

APPENDIX C

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 4 January 2018 from 7.00pm - 10.22pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth (Vice-Chairman), Richard Darby, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman), Prescott and Ghlin Whelan.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Simon Algar, Philippa Davies, Andrew Jeffers, Ross McCardle, Cheryl Parks, Graham Thomas and Jim Wilson.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Paul Fleming.

APOLOGY: Councillor Roger Clark.

420 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman ensured that those present at the meeting were aware of the emergency evacuation procedure.

421 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 December 2017 (Minute Nos. 384 – 389) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

422 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ken Ingleton declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of Item 2.6, Bayshore, 84 Scarborough Drive, Minster, as the applicant was a friend of his.

423 PLANNING WORKING GROUP

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 December 2017 (Minute Nos. 418 – 419) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

17/505562/FULL – GLADSTONE HOUSE, 60 NEWTON ROAD, FAVERSHAM, ME13 8DZ

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

The Area Planning Officer reported that the County Archaeological Officer had advised that no precautionary conditions were required for the application. Two further letters from neighbouring residents who objected to the application, had been received. One objector had stated that the application would have a domino-effect and this would worsen parking issues. The other objector had submitted

- 421 -

APPENDIX C

Planning Committee4 January 2018

Resolved: That application 17/505078/FULL be refused on the grounds of its overlooking and overbearing impact on neighbouring properties leading to demonstrable harm to the residential amenity and quality of life for those residents.

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 16/506181/FULL and 16/506182/LBC			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL- PLANNING APPLICATION AND LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION FOR;			
Demolition of the 1980s north and south wing extensions. Change of use, conversion and renovation of the Grade II listed building to provide 8no. residential dwellings. Construction of 34 no. 1-bed, 2-bed and 3-bed terraced dwellings with associated new cycle and bin stores. Re-siting and refurbishment of the Coach House. Landscaping of the site, to include parking areas and a new wildlife pond. Reinstatement of the garden wall along the southern boundary.			
ADDRESS Sheppey Court Halfway Road Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 3AS			
WARD Queenborough and Halfway	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL NA	APPLICANT P A Rooney & Bentley Developments L AGENT Vail Williams LLP	

This item was considered in closed session.

PART 5

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

- Item 5.1 – Brook Hall House, Waterham Road, Hernhill
APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

- Item 5.2 – Land on the west side of Spade Lane, Hartlip

Appeal A: APP/V2255/C/16/3165246
 Appeal B: APP/V2255/C/16/3165247
 Appeal C: APP/V2255/C/16/3165248
 Appeal D: APP/V2255/C/16/3165249
 Appeal E: APP/V2255/C/16/3165250
 Appeal F: APP/V2255/C/16/3165251
 Appeal G: APP/V2255/C/16/3165252
 Appeal H: APP/V2255/C/16/3165253
 Appeal I: PP/V2255/W/16/3165245

Appeals A and B ALLOWED – ENFORCEMENT NOTICE QUASHED

Appeals C to H NO FURTHER ACTION - ENFORCEMENT NOTICE QUASHED

APPENDIX C

Planning Committee4 January 2018

Appeal I APPEAL DISMISSED

- Item 5.3 – 100 Station Road, Teynham

APPEAL DISMISSED AND COSTS REFUSED

COMMITTEE REFUSAL – AGAINST OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

425 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC*Resolved:*

(1) That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 5 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act:

5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

7. Information relating to any action taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

426 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 16/506181/FULL and 16/506182/LBC		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL- PLANNING APPLICATION AND LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION FOR;		
Demolition of the 1980s north and south wing extensions. Change of use, conversion and renovation of the Grade II listed building to provide 6no. residential dwellings. Construction of 34 no. 1-bed, 2-bed and 3-bed terraced dwellings with associated new cycle and bin stores. Re-siting and refurbishment of the Coach House. Landscaping of the site, to include parking areas and a new wildlife pond. Reinstatement of the garden wall along the southern boundary.		
ADDRESS Sheppey Court Halfway Road Minster-on-sea Kent ME12 3AS		
WARD Queenborough and Halfway	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL NA	APPLICANT P A Rooney & Bentley Developments L AGENT Vail Williams LLP

The Major Projects Officer explained that contrary to the report, the application was for a total of 39 dwellings, of which 33 (not 34) would be new build. Further to the viability of the development, as noted on page 69 of the report, he explained that the financial contributions that the developer had agreed to pay were £10,959 (£281 per dwelling). He explained that officers considered the application to be a strong scheme, which would secure a long-term use of the listed building, and the removal of the poorly designed 1980s extension. He further explained that officers were happy in the light of the two viability assessments that had been carried out, that the viability of the scheme had been properly assessed. He stated that it was regrettable that the whole amount of contributions (£141,102.24) could not be

APPENDIX C*Planning Committee**4 January 2018*

secured, but stated that it was an acceptable, enabling development, and would bring the special building back into a productive long-term use.

The Conservation and Design Manager provided some background to the application and explained that the building continued to decay. The applicant had provided a robust viability statement, outlining the minimum they could achieve and simultaneously have a scheme that did not harm the listed building or its setting. If the scheme was not supported, the building would potentially sit on the Buildings at Risk Register for an additional number of years, with further deterioration, and a possible increase in restoration costs in the future. He explained that it was in a poor condition, especially in relation to the roof and the interior, with lots of broken glass and removed fireplaces, and that these problems would likely exacerbate without some timely intervention.

The Conservation and Design Manager explained that the Council had powers that could be used to address some of the issues with the building. These measures included an Urgent Works Notice or Repairs Notice being served. There was clear guidance on enabling development to secure the future of a significant building such as this one. He explained that there were no subsidies available from any other source to get the building back into use. The Conservation and Design Manager concluded by stating that the number of units proposed had been reduced, trees on the site would be retained, as well as protecting what was there.

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

A Ward Member welcomed bringing the building back into use. He asked whether the owner was duty-bound to maintain the building, and questioned whether local residents had been consulted. The Ward Member raised concern with the pressure on services/infrastructure in Halfway with the addition of 39 dwellings, particularly with the road infrastructure and healthcare provision. In terms of the financial contributions, the Ward Member considered £141,102.24 was not unreasonable. He welcomed the addition of 1,2,3 bed housing, but was not certain if this was worth reducing the financial contributions for.

A second Ward Member agreed that funds were required for improving the local roads. He considered the profit figures of 20% were unrealistic, and that between 7 and 11% was more realistic. He also considered that the loss of the Section 106 payments was to preserve profit for the developers.

A third Ward Member stated that the buildings had been bought and nothing done with them for ten years. He supported the inclusion of a Section 106 Agreement.

Members raised points which included: supported Stop Notice approach, to safeguard the condition of the building; welcomed the scheme; and needed contributions from the developer for the local community from Section 106 payments.

In response to questions, the Major Projects Officer explained that the condition in the report to ensure the listed building was repaired prior to the other housing being built, was fit for purpose. He stated that the role of CBRE was to assess the

APPENDIX C

Planning Committee4 January 2018

two viability reports, submitted by the applicant, on the Council's behalf, and that they were a robust, well known national consultancy company. The Major Projects Officer stated that in relation to the profit figure, this would be less than the figure quoted in the report, namely 20%, after the negative residual land value was taken into consideration.

On being put to the vote the motion to approve the application was lost.

Councillor Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow officers to go back to the developers to argue the Planning Committee's case with regard to securing developer contributions, as set out at Paragraph 8.30 of the Committee report. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

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

Resolved: That application 16/506181/FULL be deferred to allow officers to go back to the developers to argue the Planning Committee's case with regard to securing developer contributions, as set out at Paragraph 8.30 of the Committee report.

Resolved: That application 16/506182/LBC be deferred to allow officers to go back to the developers to argue the Planning Committee's case with regard to securing developer contributions, as set out at Paragraph 8.30 of the Committee report.

427 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8.23pm and reconvened at 8.30pm.

428 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

At 10pm Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders in order that the Committee could complete its business.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel