

---

## PLANNING WORKING GROUP

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the at the sites listed below on Monday, 21 September 2015 from 10.30 am - 12.05 pm.

**220 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

**221 15/502716/FULL - BREACH FARM PADDOCKS, LAND NORTH-EAST OF BREACH FARM BUNGALOW, BREACH LANE, UPCHURCH**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Bobbin, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Prescott (Vice-Chairman).

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Rob Bailey, Philippa Davies and Ross McCardle.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Cameron Beart, Mark Ellen, Sue Gent and James Hunt.

The Chairman welcome the Agent, Parish Council representatives and seven members of the public to the meeting.

The Planning Officer introduced the application which was for the change of use of land to a single gypsy pitch with associated development, including one static caravan, one touring caravan, an amenity building, and shipping container.

The Planning Officer reported that the Ward Members had objected to the application and 13 letters of objection had been received. The comments were outlined in the report for the 3 September 2015 Planning Committee meeting. Newington and Upchurch Parish Councils objected to the application. Kent County Council (KCC) Archaeology raised no objection, subject to the conditions already set out in the report.

The Planning Officer advised that the site scored high on the methodology of assessment criteria for gypsy and traveller sites, so the principle was there. He further advised that there would be landscaping at the site, and as it was far enough away from neighbouring properties, the impact was minimal.

Mr Durr, the agent, provided an overview of the application and advised that the applicant had owned the land for 30 years. The site was a brownfield site and it would provide a home for a local person who kept horses on the adjacent land. The agent explained that the planned landscaping would mean that the site was not visible from the lane.

A representative from Newington Parish Council considered the area had a higher proportion of gypsy and traveller sites than other sites in the Borough. He raised concern that KCC Highways had referred to the wrong lane in the report; local connections were not good, there were infrequent bus services and pedestrian access to the site was difficult; the site was near to two listed buildings; the

application would have an adverse effect on residential amenity; the amount of proposed landscaping showed there was a lot to conceal; this had only been a brownfield site for 30 years; the area was greater than was needed for this application; use of the land was related to the applicant's business, but report stated land should not be used for business/industrial use; and the policy considerations only justified temporary permission.

The Planning Officer confirmed that KCC Highways had commented on the correct site.

Local residents raised the following comments: comments sent to Swale Borough Council had not been acknowledged; there had been a significant change in the nature of this area over recent years; this was one step too far, this had to stop; disagreed with the approach that the report had taken; this was not just about policy, equitable change in the area should also be considered; concerned with the continuous line of ribbon development; was not against the application, but would prefer to see a house here that fitted in with the surrounding area; concerned that the site could be extended further; and the density of gypsy and traveller sites was excessive for the area.

In response to questions from Members, it was confirmed that the applicant was currently travelling; access was solely to the application site, but there was another access to the farm land further along the lane; and the shipping container would be painted green.

Members then toured the site with the Planning Officers.

**222 15/500819/FULL - LAND ADJOINING DRIFTWOOD, IMPERIAL DRIVE, WARDEN**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Bobbin, Roger Clark, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Mike Henderson, Lesley Ingham, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Prescott (Vice-Chairman).

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Rob Bailey and Philippa Davies.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Cameron Beart, Mark Ellen, Sue Gent and James Hunt.

The Chairman welcomed the Agent, Parish Council representative and 11 members of the public to the meeting.

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which was for two semi-detached, two bedroom houses and three terraced three bedroom houses, together with associated parking spaces, within the built-up area of Warden. He explained that the frontage of the site, along Imperial Drive, was 27 metres, with a depth of 40 metres. He outlined the measurements of the proposed houses, as noted in the report. The proposed development would have 10 car parking spaces, two for Plot 1, and the remainder would be in the form of a small car parking area. There would be a 0.8 metre high boundary wall to the frontage. He further advised that the site was adjacent to open land which was allocated as a play area and he considered

the proposal would not result in overshadowing or overlooking. The garden depths met or exceeded the Council's guidelines.

The Area Planning Officer reported that six letters of objection had been received, the comments of which were set out in the report. He stated that the scheme was acceptable in terms of design and the off-street parking addressed highway impact.

The agent briefly outlined the application.

A representative from Warden Parish Council spoke against the application. She stated that the Parish Council considered it was over-development of the site, the proposed terrace was excessive and would impact on adjoining dwellings; there would be a loss of view; there was a lack of employment in the area; schools were already full and there was a lack of bus services.

A Ward Member spoke against the application. She considered it was overdevelopment; there would be overlooking and it was over-intensification.

A statement from local residents in objection to the application was read out. The following points were raised: five houses on the plot was too dense for the size of the plot; this was overdevelopment; the previous application for three houses on the reduced size of site was acceptable; five houses would result in the plots being 'squeezed in', and be very close to the existing dwellings; overlooking; overshadowing; loss of privacy and views; the proposed houses were too near to existing dwellings, 18 metres to Driftwood, 10 metres to White Caps, building regulation stated 21 metre distance; five rather than 3 houses would impact on the sea views currently enjoyed; the proposed houses were very small, there was no need for further affordable or social housing in Warden; parking problems; the development was opposite a busy junction; if Cliff Drive was closed because of sea erosion, this would impact further on Imperial Drive; Plots 3, 4 and 5 did not conform to the building line for Imperial Drive; the local school and doctors' surgery were already oversubscribed; and the application would affect the lives and homes of local residents.

In response to a question, the Area Planning Officer confirmed that he would check the area of the site where six houses had previously been proposed.

Members then toured the site and some adjacent properties with the Area Planning Officer.

#### 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