Planning Committee – Supplementary agenda

A meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on:

Date: 18 June 2014
Time: 6.30pm
Venue: Canteen - Level 3, Gun Wharf, Dock Road, Chatham ME4 4TR

Items

19(B) Additional information - Supplementary agenda advice sheet (Pages 3 - 12)

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

Date: 18 June 2014
Minute 23 of the 20 May 2014 Planning Committee - MC/14/0649: Unit 5, Block T, Pier Road, Gillingham.

Members will recall that an addition condition was recommended by the Council's Senior Planner in regard to requiring the details of a Scheme to ensuring that use of the facility after 11pm be restricted to students only being submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their written approval. Members agreed to the imposition of such a condition and the wording of that condition is set out below, for Members information:

"Prior to the commencement of the use, hereby permitted, full details of the security arrangements proposed to ensure that entry to the use after 23:00 hours is restricted to students carrying a KentOne or NUS Identification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved details shall be implemented and maintained.

Reason: To regulate and control the development permitted in the accordance with the details submitted and interests of general amenity in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003."

Representative

An e-mail has been received from the applicant querying the content of recommended conditions 3 (Personal Permission) and 4 (Hours of Use) and has asked the Council to consider amending these so as to remove the applicants name from the condition, not tie the use of the track to specific the name(s) / property and to allow alternative model of operating to include some evenings during the week, but limited to no more than more than six week days per year and no more than 12 two hour evening sessions between 18:30 hours and 20:30 hours, including weekends.

Officer Comment

It is not considered that the personal permission (Condition 3) should be amended as request by the applicant, due to the fact that the reason for the imposition of the condition, as set out in the papers, would be negated. In terms of Planning Condition 4 (Hours of Use) the applicant is requesting the
use of the site for no more than six week days per year and no more than 12 two hour evening sessions between 18:30 hours and 20:30 hours, including weekends.

It is considered that the above variations when combined with the use of the facility during the weekends would amount to an over intensive use of the site that would adversely impact on the character of the area. However, in reviewing the above, Officers consider that the existing condition 04 can be tightened and revised wording is set out in the recommendations section below:

Recommendations

Delete Condition 1 (Implementation) as the application is retrospective.

Amend existing Condition 3 as follows:

3) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by Mr P Harris while he is living at Deangate Cottage, Dux Court Road, Hoo St Werburgh. The use shall cease and be discontinued when Mr P Harris ceases to live at Deangate Cottage, and the land shall be restored to its former condition prior to its use as a junior off road track, in accordance with a scheme of works related to the land restoration of the site that has first been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval in writing. The scheme of works related to the land restoration of the site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority no later than 1 month prior to Mr P Harris ceasing to live at Deangate Cottage, Dux Court Road, Hoo St Werburgh. The scheme of works related to the land restoration of the site shall include a timetable for the implementation of the restoration works and shall be fully implemented in accordance with the scheme of land restoration approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority, pursuant to this condition.

Reason: To regulate and control the permitted development in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

Amend existing condition 04 as follows:

4) The use hereby permitted shall only operate between the hours of 09:30 to 16:30 on Saturday and Sundays with no engines being started or allowed to run prior to 09:50 hours and between the hours of 12:30 hours and 13:00 hours. The use shall only operate for one day over each weekend period and shall not operated during the months of December, January and February.

Reason: To regulate and control the permitted development in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003
Renumber Conditions 02 – 06 (inclusive) to Conditions 01 – 05 (Inclusive)

Page 47  MC/13/3164  The Chestnuts, Matts Hill Road, Rainham, Gillingham.

Page 55, 2nd paragraph, 2nd line, after the words “the harm to the” add the words “character and appearance of the surrounding countryside, the Special Landscape Area and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”.

Page 59  MC/13/3171  The Chestnuts, Matts Hill Road, Rainham, Gillingham.

**Description of the Proposal** is considered to be misleading in that it refers to a stable block. This being the case it is recommended that the description be amended as set out below:

Variation of condition 1 on planning permission MC/13/0878 (retrospective application for the construction of a utility room and washroom) to allow for its use in relation to the use of the land as a travelier site.

Page 64  MC/13/1671  Garage Site Adjacent 6 Hazelmere Drive, Gillingham.

**Representations**

A petition with 41 signatures has been received objecting on the following summarised grounds:

- Loss of privacy;
- Increase in on street parking and general congestion resulting from the redevelopment of the site;
- Noise, disturbance and resultant impact on amenity, including the delivery of goods, removal of rubbish and debris etc being left on the public highway;
- The property could become multi-occupied;
- A three bedroom property would be more in character;
- The development has the potential not to be looked after and could bring the character of the area;
- The area is quite with little trouble and change to this is not wanted.

Page 75  MC/14/0781  42 Silverweed Road, Weeds Wood, Chatham

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee**
This application is being reported to Planning Committee due to the level of representation received that are contrary to the recommendation on the committee papers.

Page 93  MC/13/0102  Croneens Car Park, Railway Street, Gillingham

Representations

One additional letter of objection has been received on the following summarised ground:

- The site would be better used for affordable housing.

An e-mail has been received from Cllr Stamp questioning why no condition related to replacement pay and display / public car parking provision is recommended.

Officer Comment – An appropriately worded condition is recommended below.

Recommendation

Add condition 16 as follows:

16 No development shall take place, and the existing car parking within the site shall remain open and available for use by the general public, until 115 replacement pay and display parking spaces have been provided and made available for use. The replacement parking spaces shall be provided within 300 metres of any boundary of the application site.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with policies BNE2 and T13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee

This application is being reported to Planning Committee due to the level of representation received that are contrary to the recommendation on the committee papers.

Page 107  MC/13/3121  Land Rear Of 48 Cambridge Road Strood Kent.

Representations

The Applicant’s Agent has written raising concerns regarding pre-application advice which has been given and the comments and recommendation received from the case officer during the processing of the application. The
agent has written setting out a chronology of discussions with officers to date and has requested that this be drawn to Members attention. This Chronology is appended to this Supplementary Agenda Advice sheet for Members Information.

Cllr Mrs Etheridge has written indicating that she is unavailable to attend Planning Committee on the 18 June 2014 and has expressed the view that consideration should be deferred to enable a Members site visit to take place. She has also requested that a copy of her objection to the development be appended to this Supplementary Agenda Advice sheet for Members Information. This is appended for Members Information.
butler, chris

Subject: FW: 3408/20 - 48 Cambridge Road, Strood

From: Roland Day [mailto:Roland.Day@gdmarchitects.co.uk]
Sent: 05 June 2014 18:00
To: harris, dave
Cc: Carol Heyburn
Subject: RE: 3408/20 - 48 Cambridge Road, Strood

Dear Mr Harris,

Our client – Mr Peter Wilson of Allen Wilson Shopfitters & Builders Ltd, has asked us to prepare a chronological statement of discussions with your officers to date, which I am pleased to provide for your information, as follows:-

1. Our client met Mr Gary Edwards – planning officer on site to obtain informal advice regarding redevelopment of this 'non-conforming' commercial site for 2 storey residential development. Mr Edwards confirmed such residential development on the site, provided this included an amenity area sufficient to accommodate 1no rotary clothes line, with on-street car parking as the adjacent dwellings, would be permissible.

2. In 2013, we were instructed to design a 2 storey scheme of 2no flats and submitted a planning application on 16th July 2013. This application was dealt with by Mark Pullin who recommended refusal and was therefore withdrawn in October 2013.

3. Based on comments received, we prepared and submitted a 2nd application on 25th November 2013, for a single detached dwelling.

4. I met Mark on 20th January 2014 to discuss our application. He confirmed the design would need to change and we agreed these would be dealt with under a PEA. I agreed to amend in accordance with his comments.

5. On 28th January we submitted revised drawings of a single detached dwelling.

6. On 30th January Mark required further amendments.

7. I understand in early February our client met Mark on site to discuss these revisions and the way forward.

8. We redesigned the scheme as a chalet bungalow and submitted on 20th February.

9. These required amendment and we submitted revised drawings on 3rd March which proved unacceptable.

10. A further meeting with Mark, Peter Wilson and me was held on 12th March. Here we agreed to revise a previous proposal by lowering the roof pitch. This revised drawing was submitted on 19th March.

11. Mark then asked us to indicate pitched roofs on the dormers which we did to 3no previous schemes and issued these on 6th May.

12. The application was then taken over by Paul Ives [his 1st email to me regarding draft PEA on 8th May.

13. Paul Ives wrote 27th May confirming the application was being recommended for refusal at 18th June planning committee meeting.

Kind regards,

Roland Day

Director

For and on behalf of

gdm architects
The Master's House
College Road
Maidstone.
Kent ME15 6YQ

18/06/2014
tel: 01622 760870
fax: 01622 760871

gdm design and management limited trading as gdm architects

This message is for the urgent attention of the addressee only and its contents, together with any attached files, are strictly confidential. If all details have not been fully and clearly received or the message has been received in error, please telephone the number above. This message and the details therein are for information only and do not create or vary any contract whatsoever and therefore gdm does not accept any legal responsibility for this message or the contents therein. gdm does not accept responsibility for any drawings transmitted and such drawings do not form part of any formal issue of information. We will confirm details by letter post if required.
Dear Mr Harris and Mr Ives,

Please add my comments to my notice of objection in regard to this proposed building that is similar in proportions to the previous application previously submitted as MC/13/1746.

Drawings appear once again to have included the boundary property of neighbouring property in Brompton Lane and if that is not the case the amenity land for both properties are now left extremely tight which I ask you to take note of especially as recent redevelopment appears to have taken place in one of these properties.

The Agent’s application is incorrect as it is presented as an existing two storey building which it isn’t. It is a stable with hayloft and became the dairy in the back garden of the Victorian Terrace house in Brompton Lane identified as property owned or recently sold by the applicant. I believe that this property may have been recently converted into flats and question whether permission if required was given?

The proportions and mass of this proposed property are significantly bigger to be considered acceptable on this plot. The proposed building of this property will have the front door and windows at the edge of the pavement which is quite different to the rest of the street scene not only along Cambridge Road but neighbouring Brompton Lane.

In particular the sight lines will affect the neat Victorian properties of Cambridge Road, with their small but none the less, contained front gardens that are in contrast to the proposed new build as their properties sit back from the footpath. The sight line shown by the architect does not demonstrate this, instead the architect has chosen to compare to the flank of the wall of the property on the corner of Brompton Lane.
The style of the proposed application is in stark contrast to other properties.

The building materials suggested are out of keeping with the existing street scene. The proposed height of the roof and its style and mass will have impact on neighbouring properties, so much so that it will affect their amenity and quality of life that article 8 should be considered here as this proposed building is intrusive and impacts on the rights of other property owners/renters who will not be able to enjoy their homes in the way they do now.

This building will impact enormously not only on the neighbour next to the owner’s property in Brompton Lane who has little or no garden, but also will impact on the owner next to her and others further down the road as these properties are lower than the proposed building in Cambridge Rd as the properties are staggered on a hill which is another reason why this development has an impact on neighbouring properties in Brompton Lane and topography should be taken into account.
This proposal will not have sufficient light coming into property and will detrimentally affect the sunlight coming into neighbouring properties as the style of the property at the back will impact on the neighbours whose gardens run along the back of the proposed property.

I question whether the fixed opaque window that has been suggested as an answer to the privacy issue is adequate and whether there is an emergency exit in a fire situation.

Residents should not be faced with having the choice of a dilapidated building that has not had the appropriate upkeep or an application such as this that is completely unacceptable adding nothing to the sense of place of the area. I do not believe Members or officers if looking at a proposed new estate would approve this building on this site or this layout whether built in the 1900’s or 2014 as it is overdevelopment.

Parking in this area is particularly difficult not least because the area is very densely populated. Age UK has the use of the building at the end of the street and has considerable difficulty parking its transport during the day. Residents also have a battle trying to park during the evening when coming home from work. I am aware of double parking going on in other streets and residents advise me that it has not been unknown in this one either, so the suggestion that making this property disability access friendly will not help here especially if then a disabled space for parking is required and another person in the property or visitors or health workers need to park/visit too. Officers are currently also looking at residents parking elsewhere in the vicinity that could affect this area for the worse as there will undoubtedly be an impact.

I remain unconvinced that this site is an appropriate site for any dwelling unless it meant that the building that has some local history connected to it could possibly be properly preserved to make it into ‘studio’ ground floor property. Otherwise in my view we should be enforcing the owners to clear up and improve this property as it is or return it to garden or garages fit for purpose that the residents of the property on the corner of Brompton Lane would benefit from.

Should officers be minded to approve I wish this to go to Committee and be notified of the date to arrange my diary and attend and address the said committee. I would also ask for a site meeting for members to gauge the problem for themselves, which they may wish to do before coming to any decision especially as there is a change of Membership on the committee.

Many thanks

Cllr Jane Etheridge