
Planning Committee

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 2 April 2026 from 7.00 pm - 9.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Monique Bonney, Andy Booth (Chairman), Ann Cavanagh, Lloyd Chapman, Simon Clark (Vice-Chairman), James Hunt, Peter MacDonald, Peter Marchington, Claire Martin, Ben J Martin, Julien Speed, Paul Stephen, Terry Thompson and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Christian DeGrussa, Andrew Gambrill, Ian Harrison, Joanne Johnson and Philippa Richardson.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Kieran Golding and Elliott Jayes.

872 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chairman outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

873 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 March 2026 (Minute Nos. 786 - 791) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

874 **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

875 **Change to Order of Business**

The Chairman altered the order of business as minuted.

876 **2.1 - 25/501495/OUT Land at Perry Court, London Road, Faversham, Kent, ME13 8YA**

2.1 REFERENCE NO 25/501495/OUT	
PROPOSAL Outline application (with all matters reserved except access into the site) for residential development (Use Class C3) including dwellinghouses and extra care accommodation; 1.2 hectares of land for commercial, business and service uses (use class E(b), (c)(i,ii,iii), (f), (g) and hot food restaurant for consumption on and off premises including drive through restaurant (use class sui generis); electric vehicle charging infrastructure (sui generis); access onto Ashford Road, noise attenuation mitigation, landscaping, open space, drainage, and other associated infrastructure.	
SITE LOCATION Land At Perry Court London Road Faversham Kent ME13 8YA	
WARD Watling	
PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham	
APPLICANT Hallam Land	AGENT LRM Planning Ltd.

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) introduced the application as set out in the

report. He referred to the tabled update which included further representations from Ospringle Parish Council and Faversham Town Council received since the agenda had been published. The update also included a proposed amendment to condition (7). The Chairman asked members of the Committee if they had read the update and they confirmed that they had.

Town Councillor Rob Crayford, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke against the application.

Owen Jones, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Chairman drew attention to the planning history of the site, set out on pages 26 and 27 of the report. He also drew attention to paragraph 7.2.3 in the reportpermission should be granted unless, particularly point ii., 'any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'.

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

- Referring to paragraphs 5.21 and 7.15.10 and acknowledging condition (19) in terms of foul water/Southern Water (SW), clarification sought on whether there had been any discussions with Southern Water with regard to the practicalities of dealing with foul water;
- concerned with the risk of sewage flooding;
- were there any conditions in terms of water supply, noting that the site was not located within SW's statutory area for water supply?;
- clarification sought on evidence that there was a demand for commercial space;
- concerned that the water system was already overloaded; and
- referring to condition (2) in the report, why was the figure three years for residential development and five years for non-residential development?

In response, the Team Leader explained that SW had been consulted and confirmed that they were the waste water provider. Any future developer had a right to connect to the foul water system, but there were no details yet of what this would entail. The Team Leader advised that a condition was recommended that would secure details of the foul water drainage proposed prior to commencement. In terms of water supply, there was no condition because there was a statutory requirement for the provider to supply water to a development. There were details within the report on what marketing had taken place in terms of the commercial element of the application. Although smaller, the quantum of employment space proposed would support the walk to work market. The Team Leader said that in terms of the figure of five years for non-residential, the previous application had required reserved matters to be approved within three years for both residential and employment, and as noted employment had not come forward within that time frame, so five years had been suggested in condition (2) in order to enable the non-residential development to come forward over a longer time frame.

Further comments included:

- Could not see that there was a demand for commercial use in that location;

- acknowledged that SW had a duty to supply, but concerned that they would connect to an already overloaded system;
- concerned that the access via Tettenhall Way was not fit for purpose in terms of it being block paving and not being able to cope with construction traffic;
- concerned with any costs that might be imposed if the application was refused; and
- it was important that Section 106 agreement monies were realised.

In response, the Team Leader confirmed that Tettenhall Way was a tarmacked road and had originally been designed to take traffic from the employment site that had previously been approved.

Councillor Julien Speed proposed the following amendment: That condition (2) be amended to read: **Three** years for any phase comprising non-residential development (so that it was the same as residential development). This was seconded by Councillor James Hunt and on being put to the vote was agreed.

In response to a question, the Team Leader advised that there was not currently a condition requiring that internal roads on the development be of an adoptable standard. He added that the Council could not require them to be adopted, as that was a separate process.

Councillor Monique Bonney proposed the following amendment: That internal roads on the development be of an adoptable standard. This was seconded by the Chairman and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Councillor Bonney proposed the following amendment: That the Section 106 Agreement be completed and signed within six months, and if it was not, to return the application to the Planning Committee. This was seconded by the Chairman and on being put to the vote was agreed.

The Planning Manager (Planning Applications) was invited to speak. He said that Section 106 Agreements were complex and that applicants were generally keen to get them completed as quickly as possible with delays often being due to reasons that were out of their hands. He advised that issues could arise if the Section 106 Agreement for this development was prioritised over other developments' Section 106 Agreements.

On being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

A Member asked about pedestrian access to the site running north through the Abbey School and across the A2 and asked whether there were plans for the footpath to be upgraded and made hardstanding, and also for a crossing point which the Town Council had requested. In response, the Team Leader said there were monies which Kent County Council had requested for improving the southern end of footpath ZF18, money previously secured for the improvement of part of the route that was currently unmade and £50,000 to be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement towards Sustainable Transport Improvements including a crossing over the A2.

Members then voted on the substantive motion.

Councillor James Hunt proposed the following: That adoptable standards be carried forward for all major sites. This was seconded by the Chairman and agreed by

Members.

Resolved: That application 25/501495/OUT be granted as per the recommendation in the report, plus an amendment to condition (7) as set out in the tabled update and with the following further amendments:

That condition (2) be amended to read: Three years for any phase comprising non-residential development (so that it was the same as residential development).

That a condition be imposed to require that internal roads on the development be of an adoptable standard.

That the Section 106 Agreement be completed and signed within six months, and if it was not, to return the planning application to the Planning Committee.

877 2.2 - 25/502451/FULL New Acres, Spade lane, Hartlip, Kent, ME9 7TT

2.2 REFERENCE NO 25/502451/FULL	
PROPOSAL Retention of existing 8 plot gypsy traveller site, each with 2 mobile homes and 2 touring caravans and associated day rooms, new access, driveway, hard standing, package treatment plants, boundary fencing and landscaping (previously granted at appeal reference APP/V3355/W/20/3254539) (retrospective).	
SITE LOCATION New Acres, Spade Lane, Hartlip, Kent ME9 7TT	
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	
PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hartlip	
APPLICANT Mr Frank Mongen	AGENT Perfect Pitch Planning Ltd

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application as set out in the report.

Mr Danny Nicholson, an objector, spoke against the application.

Simon McKay, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The Chairman drew Member's attention to the planning history of the site, set out on pages 100 and 101 of the report, including the Planning Inspector's comments.

A Member sought clarification on the number of static units and mobile units included in the application, plus the number of units currently on the site. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that following the most recent appeal in 2022, there were eight plots, each with two touring caravans and one day room. Currently there were eight plots, each with two touring caravans, two mobile homes and one day room, so overall there would be 16 additional caravans on site compared with the previous appeal. The Planning Manager confirmed that there were no units lawfully on the site at the moment as the permission had expired in July 2025. A temporary permission had been granted following the 2019 application which lasted for three years. He confirmed that the current application was for 32 caravans and eight day rooms across eight plots.

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

- Clarification sought on any restrictions on the use of the units on site, especially in terms of any commercial activities;
- information sought on who would be living on the site, whether in a static unit or those with a more nomadic lifestyle;
- welcomed that an application had been submitted, which could then be conditioned;
- noted that the Council could not demonstrate a five-year supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites;
- enforcement action had been taken on the site, but there were still units there;
- suggested a site visit could be beneficial;
- there were not enough Gypsy and traveller allocated sites and from photographs this looked like a well-kept site;
- clarification sought on the current Gypsy and traveller allocated sites in the Borough;
- considered Hartlip Parish Council and the Member who called the application in should have been in attendance at the meeting;
- it was important that the number of units on the site was regulated and enforced;
- there was a lot of hardstanding on the site, more landscaping was needed; and
- suggested a temporary permission be granted.

The Senior Planning Officer responded to some of the points raised: condition (6) in the report prevented commercial activities on the site and condition (5) limited the number of commercial vehicles per pitch; there was a requirement that occupiers of the site met the definition of a nomadic lifestyle under local plan policy DM10; information submitted with the application demonstrated that they did meet the relevant definition; the last Gypsy and traveller assessment was carried out in December 2023 and there was a shortfall of 114 pitches in the borough, with a 1.3 years supply, down from 3.5 years.

The Planning Manager set out the scope for granting a further temporary permission if required, approaches to landscaping and the approach to investigating and enforcing against breaches of planning control.

The Chairman moved the following motion: That the application be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site. This was seconded by the Vice-Chairman and on being put to the vote, was agreed.

Resolved: That application 25/502451/FULL be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site.

878 1.1 - Article 4(1) Direction

The Planning Manager introduced the report as set out in the agenda papers. He drew attention to the five options set out on pages 21 and 22 of the report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation as per the recommendation in the report, and this was seconded by the Vice-Chairman.

The Chairman drew attention to paragraph 4.6 in the report which set out the potential impacts of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO). In response to a question, the

Planning Manager explained that the impacts identified by the Full Council motion had been addressed and that there were some areas where it was not considered that an Article 4(1) direction was justified, for example in terms of refuse generation as HMOs falling within Use Class C4 were given the same standard of service as a normal dwelling, with no extra bins. The Planning Manager advised that the Secretary of State would be notified and would have the scope to amend or revoke any Article 4(1) direction that was made.

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

- Referring to the table at paragraph 4.2 in the report, suggested Article 4 directions be made initially in the wards that were most affected;
- evidence in the report needed to be robust, however, did not consider it to be robust;
- suggested the report be deferred for more robust information;
- it was Full Council who had requested Article 4 directions be implemented, if it was not going to be done at this time and there were reasons why, suggested a report was needed to Full Council to explain why;
- referring to the table in paragraph 4.16 of the report, considered there was a connection between HMOs and anti-social behaviour or crime;
- there was a perception that HMOs had a negative impact on the housing market;
- measures needed to be put in place now to control development of further HMOs;
- HMOs were holding back town centres and their viability and had an impact on the community; and
- more evidence was needed.

The Chairman moved the following motion: That the report be deferred for two months for more robust information, so that it was ready to notify the Secretary of State. This was seconded by the Vice-Chairman and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved:

(1) That the report be deferred for two months for more robust information, so that it was ready to notify the Secretary of State.

879 Part 5 applications

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

Item 5.1 – Land North of Nelson Avenue, Minster-On-Sea, Sheerness, Kent ME12 3SF

PINS Decision: APPEAL IS NOT DETERMINED

Committee or Officer Decision: DELEGATED REFUSAL

The Chairman considered this to be a frustrating decision.

Item 5.2 – Land East to Courtenay House, London Road, Dunkirk, Kent ME13 9LF

PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED / ENFORCEMENT NOTICE UPHELD

Committee or Officer Decision: ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

The Chairman said this was a good decision.

Item 5.3 – Orchard View, Eastling Road, Eastling, Kent ME13 0AN

PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED

Committee or Officer Decision: DELEGATED REFUSAL

The Chairman said this was a galling decision.

Item 5.4 – Land known as Pigeon Farm Sheppey Way Bobbing Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8PD

PINS Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED / ENFORCEMENT NOTICE UPHELD

Committee or Officer Decision: ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

The Chairman reminded Members to read the commentary attached to the decisions as they contained useful information which could be helpful in future decision making at Planning Committee.

Chairman

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