’ in the first line. He also advised that condition (10) on the Conservation Area application could be deleted as there were no chimney stacks.

Louise Sittall, an objector, spoke against the proposal.

Mrs Barkaway, the Applicant, spoke in favour of the proposal.

Members made comments which included: this will improve visual amenity and the street scene; it was well designed; welcomed the views of Southern Water in the report with regard to nearby surface water culvert.

Clarification was given that entrance to the development would be from the A2, with exit being onto Grove Place.

A Member acknowledged the comments from the applicant on the help and advice received from Planning Officers.

Resolved: *That applications SW/13/0700 and SW/13/0701 be approved subject to conditions (1) to (29) for SW/13/0700, with condition (16) to be amended to add 'and physical measures', after 'signage' in the first line and to conditions (1) to (11) for SW/13/0701, with the deletion of condition (10).*

2.3 TP/14/0068	(Case 10099)	Boughton
APPLICATION PROPOSAL To remove one horse chestnut.		
ADDRESS 8 Chestnut Court, Colonels Lane, Boughton-under-Blean, Faversham, Kent, ME13 9SJ		
WARD Boughton & Courtenay	APPLICANT Mr G Gilbert	

The Area Planning Officer advised that the Parish Council had withdrawn their objection to the proposal and now supported it.

Mr Gilbert, the Applicant, withdrew from speaking on this application.

A Ward Member spoke against the proposal. He considered the tree to be a prominent part of the street scene and he was not convinced that it should be removed.

Members made comments which included: this was a finely balanced proposal; it was important to have a suitable native species replacement tree, with a condition to reflect this; tree likely to have been on development already when built; and safety was paramount.

The Area Planning Officer advised that it might be possible to strengthen condition (4) in the report and be more specific on the type of tree to replace the existing tree. He sought delegation to look into this further and amend condition (4) as appropriate.

On being put to the vote, the amendment for delegation to Officers, as above was agreed.

Resolved: *That application TP/14/0068 be delegated to Officers to approve subject to conditions (1) to (6) in the report, with an amendment to condition (4) to include more specific wording on the type of tree, namely to include it being a native species.*

2.4 SW/14/0543	(Case 11248)	Sittingbourne
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Change of use from B1 Office to D2 Gymnasium.		
ADDRESS Unit 4, Centre 2000, St Michaels Road, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3DW		
WARD Roman	APPLICANT Mr T Tobutt	AGENT Mrs Jane Hooker

The Area Planning Officer reported that KCC Highways raised no objection to the proposal. He advised that the Applicants had confirmed that a trial period, as a temporary permission, was acceptable to them.

A Ward Member welcomed the temporary permission with regard to any disturbance it may cause to local residents and noted that the site was one mile east of the town centre, not west as noted in the report.

Resolved: *That application SW/14/0543 be approved subject to conditions (1) to (7) in the report.*

2.5 SW/14/0146	(Case 25247)	Sittingbourne
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Demolition of rear barn, garage block and covered ways, together with the side conservatory structures, with the construction in lieu of 2 No. proposed houses, both attached to the current site dwelling to create a terrace, the construction of a rear single-storey extension to the current site dwelling and the undertaking of all external works associated with the development, including bin storage space and some off road car parking.		
ADDRESS 18 Bayford Road, Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 3AD		
WARD Roman	APPLICANT Mrs J Straight	AGENT Mr L Simmons

The Area Planning Officer advised that there were some errors in the report. He explained that conditions (21) to (23) had not been included from the original report for this application, and that the additional KCC Highways' conditions, as noted in the minutes of 8 May 2014 meeting should also be included. He sought delegation to approve subject to these conditions being included.

Mr Newell-Thomas, an objector, spoke against the proposal.

Mr Smith, the Applicant, spoke in favour of the proposal.

A Ward Member spoke against the proposal and raised concern that the application had not been amended to the one presented to the Planning Committee on 5 June 2014. His concerns included lack of accessibility, especially for emergency services; he was not against development, but considered this was over-intensification; loss of light to no. 22 Bayford Road; would be happy with existing property and development of right hand side property.

Members made comments which included: disappointed there were no changes to application as requested by the Planning Committee; inappropriate 'threat' of appeal not welcomed; potential for accident waiting to happen in this area; parking issues; nothing has changed so no reason to support this; and off-road parking would improve the application.

On being put to the vote the motion for approval was lost.

Councillor Mike Haywood moved a motion for refusal on the grounds of lack of off-street parking and the impact on residential amenity, including loss of light to the adjacent property. This was seconded by Councillor Andy Booth and upon being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: *That application SW/14/0146 be refused on the grounds of lack of off-street parking and the impact on residential amenity, including loss of light to the adjacent property.*