
Extraordinary Planning Committee

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Tuesday, 10 March 2026 from 7.00 pm - 10.45 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Monique Bonney, Andy Booth (Chairman), Lloyd Chapman, Shelley Cheesman, Simon Clark (Vice-Chair), Kieran Golding, Angela Harrison, James Hunt, Peter MacDonald, Peter Marchington, Claire Martin, Ben J Martin, Tom Nundy, Julien Speed, Terry Thompson and Karen Watson.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Russell Fitzpatrick, Paul Gregory, Ian Harrison, Joanne Johnson and Tim Neal.

OFFICERS PRESENT (VIRTUALLY): Alun Millard and Emma Wiggins.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Charles Gibson, Alastair Gould, Richard Palmer and Hannah Perkin.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Hayden Brawn, Ann Cavanagh, Elliott Jayes, Paul Stephen and Tony Winckless.

792 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chairman outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

793 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Kieran Golding declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of the Faversham Society and Faversham Community Land Trust.

Councillor Karen Watson declared a non-pecuniary interest as she was a member of the Faversham Society.

Councillor Ben Martin disclosed that he has had meetings with various people including supporters, objectors and the applicant in line with the Member protocol and Code of Conduct. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of the Faversham Community Land Trust. In addition, as a member of Faversham Town Council he had not taken part in any discussions or decisions pertaining to this application.

Councillor Claire Martin disclosed that she has had meetings with various people including supporters, objectors and the applicant in line with the Member protocol and Code of Conduct. She also declared a non-pecuniary interest as she was a member of the Faversham Community Land Trust. In addition, as a member of Faversham Town Council she had not taken part in any discussions or decisions pertaining to this application.

794 **2.1 23/505533/EIHYB Land at South East Faversham between A2 Canterbury/London Road and M2 Faversham Kent ME13 9LJ**

2.1 REFERENCE NO 23/505533/EIHYB
PROPOSAL: a) Full planning permission for Phase 1 of a mixed-use residential led development of 261 homes and 3,021 sq m of non-residential space, including: local centre with retail, commercial, community, business and/or employment uses (including Class E uses); water recycling centre; open space; earth form bund; landscaping; groundworks; green infrastructure; pedestrian and cycle routes; car and cycle parking; refuse and recycling storage; highways, drainage and infrastructure works including new vehicle access points to the existing network; supporting infrastructure; engineering, utilities, and minerals other associated works. b) Outline planning permission for the remaining phases of the mixed-use residential led development, including: retail, hotel, commercial, business, employment uses (including Class E uses); Class B2 and/or B8 uses; community and sports provision; primary school; nursery accommodation; health facilities; sheltered and/or other older persons' accommodation; open space; earth form bund; landscaping; groundworks; green infrastructure; pedestrian and cycle routes; car and cycle parking; refuse and recycling storage; highways, drainage and infrastructure works including new vehicle access points to the existing network; temporary access and construction route(s) as required; supporting infrastructure; engineering, utilities, and other associated works including the demolition of buildings and structures. All matters to be reserved.
SITE LOCATION Land At South East Faversham Between A2 Canterbury/London Road And M2 Faversham Kent ME13 9LJ
WARD Watling, Boughton and Courtenay
PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town Boughton under Blean Selling
APPLICANT Secretary of Duchy Of Cornwall Estate AGENT HGH Consulting

The Team Leader (Planning Applications) introduced the application as set out in the report and related updates. In terms of those updates that required specific additions / amendments to Heads of Terms, the Team Leader (Planning Applications) set out the following:

- Sought delegation to secure a financial contribution of £50,000 related to the expansion of Faversham Railway Station car park;
- sought delegation for the NHS primary healthcare contribution to reflect the wording as set out in the second tabled update;
- sought delegation to agree the financial cap for delivery of the railway bridge between the relevant parties (i.e. Swale Borough Council (SBC) Officers, Network Rail, the developer).

Parish Councillor Sarah Moakes, representing Boughton under Blean Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Parish Councillor Jonnie Reeves, representing Selling Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Harold Goodwin, a Supporter, spoke in support of the application.

Jeff Tutt, an Objector, spoke against the application.

Roger Hephher, the Agent for the application, 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.

Visiting Ward Members spoke regarding the application.

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

- How many homes could realistically be built per year on a site of this scale, with one Member estimating a 25-year build-out?;
- queried estimated vehicle movements for 2,500 dwellings and whether daily flows could reach around 11,250 movements;
- raised concerns about future congestion, including the adequacy of the Brenley Corner improvements and the impact on rural lanes such as Selling Road and Salters Lane;
- Why did some Section 106 obligations (e.g., Education Review Group, primary school) have no financial figures?;
- raised concerns about Section 106 sums being spent outside the Faversham area, and requested clearer ring-fencing for education, libraries, community learning, adult social care, and health contributions;
- queried nomination rights for extra care and supported housing;
- would Section 106 contributions be index-linked?;
- sought clarity on triggers for bus service funding and long-term flexibility for changes over a 20-year build;
- requested confirmation on what documents or masterplans would govern future reserved matters for the outline phases;
- raised significant concern about the loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land, cumulative agricultural losses in Swale, and impacts on long-standing farming enterprises;
- what material consideration was given to the livelihood of current tenant farmers?;
- did compensatory measures for BMV loss exist?;
- how would the 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement be monitored over the lifetime of the development?;
- where would the 7.6% off-site BNG be delivered?;
- raised concerns about habitat fragmentation and alignment with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy;
- highlighted potential long-term ecological impacts of a large housing development;
- questioned whether the site was genuinely walkable to the town centre or railway station, noting severance created by the A2 and railway line;

- highlighted that public transport assumptions relied on bus routes not currently agreed with operators;
- requested that cycle and pedestrian routes be delivered early to establish sustainable travel habits;
- requested explanation of Active Travel England's outstanding concerns;
- queried whether the outline phase was sufficiently controlled by design documents, and whether design quality shown in illustrations would be secured?;
- did a public art requirement exist;
- queried how acute healthcare contributions would be secured given differing views between the developer and NHS, and the link to the Highsted Park inquiry outcome;
- requested assurance that primary health contributions would be spent locally;
- noted Faversham's historic significance and asked for assurance that archaeological investigation and protection would be conditioned;
- raised concerns about the future capacity of the Faversham Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC), given past closure threats;
- queried whether Section 106 wording should ensure waste contributions benefitted Faversham;
- how would construction traffic access the wastewater recycling centre and employment land? and
- queried the purpose of the £1.25m "management toolkit fund".

In response, officers provided the following:

- Build-out rates were indicative and were based on applicant estimates of 15–20 years; the Council could not control annual delivery rates;
- detailed trip modelling was required, but peak-hour trip rates of around 0.4–0.5 movements per dwelling were standard;
- National Highways had agreed the mitigation proposed at Brenley Corner and raised no objection;
- the primary school had no financial figure because it would be delivered on-site;
- the Education Review Group cost has been agreed but was not specified numerically in the table;
- Section 106 obligations must meet statutory tests and be sufficiently precise yet flexible enough to address changing circumstances over a long build period;
- contributions would be index-linked;
- triggers for public transport funding would be finalised through the Section 106;
- nomination rights for supported and extra care housing involved both SBC and Kent County Council (KCC) due to joint assessment processes;
- officers confirmed that parameter plans, design guides, and the illustrative masterplan would control future reserved matters;
- the Council's solicitor noted that Section 106 agreements could be modified by deed if all parties agreed, but the Council could not unilaterally force changes;
- officers acknowledged harm from loss of BMV land; this was given significant weight in the planning balance;
- independent agricultural assessment showed one tenant could continue farming on other land; one could not;
- no compensatory scheme for BMV existed; decisions must be made on planning balance;
- BNG was secured at 20% (12.4% on-site, 7.6% off-site);
- off-site land was likely to be delivered on applicant-owned land south of the M2; exact locations confirmed later;

- monitoring of BNG was secured via planning condition;
- officers considered Local Nature Recovery Strategy requirements to have been addressed in the ecological assessment;
- distances to town and rail station were set out in the report; western parts of the site were more sustainable than eastern;
- bus service provision was ultimately dependent on operators; contributions were secured but routes could not be guaranteed;
- cycle/pedestrian links on the northern A2 would be delivered in phases aligned with occupation;
- some Active Travel England concerns related to constrained widths due to third-party land; officers considered the proposals acceptable;
- a suite of design documents submitted with the application (character characterisation study, street manual, design & access statement) formed part of the wording of conditions to control how development could come forward;
- there was no policy requirement for public art;
- a mechanism was included whereby the acute healthcare contribution was included or removed depending on the Highsted Park inquiry outcome;
- primary healthcare contributions and/or on-site provision would directly relate to the development;
- extensive archaeological conditions (framework, evaluation, safeguarding, interpretation) were included;
- waste contribution wording mirrored KCC's request.
- officers advised that if Faversham HWRC was to close in the future, including adequate flexibility within the planning obligation would ensure that the contribution was still able to be utilised and ensured that there was sufficient waste facilities for the development;
- construction traffic arrangements would be controlled via the Construction Environmental Management Plan condition; and
- the £1.25m management toolkit fund allowed for future additional highway interventions identified through monitoring.

Resolved: That application 23/505533/EIHYB be granted as per the recommendation in the report, with the Heads of Terms to also reflect the matters as set out in the tabled update(s); and with the Section106 negotiation to be carried out in consultation with the Ward Members and Planning Committee Chairman and to ensure the contributions / obligations secured are provided within the necessary geographical area in order to mitigate the impacts of the development.

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