

---

## Planning Committee

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 6 February 2025 from 7.02 pm - 10.20 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mike Baldock (Chair), Derek Carnell (Substitute for Councillor Richard Palmer), Ann Cavanagh, Shelley Cheesman (Substitute for Councillor Kieran Golding), Simon Clark, Charles Gibson (Substitute for Councillor Claire Martin), Angela Harrison (Substitute for Councillor Hayden Brawn), James Hunt, Elliott Jayes (Vice-Chair), Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Julien Speed, Paul Stephen, Terry Thompson, Karen Watson and Tony Winckless.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Andrew Gambrell, Simon Greenwood, Paul Gregory, Robin Harris, Ian Harrison, Joanne Johnson, Kellie MacKenzie, Guy Martin, Ben Oates and Luke Simpson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (VIRTUALLY):** Councillors Carole Jackson and Tara Noe.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Andy Booth, Hayden Brawn, Kieran Golding, Claire Martin and Richard Palmer.

### 629 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 630 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 January 2025 (Minute Nos. 550 – 558) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 631 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Charles Gibson declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 2.1 22/503389/FULL Western Works, Front Brents, Faversham as he had spoken and voted on the item when it was considered by Faversham Town Council. Councillor Gibson did not speak or vote on this item.

### 632 **Planning Working Group**

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 7 January 2025 (Minute Nos. 528 – 530) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Tony Winckless as being in attendance for the 20/505877/OUT Brogdale Farm, Brogdale Road, Ospringe application.

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 10 January 2025 (Minute Nos. 531 – 533) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of apologies from Councillor Karen Watson for the 23/505678/FULL Land West of Warden Road, Eastchurch application.

### 633 **Deferred Item 1 - 20/505877/OUT Brogdale Farm, Brogdale Road, Ospringe, ME13 8XU**

<b>Deferred Item 1 REFERENCE NO 20/505877/OUT</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Outline planning application for mixed-use development comprising up to 360sqm nursery school (use Class Ef), up to five holiday lets and up to 1,710sqm of flexible workshop, industrial & research and development floorspace (use Class Eg (ii, iii), with all matters reserved except access from Brogdale Road.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Brogdale Farm, Brogdale Road, Ospringe, ME13 8XU		
<b>WARD</b> East Downs	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Ospringe	<b>APPLICANT</b> Brogdale Farm Ltd <b>AGENT</b> Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd

The Planning Consultant referred to two points raised at the site meeting. The first point related to an application for a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for the two trees either side of the existing entrance. The Planning Consultant reported that the Council’s Tree Officer was of the view that the trees were prominent, healthy and worthy of protection, but as they would not be affected by the application so not under imminent threat, the TPO would be cautionary and not a high priority. The second point related to the history of noise complaints regarding existing businesses at Brogdale Farm, Faversham. The Planning Consultant reported that the Council’s Environmental Health Officer had confirmed that no recent complaints had been received for this site. There were two historical noise complaints from 2009 and 2015 in relation to the Butchers at Brogdale Farm, however they had both been resolved, and no statutory notices were served in relation to noise nuisance. Planning enforcement records showed that several enforcement cases were opened between 2009 and 2018 mostly relating to noise and lighting, including some associated with the butchers. However, no enforcement notices were served, and no new investigations had been opened since.

The Planning Consultant stated that the application would be subject to separate planning conditions to control its hours of use and lighting. The proposed workshop units would be restricted to Use Classes Eg(ii) and Eg (iii) which were uses that could be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area.

The Planning Consultant drew attention to the additional traffic data provided by Ospringe Parish Council which was tabled for Members.

At this point the Chair adjourned the meeting to allow Members time to read the tabled papers.

The Planning Consultant summarised the additional traffic data from Ospringe Parish Council which included data from two separate speed watch sessions on 7 January 2025 and 4 February 2025 for a one-hour period in each session. The results indicated the number of vehicles recorded passing the survey position and those that were travelling above 35 mph, along with the top speed recorded. However, no methodology of this process had been provided or evidence of the qualifications of those carrying out the survey. There were no details of the type or quality of the equipment used, therefore officers could not verify that the data provided was accurate and would advise against relying on the data over that provided in the Transport Statement. Section 3.5 of the Transport Statement set out that two automatic transport surveys were undertaken along Brogdale Road either side of the proposed access. Vehicle speeds were surveyed for

one week from 28 March 2019. Figures 3.3 and 3.4 showed the equipment used in the surveys. The highest speed recorded was to the north and headed away from the development. The recorded speeds affecting the proposed site access junction were 35.9 mph (southbound) and 34.3 mph (northbound). The required visibility from the site access junction had been designed to account for the recorded speeds in accordance with the manual for streets visibility requirements.

The Planning Consultant said at the time the Traffic Statement was provided in 2021, the best data available would have been the latest data before the Covid-19 Pandemic, as traffic movements had significantly changed during and shortly after the lockdowns. He said that whilst officers acknowledged that a certain amount of time had passed since then, Kent County Council (KCC) Highways & Transportation had not raised concern about the age of the data provided and they would be aware of the additional trips generated by the new developments in the area.

Grace Clements, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Julian Herrington, an objector, spoke against the application.

Parish Councillor Andrew Keel, representing Ospringe Parish Council, spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Terry Thompson.

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

- The 'spirit' of Brogdale was linked to the heritage of fruit and farming and it was an agricultural site not a suburban site;
- concerned that the site had not been put forward for rural use by the applicants;
- understood there was no longer support for the nursery school by Lorenden School and noted there was already a nursery within the village;
- industrialisation of a rural area was not needed;
- the application was the opposite of the remit of the East Malling Trust, which was *"the advancement of science for public benefit, primarily through the support of research and development, particularly in the fields of horticulture and other plant-based disciplines"*;
- the site should be used for rural use and considered the glass houses on the site were useable;
- pedestrians would not be able to safely access the site from Brogdale Road;
- concerned regarding the visibility of accessing the proposed access;
- concerned regarding the highway impact of the application;
- there was strict protocol from Kent Police on using the Speed Watch equipment and it was a valid scheme;
- did not consider that KCC Highways & Transportation had considered the cumulative effect of increased traffic from new developments such as Perry Court in the area since 2019;
- the proposed access would be dangerous for parents and young children visiting the proposed nursery school by foot;
- the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated development could be refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on road safety;

- did not consider an industrial area was an acceptable location for a nursery school;
- understood that some of the existing industrial units were regularly vacant and not convinced there was a demand for the proposed additional industrial units;
- the application conflicted with Policy DM31 (Agricultural land) of Swale Borough Council's (SBC's) Local Plan which protected best and most versatile land;
- the site was not allocated within the SBC's Local Plan and the applicant had not provided any evidence that alternative lower grade agricultural sites were unavailable;
- the application contravened Policy ST3 (The Swale settlement strategy) as the site was outside of the settlement boundary;
- the site was not within a rural service centre or designated employment site so it also contravened parts of Policy DM3 (The rural economy) from SBC's Local Plan;
- the application would also cause harm to the setting of Brogdale Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building, contrary to Policy CP8 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment – providing for green infrastructure) and Policy DM 32 (Development involving listed buildings) of SBC's Local Plan;
- not convinced that the benefits of the application would outweigh the contravention of so many of the Council's planning policies;
- saddened that the site had been allowed to fall into such disrepair;
- would like to see the glasshouses repaired and a plant nursery opened on the site as it would be more in-keeping and allow the listed building not to be 'hemmed-in' on all sides;
- would prefer that the existing access be used;
- the pedestrian access was hidden and was an 'accident waiting to happen';
- considered that the staff using the proposed nursery would arrive earlier than 7 am and leave later than 7 pm;
- hard to believe that the proposed access had been considered acceptable by officers;
- due to the noise of the motorway approaching vehicles could not be heard when trying to cross onto Brogdale Road via the proposed access;
- Brogdale Road was not suitable for pedestrians;
- this was the wrong side of the motorway for a nursery school;
- the sharp gradient for vehicles leaving the application site via the proposed access was unacceptable; and
- considered the application was 'stretching' diversification of the site.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding a possible deferment, the Planning Consultant said that the previously agreed extension of time for a decision on the application was 5 December 2024.

On being put to the vote the motion to approve the application was lost.

Members considered reasons for refusing the application, and reasons suggested included:

- The benefits of the application did not outweigh the harm to so many of the Council's Local Plan policies such as DM31; DM3, CP8 and DM32;

- road safety concerns;
- no demonstrable need for the nursery school; and
- no demonstration of the need for the industrial units.

The Planning Manager said that Members needed to identify the harms caused and then tie them back to SBC's Local Plan. He suggested four possible reasons for refusing the application for Members to consider.

Councillor Julien Speed moved the following motion to refuse the application:

- (1) As it had not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development would be able to be served by a safe access and as such the development would be likely to have a detrimental impact on highway safety. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policies CP 2 (Promoting sustainable transport) DM6 (Management transport demand and impact) and DM 14 (General development criteria) of Bearing Fruits 2031 – The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.
- (2) The proposed development would result in the loss of best and most fertile agricultural land and it had not been demonstrated that an overriding need exists for the development that could not be met on land within the built up boundaries or that no alternative site on land at a lower grade could accommodate the proposed development. The proposal was, therefore, unacceptable and contrary to Policies ST 1 (Delivering sustainable development in Swale), ST 7 (The Faversham area and Kent Downs strategy), DM 31 (Agricultural Land) of Bearing Fruits 2031, the Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.
- (3) The quantum and commercial nature of the proposed development and its position relative to the nearby listed building on former farmland associated with the listed farmhouse would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of that heritage asset, and the harm was not outweighed by public benefits arising from the proposal. The proposal was, therefore, unacceptable and contrary to Policies ST 1 and ST 7, CP 8 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment), DM14 (General development criteria), DM 32 (Development involving listed buildings) of Bearing Fruits 2031, the Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.
- (4) The application site lay outside any defined settlement boundary and within the countryside. Therefore, by virtue of the inappropriate quantum and siting of the proposed development, the proposal would result in urbanisation of the site and the area. Moreover, due to the position of the site relative to sustainable modes of transport, users of the site are likely to be highly reliant on the use of private modes of transport such as may undermine the objective of sustainably locating development. The proposal was, therefore, unacceptable and contrary to Policies ST 1, ST 3, ST 7, CP 2, CP 4, DM 3, DM 6 and DM 14 of Bearing Fruits 2031, the Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.

This was seconded by the Chair. On being put to the vote the motion to refuse the application was agreed.

The Chair added that if the application went to appeal that the council provided a traffic survey. This was agreed by Members.

**Resolved: That application 20/505877/OUT be refused for the reasons as minuted.**

634 **Deferred Item 2 - 24/502378//FULL 34 Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YS**

<b>Deferred Item 2 REFERENCE NO 24/502378/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Section 73 - Application for Minor Material Amendment to approved plans condition 2 (to allow increase in the height of the building comprising plots 1, 2 and 3) pursuant to 21/501143/FULL.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 34 Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YS		
<b>WARD</b> Borden and Grove Park	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Borden Parish Council	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr S Hafeez <b>AGENT</b> Blackburn Architects Limited

The Senior Planner introduced the application as set out in the report. Following a request for clarification on the siting of the development, the Senior Planner showed Members the site plan for the original permission prior to demolition, the site plan for application 20/500367/FULL and the proposed site plan. He said that in his opinion the development was on the original site.

The Chair noted there were some ‘indents’ on the lines of the diagram on the south side of the current site plan, which the Senior Planner confirmed were present. The Chair raised concern that this might allow the applicant to build a larger development and asked that Members considered that when making a decision.

Shazli Hafeez, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

The Chair invited comments from Members and points raised included:

- Raised concern that the proposed development and guttering was too close to the adjoining property, Pine Lodge Care Home;
- noted at the site meeting that the original ground level had not been ‘built-up’. It should have been ‘dug-down’ but had not been resulting in the building being higher than the original demolished building;
- understood concerns that the new building overhung the neighbouring Pine Lodge, however Members had to consider the submitted site plan, the boundary issues were a private matter between the landowners;
- what was the correct site boundary outline?
- if Members considered the height of the building was ‘imposing’, Members could refuse the application;
- aware that Pine Lodge had extended their property very close to the application site, and that any potential boundary overhang and should have been dealt with at that time. Therefore the overhang was not necessarily the fault of the applicants;
- considered that concerns raised about the boundary lines on the site plans were simply due to their scale, if made larger the lines would appear straighter;
- the additional metre in height of the building was quite imposing when viewed from the gardens in Cherryfields; and

- the correction in height should have been picked-up by Building Control.

In response, the Team Leader (Planning Applications) said that as this was a Section 73 application the boundary was fixed by the ‘parent’ planning permission. He confirmed that boundary disputes were a private matter.

**Resolved: That application 24/502378/FULL be granted as per the recommendation in the report.**

635 **Deferred Item 3 - 24/502460/FULL 34 Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YS**

<b>Deferred Item 3 REFERENCE NO 24/502460/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Section 73 – Application for Variation of Condition 5 (to allow change of the reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate from 50% to 25%) pursuant to 21/501143/FULL.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 34 Key Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1YS		
<b>WARD</b> Borden and Grove Park	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Borden Parish Council	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr S Hafeez <b>AGENT</b> Blackburn Architects Limited

The Senior Planner introduced the application as set out in the report.

Shazli Hafeez, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

The Chair invited comments from Members, and points raised included:

- The development was not being built to the correct building regulation standards;
- noted at the site meeting that the insulation was inadequate and the dispensation to reduce the 50% Dwelling Emission Rate would be beneficial on a dwelling that would not comply as it was;
- the Council had refused similar applications and lost on appeal; and
- the applicant should consider the installation of a cloud server point to provide hot water and heating to the property. Suggested this also be considered by officers for future applications.

**Resolved: That application 24/502460/FULL be granted as per the recommendation in the report.**

636 **Deferred Item 4 - 23/505678/FULL Land west of Warden Road, Eastchurch, Kent, ME12 4EJ**

<b>Deferred Item 4 REFERENCE NO 23/505678/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of 32no. dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land west of Warden Road, Eastchurch, Kent, ME12 4EJ		

<b>WARD</b> Sheppey East	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Eastchurch	<b>APPLICANT</b> Chartway Partnerships Group and Moat Homes <b>AGENT</b> DHA Planning
-----------------------------	--	--

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report. He reported that when the application had been considered by the Committee at their meeting on 5 December 2024, some of the images of materials to be used had inaccurately represented some of the colours, and the applicant had submitted some revised imagery which he displayed for Members.

Julian Moat, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Parish Councillor Mike Brown, representing Eastchurch Parish Council, spoke against the application.

A Ward Member spoke against the application.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

The Chair invited Members to raise points, and comments included:

- Noted that the 30-mph speed limit would be extended and red markings installed to slow traffic down;
- supported the application and the affordable housing it would provide;
- the site did not lie within open countryside as there was already housing on the other side of the road;
- there were no grounds to refuse the application;
- sought clarification that the proposed 30-mph sign would be conditioned;
- noted that the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) had commented that the affordable housing could not be guaranteed;
- considered Plough Road was a busy road but a safe road;
- Plough Road was used like a racetrack during weekends in the Summer;
- Eastchurch was a historical village, and the proposed flats were not in-keeping;
- there were no footpaths, and it was not in a sustainable location;
- the design and orientation of the dwellings was poor in terms of opportunities to install solar panels;
- KCC Highways & Transportation raised no objection to the application;
- affordable housing was required across the borough;
- there was a clear need for affordable housing on the Isle of Sheppey;
- the Council had declared an affordable housing emergency, which lent support to the application;
- considered biodiversity was very 'loose' and asked that Moat Homes provided several swift boxes on each dwelling rather than one per dwelling;
- there were no planning grounds to refuse the application;
- most properties were built on an area which was previously 'open space';
- what was meant by two and a half storey?; and
- referred to the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) contribution set out under paragraph 7.111 on page 142 of the report and said it should be



solely for facilities on the Isle of Sheppey, not in ‘Swale District’ as stated.

In response, the Planning Consultant reported that with regard to the 30-mph sign, a condition would be imposed requiring the applicant to seek a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for an extended speed restriction on Warden Road with KCC Highways & Transportation. As the Homes England grant was dependent upon Moat Homes providing the affordable housing and as they were also a registered housing provider, it would not be in their interest not to deliver the affordable housing, including from a reputational point of view. The Planning Consultant agreed to amend the relevant condition to require the submission of further details of biodiversity enhancements. Two and a half storeys referred to dwellings that provided accommodation within the roof space i.e. dormer windows, so not a full height storey.

The Chair asked whether, if granted, the permission could require that it ‘not be transferable to private homes’, in order that the applicant could not provide private homes instead of affordable homes? The Planning Manager reported that such a requirement could not be added as it would not meet all the requirements of the NPPF as being reasonable and necessary. It could also be transferred from one housing provider to another if Moat were not able to deliver.

**Resolved: That application 23/505678/FULL be granted as per the recommendation in the report and that the relevant condition be amended to require the submission of further details of biodiversity enhancement.**

637 2.1 - 22/503389/FULL Western Works, Front Brents, Faversham, Kent, ME13 7EB

**PART 2**

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO – 22/503389/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of 9 dwellings and demolition of the rear extension to the south of the existing office block.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Western Works, Front Brents, Faversham, Kent, ME13 7EB		
<b>WARD</b> Priory	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Faversham Town Council	<b>APPLICANT</b> BMM Weston Ltd & Weller Properties <b>AGENT</b> GPP

The Chair allowed Members time to read the tabled update which included the additional comments of the Faversham Community Land Trust and the officer response. It also suggested the addition of a Conservation Management condition. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application as set out in the report.

Steve Atkins from The Faversham Community Land Trust, an Objector, spoke against the application.

Town Councillor Charles Gibson, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke against the application.

The Chair asked what the position was in relation to the adopted Faversham Neighbourhood Plan (NP), December 2024 against planning applications yet to be determined? The Team Leader (Planning Applications) explained that whilst this application had been submitted in 2022, officers had still carefully assessed it against the policies contained within the adopted Faversham NP and made a balanced view on the benefits and disbenefits.

The Chair moved the officer recommendation to grant planning permission as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless.

The Chair invited comments from Members, and points raised included:

- Safety concerns in respect of visibility onto Front Brents due to the sharp bend in the road;
- referred to paragraph 5.2 and 5.3 on page 180 of the report and concerns regarding surface water near the creek;
- requested clarification that it was a minor development;
- referred to paragraph 7.5.5 on page 190 of the report and KCC Highways & Transportation confirmed the proposed nine dwellings would generate less vehicle movements than the existing use;
- poor design;
- as this had been identified as a residential site under the adopted Faversham NP, was this underutilisation of a resource?;
- the application was contrary to the spirit and to Policies Fav 3, Fav 7, Fav 8, Fav 11, Fav 10 and Fav 23 of the adopted Faversham NP; and
- made more sense to have development for the whole site.

In response the Senior Planning Officer clarified that the site area fell below the one-hectare requirement for affordable housing contributions. The national definition was 1 hectare or 0.5 hectares and the number of dwellings proposed was unknown. This application proposed nine dwellings which did not meet the trigger for affordable housing contributions.

With regard to whether it was an underutilisation of a resource, the Team Leader (Planning Applications) said officers had considered the historic sensitivity of the site. They had taken into account the comments from the Council's Heritage Officer about reducing the density and had responded sufficiently more sympathetically to the context.

In response to a question from a Member, about why it had taken so long for the application to be considered, the Planning Manager (Planning Applications) explained there had been several amendments to the original application and also different case officers.

Councillor Tony Winckless proposed a site meeting. This was not seconded.

A Member requested an additional condition be imposed to address drainage concerns. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed this was possible.

On being put to the vote the motion to approve the application was lost.

The Chair adjourned the meeting so that Members and officers could consider suitable

wording to refuse the application.

Councillor Ben J Martin moved the following motion to refuse the application:

1. The proposed development would fail to include a mix of housing that would meet local needs and would fail to make efficient use of the land available. The proposal would therefore be unacceptable and contrary to policies ST1 and CP3 of the Local Plan 2017, policy FAV3 of the Faversham Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2038, and the NPPF.
2. The proposed development by virtue of the scale, density, form and arrangement of the development would harm the character and appearance of the site and the area, cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and less than substantial harm to the setting of listed buildings that is not outweighed by the public benefits of the development. The proposal would therefore be unacceptable and contrary to policies ST1, ST7, CP4, CP8, DM14, DM32 and DM33 of the Local Plan 2017, policies FAV10, FAV11 and FAV23 of the Faversham Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2038, and the NPPF.

This was seconded by Councillor Julien Speed. On being put to the vote the motion to refuse the application was agreed.

***Resolved: That application 22/503389/FULL be refused for the reasons as minuted.***

## 638 Part 5 applications

### PART 5

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

---

**Item 5.1 – Land north of Lower Road, Eastchurch ME12 4DE**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED**

**Committee or Officer Decision : COMMITTEE REFUSAL**

**Item 5.2 – Land to the North of Lower Road, Teynham, Kent ME9 9EQ**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

**Committee or Officer Decision : DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Item 5.3 – Pear Tree House, Otterham Quay Lane, Upchurch, Kent ME8 8QW**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

**Committee or Officer Decision : DELEGATED REFUSAL**

**Item 5.4 – Thompson Hall, St Michaels Road, Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 3DN**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

**Item 5.5 – Cherrymere, Keycol Hill, Bobbing, Kent ME9 7LG**

**PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

**Committee or Officer Decision : DELEGATED REFUSAL**

## 639 Adjournment of Meeting

The meeting was adjourned from 8.20 pm until 8.30 pm, from 9.20 pm until 9.22 pm and from 10.04 pm until 10.17 pm.

640 **Extension 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