

APPENDIX C

529 24/502378/FULL 34 Key Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 1YS

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock (Chair), Ann Kavanagh (Substitute for Councillor Kieran Golding), Terry Thompson, Karen Watson and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Andrew Gambrill, Paul Gregory and Kellie Mackenzie.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Simon Clark, Kieran Golding, James Hunt and Elliott Jayes.

The Chair welcomed the Applicant, members of the public and Members to the meeting.

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) introduced the application for a Section 73 application to vary condition (2) of 21/501143/FULL to allow an increase in the height of the building comprising plots 1, 2 and 3 at the rear of 34 Key Street, Sittingbourne. The Team Leader reported that the Council's planning enforcement team had identified that the two-storey building had not been constructed as per the approved details under application 21/501143/FULL. This had led to this application being submitted seeking planning permission for the as built structure. The Team Leader gave details of the approved building heights and the heights as built and now applied for, as set out in the committee report.

The Team Leader reported that one objection to the application from a resident of Cherryfields had been received, as set out in the report, although they had not objected to the increased height of the building.

The Applicant explained that due to discrepancies in land levels they had to dig down and they had done everything they could to address issues with the land levels.

A local resident raised concerns about the impact the development had on the residential amenity of No. 54 Cherryfields. She said the development had come out too far towards her property and showed Members photographs of the view of the development from her garden and from inside her property.

Members, local residents and the applicant then toured the application site and also viewed the site from No. 54 Cherryfields.

In response to a question from a Member regarding concerns about the guttering overhanging the adjacent care home, the Applicant explained that this was because the Pine Lodge Care Home development projected over their boundary and he had written proof of this. The Team Leader commented that issues regarding boundary disputes were private matters falling outside of the planning process.