

Planning Committee

Notice of a Meeting, to be held as a **Virtual Meeting** in accordance with Regulation 5 of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020

A meeting of the committee will be held on:

Date: Wednesday, 22 July 2020

Time: 6.30pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Membership: Councillors Adeoye, Barrett, Bhutia, Bowler, Buckwell,

Mrs Diane Chambers (Chairman), Curry, Etheridge, Sylvia Griffin, Hubbard, McDonald, Potter, Chrissy Stamp, Thorne and Tranter

(Vice-Chairman)

Agenda

10 Additional Information - Supplementary agenda advice sheet

(Pages 3 - 6)

For further information please contact Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer on Telephone: 01634 332012 or Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk

Date: 22 July 2020

Information about this virtual meeting

Please note that any member of the press and public may follow proceedings at this 'virtual' meeting via a weblink which will be publicised on the Council's website ahead of the meeting. Please refer to this meeting via the meeting calendar for further details:

https://democracy.medway.gov.uk/mgCalendarMonthView.aspx?GL=1&bcr=1

Members of the press and public may tweet, blog etc. during the live broadcast as they would be able to during a regular Committee meeting.

Medway Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 July 2020

Supplementary Agenda Advice

Planning Committee 29 April 2020

Minute 821 Land South of Lower Rainham Road

As agreed by Planning Committee, following discussion with the Ward Councillors the following amendments were made to the heads of S106 agreement

- iv) Green Space MUGA to be provided on site and contribution of £194,179.62 towards refurbishment/repair of Splashes Leisure centre
- xiii) £192,337.66 towards off site ecological improvements at Berengrave Nature Reserve Park and/or Riverside Country Park

Page 6 Minute 63

Land South of Multi Storey Car Park, Hempstead Valley Shopping Centre, Hempstead Valley Drive, Hempstead

With delegated authority, the Head of Planning agreed the final wording of the refusal grounds with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson to read as follows:

1 The proposed development is simplistic and generic in architectural design and by the nature of the use is likely to be subject to an array of advertisements at a later date. The siting of the building would also be within close proximity to Hempstead Valley Drive at an access point into and out of Hempstead Valley Shopping Centre. As a result of this, the proposed development would be unacceptably prominent within the street scene where development associated with the shopping centre is generally set back from the road with a significant level of soft landscaping along the road which contributes to maintaining a feeling of openness and greenery whilst you travel along Hempstead Valley Drive. This helps keep a balance between the suburban residential character and ensure that the shopping centre and its associated buildings are not the dominant feature along this road frontage. In addition, at times queues of customers for the drive through will impact negatively on access to the centre's

multi storey car park and indeed may result in queueing up to Hempstead valley drive and thereby impact on traffic congestion in the area to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and the amenities of the area. The proposal is contrary to Policies BNE1, BNE2 and T1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 124 and 127 of the NPPF 2019.

Notwithstanding the litter picking strategy discussed with the applicant and generally in force within the confines of the centre itself, the LPA is concerned that a number of visitors to the drive through will take their purchases to nearby attractive areas and after eating will fly tip the resulting waste to the detriment of the amenities of the area, particularly if there are no litter bins at those particular places. The proposal is therefore contrary to general ambition of Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan to protect the amenities of an area.

Page 8 Minute 64 51 Shepherds Gate, Hempstead, Gillingham

With delegated authority, the Head of Planning agreed the final wording of the refusal grounds with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson to read as follows:

The proposed development by virtue of its design, depth, height and proximity to the boundary with 52 Shepherds Gate, would be disproportionate and out of character with existing pattern of development in the area, and would be an overbearing form of development when viewed from the rear garden of 52 Shepherds Gate, detrimental to the amenity and living conditions of the occupiers of that property, contrary to Policies BNE1 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 124 and 127f of the NPPF.

Page 9 Minute 65 Land at Port Victoria Road, Isle of Grain Rochester

With delegated authority, the Head of Planning agreed the final wording of the refusal grounds with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson to read as follows:

The proposed development by reason of its siting within the setting of Grain Fort and obstruction of the line of fire of the Grain batteries would adverse impact on the setting of the nearby Scheduled Monument. It is considered that the cumulative community benefits resulting from the development would not outweigh the identified resulting long term harm to the schedule Monument and as such the proposed development

would be contrary to Policy BNE20 of the Local Plan and would not be in compliance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF.

Page 10 Minute 66 2-4 Canterbury Street, Gillingham

With delegated authority, the Head of Planning agreed the final wording of the refusal grounds with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson to read as follows:

- The proposed development due to the lack of provision of an active shopping frontage would result in the loss of a commercial use in the district centre that would impact negatively on the retail viability and vitality of this section of the Canterbury Street frontage of the Gillingham district centre. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy R12 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraph 85 of the NPPF.
- The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site due to the amount of bedsits proposed, inadequate usable external amenity space in terms of both provision and layout to serve the prospective residents, and poor outlook to bedsits 1 to 3 within the ground floor extension where their windows face onto rear walls of properties on Gillingham High Street. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Page 16 MC/20/0216 The Prince of Wales, 90 Cecil Road, Rochester

Recommendation

Replace reference to 2018 in condition 7 to 2015.

Add conditions:

9. The windows on the location on both flank elevations at ground and first floor shall be fitted with obscure glass and apart from any top-hung light, that has a cill height of not less than 1.7 metres above the internal finished floor level of the room it serves, shall be non-opening. This work shall be completed before the room it serves is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development does not prejudice conditions of amenity by reason of unneighbourly overlooking of adjoining property, in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development shall be carried out within Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D and E of that Order unless planning permission has been granted on an application relating thereto.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control such development in the interests of visual and neighbouring amenity in accordance with Policies BNE1 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

Page 26 MC/20/0559 Former NHS Walk In Centre, 547-553 Canterbury Street, Gillingham

Recommendation

a) Section 106

Replace the wording of part vi) with the following:

vi) A contribution of £37,959.85 for Education consisting of: Nursery £9,026.05 and Primary £7,736.59 to one or more of Greenvale Infants, Phoenix Juniors, New Road Primary, St Thomas of Canterbury. £19,744.94 towards secondary provision and £1,452.26 towards sixth form provision to one or more Brompton Academy, Victory Academy, Chatham Grammar School for Girls, Robert Napier.

Appraisal

Under Heading Education within the **s106 Matters** section

Replace the wording with the following:

A contribution of £37,959.85 for Education consisting of: Nursery £9,026.05 and Primary £7,736.59 to one or more of Greenvale Infants, Phoenix Juniors, New Road Primary, St Thomas of Canterbury. £19,744.94 towards secondary provision and £1,452.26 towards sixth form provision to one or more Brompton Academy, Victory Academy, Chatham Grammar School for Girls, Robert Napier.