
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in The Sapling Room, The Appleyard, Avenue of Remembrance, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 4DE on Thursday, 10 November 2022 from 7.00 pm - 10.13 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, Richard Darby, Oliver Eakin, Tim Gibson (Chair), James Hall, Angela Harrison (Substitute for Councillor Carole Jackson), Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chair), Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Ken Rowles, David Simmons, Paul Stephen and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Billy Attaway, Andy Byrne, Paul Gregory, Corinna Griffiths, Cheryl Parks and Jim Wilson.

OFFICERS PRESENT (Virtually): Simon Algar, Flo Churchill, Philippa Davies and Eze Ekeledo.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Richard Palmer, Alan Horton and Mike Whiting.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Carole Jackson and Tim Valentine.

434 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

435 **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

436 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 October 2022 (Minute Nos. 388 – 394) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

437 **Planning Working Group**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 1 November 2022 (Minute Nos. 403 - 404) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

22/502340/OUT Land Adjacent Westfield Cottages Breach Lane Lower Halstow Kent ME9 7DD.

The Area Planning Officer referred to the tabled update which set-out a new red-line plan that reduced the overall size of the site.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

The Chair invited Members to comment on the application. Members raised points which included:

- The applicant had done a lot of work to clear the site of fly-tipping;

- concerned that refusing this application would result in the land becoming a dumping site again;
- the development was only for one dwelling so could not see the harm it brought to the village; and
- thought the design was in-keeping with the surrounding area.

On being put to the vote, the motion to refuse the application was lost.

Councillor James Hunt moved a motion to approve the application subject to the relevant conditions, this was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

On being put to the vote Members agreed that the application should be approved with delegation to officers to compile relevant planning conditions including a restriction in respect of the development only being constructed as a self-build.

Resolved: That delegated authority be given for application 22/502340/OUT to be approved subject to the relevant planning conditions including a restriction in respect of the development only being constructed as a self-build.

438 **Schedule of Decisions**

Part 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended.

2.1 REFERENCE NO 20/503675/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Part Retrospective Change of Use of land within Palm Trees Holiday Park to allow stationing of 28 mobile home lodges around a centrally located recreation area.		
ADDRESS Palm Trees Caravan Park Second Avenue (junction with Third Avenue) Warden Road Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4ET		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Palm Tree Management Ltd AGENT John Burke Associates

The Area Team Leader introduced the application and advised Members of an update to paragraph 2.3 in the report, on the basis that five caravans had been placed on another part of the site, in addition to other caravans which were already on the site. However, as there was a condition requiring them to be moved to comply with the approved layout, this did not raise any particular concerns.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Some of the caravans on the site were very close to the erosion zone and erosion was occurring more rapidly;
- thought the five larger caravans being proposed were good to compared to some of the older caravans on the site;
- concerned with the water drainage on the site;
- understood that caravans needed to be moved away from the erosion but was concerned that designated countryside was being used;
- understood there was nowhere else for these caravans to be relocated;
- thought that the old 150 designated number of caravans on the site was too many and should be reduced to ensure no additional caravans would be added; and
- it was important to replace older caravans with improved larger ones that would last longer and be more sustainable.

In response to queries raised the Area Team Leader explained that the drainage scheme had been assessed by Kent County Council (KCC) who had raised no objection subject to a condition which had been recommended.

Councillor Elliott Jayes moved the following amendment: That the number of caravans permitted on the site be reduced from 150 to 141 and condition (3) be amended accordingly. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney, and on being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

Resolved: That application 20/503675/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (13) in the report, with the amendment that the number of caravans on the site was reduced to 141 as controlled by condition (3).

2.2 REFERENCE NO 22/503684/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Garage conversion into habitable space including obscuring window and fixed shut (Part retrospective).		
ADDRESS 10 Ferry Road Iwade Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8RR		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Dr Angela Hammond
Bobbing, Iwade and Lower Halstow	Iwade	AGENT Mr Jonathan Williams

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set-out in the report.

Sam Fuszard, an objector, spoke against the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Thought that obscure glazed Pilkington Glass Privacy level three was not sufficient enough, level five was more appropriate;
- was the window going to be fixed shut?;

- had concerns with parking in the area;
- gardens were very small in the area;
- considered bricking-up the window would be a better option for privacy;
- wondered why the applicant had not considered a roof light instead to improve the internal light; and
- paragraph 5.1 in the report stated that a window was not needed.

In response, the Area Planning Officer said that the applicant’s proposal of a level three glazed window met the Council’s usual standard for privacy glass, however there was an arguable case that a higher level should be applied in this instance, given the location of the window. He added that condition (2) could be amended to require details of how the window would be obscure glazed and fixed shut to deal with Member concerns that application of a film on the existing window would not be sufficient.

Resolved: That application 22/503684/FULL be approved subject to condition (1) and an amendment to condition (2) in the report, to require that a scheme of the window privacy design be submitted to officers for consideration.

2.3 REFERENCE NO 22/03385/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Change of use of the land to use for the stationing up to 20 holiday caravans, with associated access road and parking areas.		
ADDRESS Wynne Hall First Avenue Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4JN		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs D Wynne AGENT Woodstock Associates

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set-out in the report.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Could not understand why this property was within the caravan allocation boundary and not others that were closer to caravan park sites;
- was there a business case for the proposal?;
- what was the need for an extra 20 caravans on this site?;
- thought that 20 caravans on a small site was too many;
- felt that two particular caravans were not needed and too close to the property; and
- the residential property was entitled to privacy from the caravans.

The Area Planning Officer explained to Members that as the site was in a designated holiday park area there was positive policy support for such development and no requirement to make a business case. The proposal for 20 holiday caravans had been laid out to comply with the licensing requirement, and he advised that it would be difficult to

justify a need to remove caravans from the site, given that this was an essential characteristic of the surrounding area.

Councillor Monique Bonney moved the following motion: That the application be deferred for officers to work with the applicant to consider the removal of two caravans and to explore the possibility of moving one caravan further away from the residential home and amending the layout of the remaining caravans. She added that if the applicant was amenable to the removal of the caravans and an amended layout, that was in accordance with the Planning Committee’s views and the discussion at the meeting then, delegated powers be given to the officer to approve in line with the agreed changes to the scheme and as per the draft conditions in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless.

Members considered the motion and raised points which included:

- The site was in the countryside, so it was important to keep it under control and for it not to be too densely populated;
- felt that the whole site needed looking at not just the two caravans at the front;
- removing some of the caravans from the front of the site would keep the rural image of the residential home; and
- the licensing requirements were a minimum guideline and not always suitable for individual sites.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 22/503385/FULL be deferred and if the applicant was amenable to the removal of the caravans and an amended layout that was in accordance with the Committee’s views and the discussion at the meeting then delegated powers be given to the officer to approve in line with the agreed changes to the scheme and as per the draft conditions in the report.

2.4 REFERENCE NO 20/505059/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL			
Retention of existing chalet bungalow with amended residential curtilage and erection of 10 dwellings (7 x three bedrooms and 3 x four bedrooms) with associated access, parking, amenity, and landscaping.			
ADDRESS Willow Trees 111 High Street Newington Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7JJ			
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT	UK Land
Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	Newington	Investors Ltd	
		AGENT	DHA Planning

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application as set-out in the report.

Parish Councillor Stephen Harvey, representing Newington Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Emma Hawkes, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Ward Members spoke against the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Had real concerns with the number of visitor parking spaces and thought they were not enough;
- concerned with access into the site as it was on a key part of the A2;
- concerned about potential overspill onto the A2 if there were not enough parking spaces on the site;
- needed to ensure that there was enough space for refuse lorries to pass visitor parking spaces as well as resident parking;
- considered it was a shame that less than 11 homes were being provided which meant a loss in affordable housing units;
- the applicant's proposed travel vouchers and electric bike vouchers was good to see but felt that it was still not enough mitigation to address air quality concerns;
- £500 voucher per dwelling was not enough to cover the cost of an electric bike; and
- thought that it was a good development in principle but asked if we could work with the developer to improve the proposed development?

In response, the Senior Planning officer reminded Members that the recently approved Supplementary Planning Document on parking standards for developments required the proposed development to have two visitor parking spaces due to the size of the development, and the applicant had already increased this to three parking spaces.

The Senior Lawyer (Planning) explained to Members that the developer had already committed to mitigation for air quality of almost double the amount of damage costs but any additional costs could be negotiated with the developer through the Section 106 Agreement, but that it would not be reasonable to require above what was needed to mitigate the planning impacts.

Councillor Mike Henderson moved the following motion: That the developer should increase the bike vouchers for each dwelling from £500 to £1000 to ensure each dwelling had sufficient funds to purchase an electric bike. He moved a second motion that the developer should also increase the number of visitor parking spaces from three to six to ensure that there was sufficient parking on the site. Councillor Monique Bonney seconded both motions.

The Senior Lawyer (Planning) suggested to Members that they could defer the item for Planning Officers to negotiate the value of bike vouchers and the additional visitor parking spaces and report back to the Committee.

Councillor Monique Bonney proposed that the item be deferred, this was seconded by Councillor Mike Henderson.

On being put to the vote Members agreed that the application should be deferred to a future meeting so that Planning Officers could negotiate with the developer.

Resolved: That application 20/505059/FULL be deferred to allow for negotiation with the developer in respect of increased visitor parking bays and increased contributions toward electric bike vouchers for future residents.

2.5 REFERENCE NO 21/505722/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline application for demolition of existing residential dwelling, and for the erection of up to 46 residential dwellings, including affordable housing, with access from A2 high Street (Access only being sought).		
ADDRESS 128 High Street Newington Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7JH		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Andrew Wilford AGENT
Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	Newington	

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application as set-out in the report.

Parish Councillor Stephen Harvey, representing Newington Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Paul Henry, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Ward Members spoke against the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Concerned that KCC Highways and Transportation had not looked at this application properly as there was a real issue with regards to access to the site; and
- this was a busy stretch of the A2 which made it difficult for drivers to pull out onto and for pedestrians to cross.

Councillor Tony Winckless moved a motion for a site visit so that Members could consider the sight lines for access to and from the site, this was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney.

Members considered the motion and raised points which included:

- KCC Highways and Transportation had already given their views on the proposed development, but had officers sought independent highways advice?;
- did not think that a site visit would achieve much but hoped that it would make KCC Highways and Transportation listen to the concerns of local residents and reconsider the application;
- a site visit gave the opportunity for members of the public to voice their opinions on the traffic problems on the A2 directly to the KCC Highways officers; and
- Members needed to understand the full extent of the issues on access for the proposed development and thought independent highways advice would help achieve this.

In response, the Senior Planning Officer informed Members that independent planning advice had not been sought for this application but KCC Highways and Transportation had

been consulted on this site a number of times. She added that the Parish Council's Railton Transport Review had been based on an older plan that had not considered the updated visibility splay details. The Major Projects Officer suggested to Members that a deferral for officers to seek independent highways advice could be better than a site visit to understand the full extent of issues around the access on the development.

Councillor Tony Winckless and Councillor Monique Bonney withdrew their original motion for a site visit.

Councillor Angela Harrison moved the following motion: That the item be deferred so officers could undertake advice from an independent highways team. This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Resolved: That application 21/505722/OUT be deferred to allow an independent highways assessment of the application to be undertaken.

Part 3

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO 20/505046/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of 2no. holiday homes.		
ADDRESS High Hopes Poot Lane Upchurch Sittingbourne Kent ME9 HL		
WARD Hartlip, Newington and Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Newington	APPLICANT Mr Curtis AGENT Woodstock Associates

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application as set-out in the report.

Parish Councillor Gary Rosewell, representing Upchurch Parish Council, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Curtis, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Ward Members spoke in support of the application.

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

Members considered the application and raised points which included:

- Felt that officers had made the right decision and used the DM3 Policy effectively;
- there was no evidence to suggest that the applicant had worked on a business case; and
- the application had been with officers for two years had a business plan been requested?

Councillor James Hunt moved the following motion: That the application be deferred so the applicant had an opportunity to provide a business case to officers to identify that there was a need for this development in the area. This was seconded by Councillor Cameron Beart.

Members considered the motion and raised points which included:

- Felt that if extra information was needed for officers to fully consider the application then a deferral would be sensible so officers could collect that information and report back;
- other supporting information under Policy DM3 was required in terms of other more preferable sites considered; and
- it was important that a need for the business was identified because the site was in the countryside.

In response, the Area Planning officer said that the applicant had been asked if there were any supporting documents to support the proposed application, but they had not provided any.

On being put to the vote the motion for deferral was agreed.

Resolved: That application 220/505046 be deferred to allow the applicant to provide details of the business case and evidence of the identified need for the development proposal and further information as to why development of this site is necessary over other sites and locations.

439 **Adjournment of Meeting**

The Meeting was adjourned from 8:26 pm until 8.47 pm.

440 **Suspension of Standing Orders**

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

Chair

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