

COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS AND OFFICERS' RESPONSE – PLANNING COMMITTEE 08 DECEMBER 2022

Item and application	Question	Response
<p>Item 3.1 19/502969/FULL Land East of Queenborough Road Queenborough</p>	<p>Cllr Beart</p> <p>One of the reasons for refusal is the ‘less than substantial harm’ to the setting of the listed building at Neats Court Manor. As far as I can see on the planning portal, the Conservation Officer has not been reconsulted since the last time the scheme was considered and approved, their last comments submitted were in July 2020. If this is one of only two reasons put forward for refusal, can an updated view from the Conservation Officer be presented to the committee?</p> <p>Furthermore, It was previously assessed by SBC (Nov 20) that the "the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the harm" to the listed building, contrary to the view now. SBC have recently (May 22) under delegated powers approved another site along Queenborough Road where the conservation officer commented "Due to the distance from the proposal site and lack of proper intervisibility provided by vegetation on the boundary of the heritage asset along Queensborough Road which screens the views of the listed building I think there would be no significant harm to the setting of heritage asset."</p> <p>Is this not an inconsistency in advice? Whilst the distance from the listed building vary, the listed building has had tall industrial palisade fencing erected around it's entire frontage, arguably doing some level of visual harm to the setting of the listed building and has significant growth of vegetation to the point it is no longer visible from Queenborough Road and hasn't been for many years.</p>	<p>William Allwood</p> <p>Following your e-mail, and further to discussions with the Chair of Planning Committee and internally within the Department, it has now been decided to drop Reason for Refusal no. 2 from the recommendation to Planning Committee</p> <p>It therefore follows that the application will be recommended for Refusal based on the following reason <u>only</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal would lead to an unacceptable and significantly adverse impact on Sheerness Town Centre contrary to Policies A1 and DM2 (Parts 4a & b) of the Adopted Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017, and in line with paragraph 90b and 91 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. <p>Your comments regarding the Medicem site are noted</p> <p>Finally, and in terms of the status of the Queenborough and Rushenden Masterplan, I would advise the following</p> <p>At its meeting on 18th November 2009 Swale Borough Council resolved to adopt the Queenborough and Rushenden Masterplan SPD. The Council adopted it on 12th November 2010. This now forms part of the Local</p>

	<p>I also noted on my first skim read a couple of factual inaccuracies in the report, firstly that the Medichem site (Walbrook West) has not implemented permission, I believe that to be incorrect, it was implemented some time ago with the access being started and construction and prep of the site for foundations started over a month ago. It also states at 5.6 that the Queenborough and Rushenden Masterplan includes a number of things including a Marina. That masterplan hasn't been part of our planning policy since approx 2014, it was replaced with a new masterplan which forms part of Bearing Fruits. There is no marina planned. This questions more generally what documents are being worked to when preparing this report when we are weighing up the Q&R Regen policies?</p>	<p>Development Framework for Swale Borough Council. This applies to the Queenborough and Rushenden area and is prepared pursuant to Policies AAP6 and MU5 and MU6 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008.</p> <p>Due to changing economic conditions, proposals for the regeneration at Queenborough and Rushenden needed to be refreshed. A revised land use plan has therefore been produced. The addendum also reflects progress in the current and planned delivery of the Queenborough and Rushenden regeneration proposals, alongside changes in land ownership. Much of the adopted Masterplan will remain in place for Development Management purposes. The main changes proposed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the reduction of dwelling numbers from 2,000 to 1,180;• the removal of the proposed marina;• the inclusion of the former ISTIL Mill and Thomsett Way sites for potential residential development; and• a new location for the proposed primary school. <p>The Masterplan Addendum was consulted on in November and December 2014 and the Local Development Framework Panel agreed the adoption of the Addendum to the original Masterplan SPD for Development Management purposes on 2nd March 2015.</p>