

APPENDIX B473 **2.1 - 20/505877/OUT Brogdale Farm, Brogdale Road, Ospringe, ME13 8XU**

2.1 REFERENCE NO – 20/505877/OUT		
PROPOSAL		
Outline planning application for mixed-use development comprising up to 360sqm nursery school (use Class Ef), up to give 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.		
SITE LOCATION		
Brogdale Farm, Brogdale Road, Ospringe, ME13 8XU		
WARD East Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ospringe	APPLICANT Brogdale Farm Ltd AGENT Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd

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

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

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

Mr Julien Herrington, an objector, 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 James Hunt.

The Chair invited Members to make comments, and these included:

- This was a good application and what the borough needed in a good location;
- understood the highways concerns that the parish council had but Kent County Council (KCC) Highways had not raised any objections;
- was there an operator for the education facilities being offered?
- concerned that no education operator would be found, and the site may come back to a future committee for a change of use; and
- could a condition be placed to ensure that no development was started on the site until an operator for the education was sought?

The Planning Consultant responded that Members could only consider what was

APPENDIX BPlanning CommitteeThursday, 5 December 2024

currently being proposed and that no operator had been identified. He added that a condition could be imposed requiring confirmation of an operator for the education facilities of the site but the exact wording would need to be considered.

Councillor Hunt proposed that delegation be given to officers to work with the required wording to ensure that an operator for the education facilities of the site be confirmed before any development took place on the site. This was seconded by the Chair and on being put to the vote, agreed by Members.

The Chair invited Members to make further comments, and these included:

- Were the holiday lets short-term or long term leases?;
- the development was outside of the built-up area;
- much needed agricultural buildings were being lost;
- had the applicant proved that there was no other agricultural land available?;
- concerned that the proposal was close to a listed building, and it would be good to visit the site to understand the impact the development would have on the listed building;
- the site offered good natural bio-diversity opportunities that should not be destroyed;
- the site should be used as a nursery for plants and vegetation rather than for children;
- there was no real need for this type of development in the area;
- the borough was in need of housing so offering holiday lets was no ideal;
- it was difficult to understand the impact the development would have on the natural setting of the site and the surrounding buildings; and
- the site had a natural reservoir that could be used to provide water in hot months, which should be part of the farm's education programme to teach about the value of water in agriculture.

The Planning Consultant responded to say that condition (40) specified that the holiday let units should be used solely for the purpose of holiday accommodation and should not be used by any person as their sole or main residence and should not be occupied by any person or group of persons for more than four weeks in any calendar year. The Planning Consultant also confirmed that the application had not provided evidence of marketing or any alternative sites assessment.

Councillor Thompson moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site. This was seconded by the Chair and on being put to the vote, agreed by Members.

Resolved: That application 20/505877/OUT be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.