

APPENDIX B

Planning Committee

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 23 May 2024 from 7.00 pm - 10.25 pm.

2.1 REFERENCE NO 23/505541/REM		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Approval of Reserved Matters (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale sought) for erection of 298no. dwellings, a sports ground including pavilion, changing rooms and car park, open space including allotments and community orchard, and associated new infrastructure including access, parking and landscaping pursuant to 16/507689/OUT.		
ADDRESS Land Between Frognal Lane and Orchard View, Lower Road, Teynham		
WARD	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT c/o Agent

Teynham and Lynsted	Teynham	AGENT Chartway
---------------------	---------	-----------------------

The Planning Consultant introduced the application as set out in the report. He drew attention to the tabled update from Teynham Parish Council which had been emailed to Members and added to the website. The Planning Consultant reported that one additional objection had been received raising concerns about foul water drainage.

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

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

Louise Smith, an objector, spoke against the application.

Parish Councillor Paul Townson, representing Teynham Parish Council, spoke against the application.

The Ward Members spoke against the application and raised points which included:

- Residents felt let down by the application;
- felt the applicants were “cherry-picking” what they wanted to develop;
- this did not comply with paragraph 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- contrary to Policy MU4 and the S106 legal agreement in relation to phasing;
- concerned that the employment space and health facility would not be delivered;
- the agent was not interested in providing a GP surgery;
- no housing should be approved until there were “concrete” plans for a GP surgery;

APPENDIX B

- the proposed mitigation measures in respect of traffic were not adequate;
- this would lead to an additional detrimental impact on current air quality issues;
- this would exacerbate issues with the already poor sewerage system;
- the proposed scale of the application was poor and over intensive for the area;
- this would exacerbate existing on-street parking issues;
- the application was not providing sports facilities just replacing what was already there; and
- the site had been earmarked for development for a long time, but this application added nothing to the village and was not good for existing residents.

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

- The provision of the GP surgery was key to sustainable development;
- had a housing needs assessment been carried out?;
- Would not improve air quality in the area and would be 'storing-up' health problems for the future;
- where would the new residents go for health and dentistry care?;
- where would the access to the site be if the employment area was built?;
- the proposed 25 year community asset was not adequate and should be increased;
- the Parish Council should to establish a Neighbourhood Plan as they would benefit from a policy basis to support their views;
- welcomed the 33% affordable housing proposed;
- considered the design proposed was good; and
- if refused the Council would not win at any subsequent appeal.

In response to questions from Members, the Planning Consultant said that if the landowner decided they did not want to provide the employment area and wanted some other form of development they would need to apply for a change of use. There was nothing within the existing legal agreement to say that housing and the employment use had to be provided at the same time, and as such the application complied with the outline planning permission. The Planning Consultant explained that access to the employment area had been agreed at the outline stage and would be off the A2. He explained that the current application agreement did not require provision of a GP surgery and it was not possible to add a condition requiring a GP surgery to be provided.

Councillor Simon Clark moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow officers to look further at the road access plan for the employment area and whether the GP surgery would be provided. This was seconded by Councillor Tony Winckless.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the road access was relevant, and the proposer and seconder of the motion agreed to withdraw that from the motion.

The Vice-Chair requested that clarification on what happened to the community facilities at expiry of the S106 defined 25-year peppercorn rent term be included within the reason for deferment. A Ward Member asked that the motion to defer the application included clarity on whether the sewerage capacity would be improved and on air quality impacts. The proposer and seconder agreed to include these in their motion for deferment. On being put to the vote the motion to defer the application was agreed.

Resolved: That application 23/505541/REM be deferred to enable officers to provide detail on: medical provision; sewerage capacity; community facilities (ie. what happened to these facilities at expiry of the S106 defined 25-year peppercorn rent term); and on air quality impacts.