Swale House, East Street,
Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 3HT
DX59900 Sittingbourne 2
Phone: 01795 424341
Fax: 01795 417141
www.swale.gov.uk

Emma Hopkins

Sent via Email:
PCC@communities.gov.uk

Please ask for: Ian Harrison
Direct Line: (01795) 417118
Email: ianharrison@swale.gov.uk
Our Ref: IH/HP
Your Ref:
Date: 25/09/2026

Dear Emma

APPLICATION A (LPA REF 21/503914/EIOUT) - LAND TO THE SOUTH AND EAST OF SITTINGBOURNE, KENT (THE SOUTHERN SITE) -
MADE BY QUINN ESTATES KENT LTD, G.H.DEAN & CO LTD, ATWOOD FARMS LTD, ATWOOD TRUSTEES, AND AG KENT HOLDING BV

APPLICATION B (LPA REF 21/503906/EIOUT) - LAND TO THE WEST OF TEYNHAM, KENT (THE NORTHERN SITE)
MADE BY QUINN ESTATES KENT LTD, G.H.DEAN & CO LTD

I write in response to your letter of 11th September 2026 with respect to the abovementioned planning applications. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the representations that were circulated previously.

The respective parties have put forward their cases in relation to the implications of the 2026 version of the NPPF, emerging Draft Local Plan and the other evolving matters. Each of these views are noted. It is considered that the Council's position in this regard does not need to be re-visited in light of the other opinions that have been provided.

With respect to current applications 22/503654/EIOUT (Bobbing) and 23/505533/EIHYB (South East Faversham) which have been discussed extensively within all submissions, the position of both applications has not materially changed in the time since the respective parties last commented. It is noted that the applicant has the perception that the applications need to be reported back to the Swale Borough Council Planning Committee. In this regard, the Council is aware that the principles emanating from the case (*R (on the application of Kides) v South Cambridgeshire District Council [2002]*) will be applicable. This creates a duty for Officers to be satisfied (a) that the authority is aware of the new factor, (b) that it has considered it with the application in mind, and (c) that on a reconsideration the authority would reach (not might reach) the same decision. It is respectfully suggested that this letter is not the arena for the Council to undertake an assessment as to those considerations. It does, however, remain a fact that the Planning Committee has resolved to approve both of those planning applications, subject to the applicable requirements being met.

Whilst the position of the applicant in respect of the assessment of highway matters at Appendix 3 of their submission is noted, it is considered relevant that Kent County Council, as highway authority, have maintained their position that their assessments are sound and robust.

If the Local Planning Authority can be of any further assistance in relation to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Harrison

Ian Harrison
Planning Manager (Planning Applications)

POSITIVE ABOUT DISABLED PEOPLE
INVESTORS IN PEOPLE