

---

## Planning Committee

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 12 October 2023 from 7.00 pm - 8.40 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mike Baldock (Chair), Lloyd Bowen (Substitute for Councillor Andy Booth), Hayden Brawn (Substitute for Councillor Charlie Miller), Simon Clark, Kieran Golding, Angela Harrison (Substitute for Councillor Karen Watson), Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Chris Palmer (Substitute for Councillor James Hall), Richard Palmer (Substitute for Councillor Elliott Jayes), Julien Speed, Paul Stephen, Terry Thompson, Angie Valls and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** William Allwood, Andy Byrne, Philippa Davies, Matt Duigan and Ceri Williams.

**OFFICERS PRESENT (VIRTUALLY):** Simon Algar.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Monique Bonney.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (VIRTUALLY):** Councillor Carole Jackson.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Andy Booth, James Hall, Elliott Jayes, Peter Marchington, Claire Martin, Charlie Miller and Karen Watson.

### 352 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 353 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 September 2023 (Minute Nos. 287 – 291) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 354 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Tony Winckless declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 3.1 23/502886/FULL 2 Walnut Court, Lammas Drive, Sittingbourne. He explained that he supported the application and would speak as Ward Member and then not speak or vote on the item.

### 355 **Schedule of Decisions**

#### **PART 2**

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO – 23/502632/FULL</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>
Increase roof height of existing garage, creating a first floor link extension with insertion of front and side dormers. Erection of 2.5m high retractable pool roof enclosure.

<b>SITE LOCATION</b> 8 Oak Tree Close Eastchurch Sheerness Kent ME12 4JY		
<b>WARD</b> Sheppey East	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Eastchurch	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr & Mrs Oyeniyi Oyelade <b>AGENT</b> JAT-Surv Ltd

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 Councillor Lloyd Bowen.

The Chair invited Members to make comments and points raised included:

- There could be some overlooking towards the adjacent property from the proposed dormer windows;
- considered the Parish Council should have made representations at the meeting as they had referred the application to the Planning Committee;
- clarification sought on how the retractable pool roof would open and close and whether this would cause any noise issues; and
- this was a large site, and a relatively modest extension.

In response, the Area Planning Officer considered there would be no harmful overlooking due to the orientation of the windows in the proposed first floor. He said the neighbouring garage located between the application site and the adjacent property would also help mitigate any overlooking issues. It was not clear from the application information whether the roof enclosure would be operated manually or not.

***Resolved: That application 23/502632/FULL be approved subject to conditions (1) to (3) in the report.***

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO – 23/502598/FULL</b>		
<b>PROPOSAL</b> Replacement of existing chain link and concrete post fencing with 2.4-meter-high palisade fence (green in colour).		
<b>SITE LOCATION</b> Chalkpit 1 Highsted Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 4BE		
<b>WARD</b> West Downs	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Rodmersham	<b>APPLICANT</b> Miss Julie Hadlow <b>AGENT</b> Miss Julie Hadlow, GH Dean and Co.

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report.

Tim Malpas, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Parish Councillor Duncan Burnett, representing Rodmersham Parish Council, spoke against the application.

A visiting Ward Member spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to approve the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Lloyd Bowen.

The Chair invited Members to make comments and points raised included:

- Acknowledged that a robust fence needed to be in place, but considered palisade fencing to be intrusive on a rural lane, although this could be mitigated over time with additional landscaping;
- this was an industrial type of fencing, very imposing especially taking into account the height of the verge, and it was not suitable for a rural lane;
- suggested the fencing be moved further back to allow pedestrians to walk on the verge;
- could see the benefits of the fence, but considered it would have an urbanising impact on the area;
- this was an improvement to the chain link fencing;
- the Parish Council and Ward Member should have been consulted prior to the application being submitted;
- could not see a reason to refuse the application;
- the applicant had made some changes along the way, i.e. painting the fence green to fit in with the surroundings, so considered there must have been some discussions;
- concerned that there was 'no give' with the palisade fencing, unlike the chain link fencing; and
- did not consider there was sufficient room for planting in front of the fencing as set out in paragraph 7.4.2 in the report.

In response to a question, the Planning Consultant explained that there was no pre-application discussion, although he did speak to the Ward Member. He said the original colour had been gun metal grey, but officers had been concerned that the fence would not blend in. He explained that the Parish Council and Ward Member had suggested park railing fencing, but the Applicant had said this was not feasible. The Planning Consultant confirmed that the fencing would be like-for-like in terms of its position.

Councillor Simon Clark moved the following motion: That the application be deferred for consultation by officers with the Applicant, Parish Council, Ward Member and the Active Travel Co-ordinator. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Palmer. On being put to the vote, the motion was agreed.

***Resolved: That application 23/502598/FULL be deferred for consultation by officers with the Applicant, Parish Council, Ward Member and the Active Travel Co-ordinator.***

**PART 3**

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO: 23/502886/FULL</b>		
<b>PROPOSAL</b> Insertion of replacement windows and doors.		
<b>SITE LOCATION</b> 2 Walnut Court Lammas Drive Sittingbourne Kent ME10 2DR		
<b>WARD</b> Milton Regis	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> N/A	<b>APPLICANT</b> Miss Esther Owusu <b>AGENT</b> Blackrock Architecture Ltd

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

Esther Owusu, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

A Ward Member, who was also a member of the Planning Committee, spoke in support of the application. He highlighted that only part of the application site was within the conservation area; that the windows would be replaced with brown UVPC (to match existing colour); and that no objections had been received.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Lloyd Bowen.

The Chair invited Members to make comments and points raised included:

- Wooden window frames lasted a lot longer than UVPC ones;
- some sympathy towards the applicant, and acknowledged that wooden window frames would be more expensive;
- this could set a precedent;
- considered UVPC looked similar to wooden frames;
- did not consider the application would have an impact on the conservation area;
- there was a property nearby with UVPC windows which was within the conservation area; and
- considered that as Permitted Development Rights had been removed when the planning permission for the development was approved, and the application site was adjacent to the conservation area, the application should be refused.

The Conservation and Design Manager was invited to speak. He acknowledged that only a small part of the application site was within the conservation area, and said that even if the boundary was amended, it still meant that the site was within the immediate setting of a conservation area and several listed buildings. He said that timber was of a higher quality than UVPC and the following major points needed to be considered: aesthetics; function; maintenance; and sustainability.

**Resolved: That application 23/502886/FULL be refused for the reason set out in the report.**

**PART 5**

Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

---

- **Item 5.1 – Fifield Lodge School Lane Borden**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**APPEAL ALLOWED**

- **Item 5.2 – Land at Cellar Hill Teynham**

**DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

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