
PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held at the sites listed below on Monday, 3 September 2018 from 10.00am - 11.55am.

184 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

In the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Councillor Cameron Beart was elected Chairman for the meeting at Land adjacent to Sheppey Academy East, Admirals Walk, Halfway.

185 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

186 18/500283/FULL LAND ADJACENT TO SHEPPEY ACADEMY EAST, ADMIRALS WALK, HALFWAY ME12 3JQ

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart (Chairman), Richard Darby and James Hall.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Matt Bembridge, Jo Millard and Jim Wilson.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Andy Booth, Mike Dendor, Nicholas Hamsphire, James Hunt and Bryan Mulhern.

The Chairman welcomed the applicants and the members of the public to the meeting and outlined the format the meeting would take.

The Major Projects Officer introduced the application and explained that it proposed the erection of 31, 3 bedroom dwellings on a site which was allocated for housing in the adopted Local Plan. He explained that the proposed dwellings were a mixture of 2 and 2 and a half storeys in height, each with their own dedicated parking spaces and rear private amenity space, and the site would have a total of 73 parking spaces, including 11 visitor spaces.

The Major Projects Officer explained that the closest proposed property to No. 2 Admirals Walk, on the western boundary of the application site, would sit approximately 3.5m forward of the front elevation of the existing property and on the opposite side of Admirals Walk, the closest proposed element of plot number 31 would be broadly in line with the front elevation of No. 1 Admirals Walk and there would be a 4m gap.

The Major Projects Officer advised that the rear of four of the proposed dwellings in the western part of the application site would face towards the rear of Nos. 65, 67, 69 and 71 Highfield Road and the closest rear to rear separation distance was 29m, rising to 35m. He added that this was in excess of the minimum distance of 21m the Council would usually expect.

The Major Projects Officer said that in the northern part of the site, the rear of 14 proposed units would face towards the rear of a number of properties on the southern side of Minster Road and the separation distances were in excess of 50m with vegetation retained between the rear gardens of the existing and proposed dwellings.

The Major Projects Officer referred to the parking and highway issues raised at the Planning Committee meeting on 16 August 2018, and highlighted that the car ports had been designed specifically to be lightweight to make them far less susceptible to conversion in the future. He added that condition (8) of the proposed Planning Approval notice required the retention of those parking spaces. The Major Projects Officer advised that Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation considered that the development did not represent an overbearing impact on the local highway network, did not require highway improvements and raised no objection to the proposal.

The Major Projects Officer advised that a Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted with the application and after consultation with KCC and Southern Water, neither had raised objection. He said that 3 standard conditions had been recommended.

The KCC Highways and Transportation Officer stated that the principle of the access to the site was already established due to its allocation in the local plan, and liaison with the agent had lead to initial concerns around parking layout being overcome. He advised that a turning head on the site would be able to accommodate large vehicles and the Highway Manager had confirmed that gritting lorries had operated in the area earlier in the year.

Mr Ian McCourt, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. He drew attention to the major highway improvements currently under way at Barton Hill Drive, Minster which would alleviate the issue of using Halfway as a 'rat run', stated that the surface water on Admirals Walk was nothing to do with the scheme and said that KCC had not raised any highway objection. He added that many residents in the area chose not to park on their driveways and said that the site was allocated in the Local Plan for Housing.

Local residents raised points which included:

- Did the Secretary of State have permission to sell the land for development?;
- the land was contaminated;
- there was an underground stream;
- sought assurance that if the development went ahead, regular monitoring would ensure it was built strictly in accordance with the approved plans;
- why were there gates at the back of the properties?;
- concerned that trees were a fire risk;
- suggested a Tree Preservation Order for existing trees;
- roads in the area could not cope with extra traffic;
- area was already a 'rat run'
- impact on highway by HGV's when development was being built;
- concern that visitor spaces would not be used;

- overlooking issues;
- why had KCC Highways and Transportation changed their opinion?;
- asked that any damage to highway was rectified;
- the 20mph speed limit would be ignored;
- there was no employment on Sheppey for any residents of new properties;
- concern on the effect of wildlife in the area;
- requested frosted glass in windows that overlooked existing properties;
- views from the marshes were spoiled;
- facilities such as school and hospitals could not cope with further development – there was already too much development on the Isle of Sheppey;
- the school could not expand in the future;
- safety concerns for children with construction traffic;
- had an independent survey of traffic ever been carried out at peak times?;
- concerns around speeding traffic exiting the development;
- bungalows would be more acceptable; and
- concern on the affect the development would have on the high population of elderly who lived in the area.

In response to questions, the Major Projects Officer clarified that the proposed dwellings were a mixture of 2 and 2.5 storeys tall and that the distances between existing and proposed dwellings as shown on the plans were correct. He explained the difference between the proposed 2.5 storey dwellings which had rooms in the roofspace on the 3rd level and full 3 storey dwellings. He also drew attention that all plans were viewable on the Council's website.

A Member highlighted the damage that might be caused by heavy construction traffic and suggested a planning condition to make good and improve the highway after the development was complete, if the application was approved.

Members then toured the site.

187 18/502643/FULL 3 CHETNEY VIEW, IWADE, SITTINGBOURNE, KENT ME9 8SQ

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Richard Darby, James Hall and Bryan Mulhern (Chairman).

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey and Jo Millard.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Roger Clark.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Andy Booth, Mike Dendor, Nicholas Hampshire and James Hunt.

The Chairman invited the Area Planning Officer to introduce the application.

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which sought the erection of a single storey side and rear extension with a pitched roof, and repositioning of a garden side wall. He explained the proposed position of the wall, which was a maximum of 2.6m from the existing wall and 0.75m from the outer boundary of the

property. The Area Planning Officer explained that the extension was acceptable but the repositioning of the garden side wall was prominent and visually harmful to the streetscene.

The applicant explained that the extension could not be built without moving the wall as the existing garden was not big enough, and the wall in its current position would cause a large shadow across the garden. She explained that landscaping would be carried out in front of the wall to minimise impact. The applicant said that planning permission had been granted to a near neighbour for a similar proposal.

A visiting Member spoke in support of the application and stated that the road was not widely used.

In response to a question from a Member, the applicant clarified her ownership of the garage and parking spaces to the rear of the garden.

In response to questions from Members, the Area Planning Officer advised that landscaping could be secured by condition and agreed to advise on whether a split decision was possible.

Members toured the application site.

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