
PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the See details below on Monday, 23 March 2015 from 9.30 am - 12.38 pm.

579 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

580 14/505542/FULL (2.3) - 1A SAXON ROAD, FAVERSHAM

PRESENT: Councillors Sylvia Bennett, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Vice-Chairman), Ben Stokes and Ghlin Whelan.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor John Coulter (Ward Member).

OFFICERS PRESENT: Philippa Davies, Claire Dethier and Andrew Spiers.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Barnicott and Adrian Crowther.

The Vice-Chairman (in the Chair for this meeting) welcomed the Agent, Faversham Town Council representatives, Ward Member and members of the public to the meeting.

The Senior Planner introduced the application and stated that it was for the restoration and extension of no. 1A Saxon Road, Faversham to form a one 1-bed and one 2-bed flat, and the demolition of the existing building in the yard with the construction of two 2-bed semi-detached dwellings with associated amenity and parking spaces. The Senior Planner explained that 1A Saxon Road would be extended sideways to the boundary of the site, providing a first floor extension, with a gap at ground level to provide vehicular access to the rear of the site. Paint would be removed from the front elevation of 1A, timber sash window frames would be added and the roof tiles replaced with slate. There would be a seven metre rear garden, three parking spaces, a turning space and a bike shed. The two additional properties would be low maintenance finish, with solar panels to reduce the carbon footprint.

The Senior Planner reported that three letters of objection had been received, plus one with neutral comments. She outlined the objections which included: loss of privacy; unauthorised access; lack of sight lines especially for cyclists; the development did not meet criteria of the Local Plan. The neutral points included that the warehouse had outlived its useful purpose.

The Senior Planner reported that Faversham Town Council had raised objection. They considered the development would cause overlooking, and it was not deliverable as the applicants did not control the access to the site.

The Agent provided an overview of the application. He explained that the ridge height was lower than it was previously; solar panels would be added to reduce the

carbon footprint; and windows at the side were to be at a high level on the ground floor, with most glazing being at the end of the property to avoid any overlooking issues.

A Ward Member considered there was too much being added to the site, with the reliance on the access at the rear of the properties, on Stone Street, which was historically to be used only in emergencies. He considered the proposed application was damaging the interests of residents on all sides of the site.

Local residents raised the following points: concerned with access to the site; there was access onto Saxon Road, the access onto Stone Street was not necessary, except in emergencies; the plans showed a gateway which did not exist; the pathway was through a private garden; clarity was needed on the access and the parking; overlooking issues; proposed floor-to-ceiling windows directly overlooked the neighbouring property; and the pedestrian use of the access was for the existing properties.

The Agent explained that he understood there were pedestrian rights of way to the rear of the site.

Members then toured the site with officers.

581 14/505472/FULL (2.7) - 66 PARK DRIVE, SITTINGBOURNE

PRESENT: Councillors Sylvia Bennett, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Vice-Chairman), Prescott, Ben Stokes, Ghlin Whelan and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey and Joanne Hammond.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Barnicott and Adrian Crowther.

The Vice-Chairman (in the Chair for this meeting) welcomed the applicant, agent and members of the public to the meeting. He outlined the format that the site meeting would take and asked the Area Planning Officer to introduce the item.

The Area Planning Officer outlined the application for the erection of a detached chalet bungalow in the rearmost portion of the garden of 66 Park Drive, with vehicle access from Roseleigh Road. The plot would measure approximately 31m deep x 9.2m wide, with the bungalow sitting roughly central on the site. He outlined the measurements for the bungalow and advised that it included two parking spaces to the front of the property with a third within an integral garage. He referred to the six letters of objection received, as set out in the report.

The Area Planning Officer confirmed that Kent County Council Highways and Southern Water had raised no objection and comments were awaited from the Council's Environmental Health Manager. He outlined the reasons for the recommendation for approval and considered that the proposal complied with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on minimum rear-to-rear separation distances.

Local residents were then invited to speak and made the following comments in objection to the application: residents on either side of the property would have their view spoiled; concerns about overlooking; proposed dwelling too close to the boundary of the neighbouring properties' fences; large gardens were part of the attractiveness of the area; loss of privacy; traffic concerns; cars will not be able to pass safely and it will be a dangerous access; loss of light; security concerns; noise and disruption to neighbouring properties; scaffolding will be intrusive; flooding concerns for neighbouring properties as the soakaway was not fit for purpose; and general safety concerns.

Members then toured the site with the officer, the applicant and the agent, also inspecting the site from Roseleigh Road.

582 14/505351/FULL (2.4) - DANE WORKS, CROWN QUAY LANE, SITTINGBOURNE

PRESENT: Councillors Sylvia Bennett, Andy Booth, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Vice-Chairman), Prescott, Ben Stokes, Ghlin Whelan and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey, Paul Gregory and Joanne Hammond.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Barnicott and Adrian Crowther.

The Vice-Chairman (in the Chair for this meeting) welcomed the applicant and representative from Lebus International, agent and member of the public to the meeting. He outlined the format that the site meeting would take and asked the Planner to introduce the item.

The Planner outlined the application for an extension to the existing industrial unit which would measure 11.5m in length and 15m in width, 5.5m to the eaves and 8.7m in overall height. A small section of mezzanine floor was proposed, 3.3m in length. He advised that one letter of objection had been received and summarised the grounds for objection as set out in the report. He addressed each of the objections in turn, noting that the Council's Environmental Health Manager had raised no objection subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions, and Network Rail had also raised no objection to the application.

The applicant made the following comments: the company were regularly surveyed by their insurers to ensure that they were compliant with Health and Safety and noise regulations; the proposal would enable the business to increase productivity and employ one or two additional members of staff; the noisiest part of the production line would be moved further away from the neighbouring residential building; and no outside work was undertaken. He also confirmed via the Works Manager that forklift truck movements were on average not more than 2.7 hours per week. In response to a question, the applicant confirmed that the extension would be used for fabrication and welding and the mezzanine floor level would be used for storage purposes.

A local resident spoke in objection to the application and circulated impressions of the new structure to Members to demonstrate the view from his rear garden. He

considered that the extension would have a significant impact on their view. He also considered that the ridge height was not significantly different from the existing building and it would therefore be an imposing structure at the rear of the garden. Members then toured the site with officers, the applicant and agent and viewed the site from the rear garden of No.1 St Michael's Road.

583 14/502557/FULL (2.10) - MOORDEAN, OAK LANE, MINSTER-ON-SEA

PRESENT: Councillors Sylvia Bennett, Andy Booth, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Vice-Chairman), Prescott, Ben Stokes, Ghlin Whelan and Tony Winkless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey and Philippa Davies.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Barnicott and Adrian Crowther.

The Vice-Chairman (in the Chair for this meeting) welcomed the applicant, Minster Parish Council representative and members of the public to the meeting.

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which was for the conversion of part of the existing garage to an accessible bedroom and en-suite, with dayroom, as an ancillary use to the main building, to also include a utility room. One of the two car ports would be in-filled, an external wall to the front elevation and an internal wall would be constructed. There would be two rooflights on the southern roof slope and one on the northern roof slope. The Area Planning Officer explained that a Lawful Development Certificate had been issued for the use of the dwelling house as a residential care home for six people.

The Area Planning Officer reported that Minster Parish Council had objected to the application. Their views, along with the views included within six letters of objection were outlined in the 12 March 2015 Planning Committee report.

The Area Planning Officer explained that the plans for the existing garage were acceptable, as the use was as an ancillary to the main dwelling. He explained that a window to the southern elevation had been deleted, and replaced with a rooflight. The Area Planning Officer considered the garage was not in a prominent public vantage point, the proposals were of a small scale nature and would not have an adverse effect on local residents. He also explained that it would not harm the amenity of local residents; the traffic generated would not be significant; there was sufficient parking on site, and he stated there were no planning objections to the application.

The applicant advised that the parking area would be extended on the site, sufficient for the use of the site and there would be no parking on the road. She explained that the clients would be involved within the local community and make use of the local facilities. The applicant further explained that the utility room would be for the use of the six residents, there would be two washing machines and one tumble dryer. She explained that she had tried to take account of neighbours' comments throughout the process.

The Minster Parish Council representative explained that the Parish Council considered the conversion of the garage to be a step too far. They had welcomed the community project, but suggested the clients would be isolated at this location. The representative also considered that the amenity and privacy of local residents would be affected, specifically from any noise nuisance near the boundary; he stated that the annex was too close to the boundary of other properties.

Local residents raised the following points: drainage relating to the application will go across neighbouring properties; drainage had been constructed in an amateur way; concern that there would be other members of staff, such as cleaners and cooks at the premises; there was no amenity area for the clients on the site; poor drainage in the area, with water running down the lane; pipes were inadequate; the foundations of the garage were inadequate; the surrounding area was not suitable for the clients with potential dangers of a nearby pond; traffic, with bends in the road and the cliff side; this was not humane; noise would be generated from the utility room and day room, suggest this use be installed in the main house instead; there was only a 15 foot patio between the annex and neighbouring property; the day room would generate a lot of noise, as would noise from the outside space; and acknowledge rights for clients to live in the community, but this was too close to other properties.

In response to the queries raised, the applicant advised that the family group within the house had a right to live in the community, this was not being run on an institutional basis; and allocated carers engaged with the clients with everyday cooking and cleaning, so no additional staff would be at the property. The applicant explained that all 12 people on the site were unlikely to be out in the garden at one time, they would be engaging in individual activities. She considered any noise generated from the site would be comparable to that from a family.

The Area Planning Officer advised that he would look further into the drainage of the site prior to the Planning Committee meeting on 2 April 2015.

Members then toured the site and adjoining property with officers.

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