
PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the See details below on Monday, 26 October 2015 from 9.30 am - 12.07 pm.

297 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

298 15/505910/REM LAND ADJ. COLESHALL FARM, FERRY ROAD, IWADE, SITTINGBOURNE, KENT ME9 8QY

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman), Prescott (Vice-Chairman) and Ben Stokes.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Mick Galvin.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Jo Millard and Ross McCardle.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Roger Clark, Mark Ellen and Sue Gent.

The Chairman welcomed the applicant, representatives from Iwade Parish Council and members of the public to the meeting and outlined the format the meeting would take. He advised that Councillor James Hunt would be spokesperson for Iwade Parish Council.

The Senior Planner introduced the item which was for the Approval of Reserved matters including details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 86 dwellings pursuant to outline application SW/08/1127. He advised that Iwade Parish Council had raised objection to the application. Their views, along with the views included within eight letters of objection were outlined in the 15 October 2015 Planning Committee Report.

The Senior Planner advised that amended drawings had recently been received from the applicants addressing some of the objections raised; swapping of 2.5 storey units with 2-storey units and re-siting of units to provide better back-to-back relationships with properties in Mansfield Drive and minimise potential for overlooking; a knee height railing to be added adjacent to the stream to prevent pedestrians using the footpath from falling in; boundary hedge on the northern site boundary to be extended closer to the stream to prevent access through Mansfield Drive; provision of 1.8 metre fencing and hedging along the northern boundary. The Senior Planner supported the amendments, and advised that it would now be difficult to provide the planned wildlife corridor running east-west across the site and this was not a specific requirement of the outline planning permission, but that one was provided along the stream, running north-south.

Councillor James Hunt, as Iwade Parish Council representative, thanked the Applicants for their positive amendments to the scheme but asked if the fencing

could be reconsidered as there may be issues of maintenance of overgrowth in between existing and proposed fencing. He also suggested that the planned wildlife corridor would have broken the site up.

The Ward Councillor supported the Parish Council's response.

A member of the Parish Council asked if the 1.8 metre fencing proposed would be erected within new or existing property boundaries. The Senior Planner advised they would be within the ownership boundaries of the new dwellings. The Chairman advised that the difference in levels on site would be considered by Members of the Planning Committee when they toured the site, after the site meeting.

A local resident said that existing conservatories were not shown on the plans which meant some properties were less than the minimum 20 metre back-to-back suggested and this could cause overlooking. Another resident suggested there was insufficient space to provide 2 parking spaces to each property on plots to the rear of 38-48 Mansfield Drive and asked who would be responsible for the upkeep of the new fencing in this location. The Senior Planner advised that the new owners of the property would be responsible for the new fencing.

Members then toured the site with the officer.

299 15/506335/FULL 30 WOODSIDE GARDENS, SITTINGBOURNE, ME10 1SG

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman), Prescott (Vice-Chairman) and Ben Stokes.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Mick Galvin.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Philippa Davies and Ross McCardle.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Roger Clark, Mark Ellen, Sue Gent and James Hunt.

The Chairman welcomed nine members of the public to the meeting.

The Senior Planner outlined the application which was for the demolition of the existing detached garage, and the erection of a side and rear extension, creation of a first floor, including dormer windows and roof lights to the north and south elevations. He explained that the side extension would project four metres to the side at the front of the property and six metres to the rear, forming an L-shaped extension. There would be two pitched-roof dormer windows to the front, and a dormer and two roof lights to the rear.

Twelve letters of objection to the application had been received; these outlined points already noted in the report. The Senior Planner advised that the previous application (15/501692) had included a hip-to-gable roof conversion; this one included a hipped roof, pitched away from the common boundary. He stated the application was within the built-up area, and he considered it to be a relatively small extension. The height of the dwelling would not be increased, and terracing effect

and loss of openness was unlikely. The Senior Planner advised that the insertion of rear dormer windows were in any case allowed under Permitted Development Rights. He considered overlooking, overshadowing and loss of privacy would not be an issue; the rear-to-rear distance was 23 metres which was above the minimum requirement. There would be no windows to the side, and he advised that parking was in accordance with the current adopted Kent Parking Standards.

Local residents made the following comments: this had not changed significantly, compared to the previous application; this was a small cul-de-sac, the size of the application was out-of-keeping; only slight alterations had been made; this was not a small extension, it was a major alteration; nothing had changed with regard to the overbearing aspect of the proposed extension; the property could attract a family, with the potential of additional cars, resulting in parking issues; this was overbearing and would result in overlooking; it would spoil the character of the area; this was a tranquil, well laid out neighbourhood; the problems in the original application had not been addressed or modified; the dormer windows would result in overlooking; and the door to the rear was very close to the adjoining property's bedroom window.

In response to a question, the Senior Planner advised that the dwelling opposite was not comparable in design with the proposed dwelling as it did not feature a side extension, and had a front box dormer and gable end. He confirmed that the distance from the new garage to the side fence was approximately one metre.

Members then toured the site and neighbouring properties with the officer.

300 15/505114/FULL LAND ADJACENT TO AND FORMING PART OF 2 SWEDISH HOUSE, THROWLEY ROAD, THROWLEY, ME13 0PF

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Andy Booth, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Mike Henderson, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Prescott (Vice-Chairman).

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Mick Galvin.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Philippa Davies and Graham Thomas.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Roger Clark, Mark Ellen, Sue Gent, James Hunt and Ben Stokes.

The Chairman welcomed the applicants and two members of Throwley Parish Council to the meeting.

The Area Planning Officer explained that the application was for change of use of land from agricultural to mixed agricultural/equestrian use, and construction of stabling for horses.

The applicants had indicated the footprint of the proposed stables which were located in the south east corner to the front of the site, adjacent to an existing sub-station. The application site was within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding

Natural Beauty (AONB), near to Throwley Church which was Grade I Listed, and nearby to other listed buildings.

The stables would be L-shaped, with overall dimensions of 10.8 metres by 10.3 metres. The stables would be dark-stained and had a perspex window and felt tiling on the roof. The ridge height would be 3.3 metres; the roof pitch had been slightly increased to 27.5 degrees.

The Area Planning Officer reported that the Environment Agency had no objection to the application, and no comments had been received from the Parish Council. He explained that refusal was recommended as it was a prominent site, within the Kent Downs AONB, and it was below the standard of design and materials that would be expected in this area. A tiled roof was a preferred material at this location, but a corrugated material was preferable to the felt tiles proposed by the applicants. The Area Planner was happy with the principle, but suggested it be re-located to the rear of the property, as a well-designed wooden structure would be acceptable next to the church.

The applicant outlined his application and explained that he had complied with the Council's leaflet on this type of development, and had followed pre-application advice. He acknowledged the site was at a higher level, but considered the hedging would address this, and he stated that the area was already compromised by the existing sub-station and telegraph pole. The applicant spoke on the suggestion that the stables be re-located to the rear of the property, but advised that this would mean the construction of an access drive to the stables. He stated that the increase in pitch seemed to be at odds with the consideration that the stables appeared to be prominent, and advised that other advice that he had taken had been agreed at the pre-application stage.

A Parish Council representative apologised that a representation had previously not been sent from Throwley Parish Council. He explained that the Parish Council was in favour of the stables being positioned along the hedgeline, near to the sub-station and telegraph pole, as it was adequately screened. He considered that if it was sited behind the house it would be visible from the public footpath. A second Parish Council representative spoke in support of the application and considered the proposed siting had the least impact.

The Chairman requested that the Parish Council forward a written representation to the Area Planning Officer.

The Ward Member considered the stables would only be visible from the driveway opening of the property, and further hedging would be added. He did not consider it was necessary to position it behind the dwelling. He considered the quality of the building was subjective.

In response to a question from a Member, it was confirmed that the site where the stables were located had been recommended at the pre-application stage.

Members then toured the site with the 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