

COUNCIL

22 JANUARY 2015

CHATHAM DOCKYARD AND ITS DEFENCES PLANNING POLICY DOCUMENT – ADOPTION

Portfolio Holders:	Councillor Rodney Chambers, Leader Councillor Jane Chitty, Strategic Development and Economic Growth
Report from:	Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture
Author:	Joanne Cable, Heritage and Social Regeneration Manager

Summary

This report seeks Council approval to adopt the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document, following consideration by Cabinet on 16 December 2014.

Please note that Appendix 1 is set out in Supplementary Agenda No.1.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

- 1.1 Policies S1 (Development Strategy) and S9 (Chatham Historic Dockyard) of the Medway Local Plan (2003) establish a vision for Medway's future firmly linked to the protection of the area's heritage assets. Regeneration ambitions are intertwined with promoting the value of Medway's rich historic legacy, to achieve the high quality development sought for the area. The internationally significant heritage of Chatham Dockyard and its Defences is a key component of this vision.
- 1.2 The Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document has been prepared to have the status of, and the same planning weight as, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It has been drafted with significant stakeholder involvement and has been subject to public consultation in accordance with the Medway Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. It is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan for Medway.
- 1.3 Procedurally, the Planning Policy Document cannot yet be given a timetable for becoming a full Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) because there is no adopted parent policy which it can supplement. This means that it is an

amendment to the current policy framework and will need to be approved by Full Council. In future, it is the intention to upgrade the Planning Policy to full SPD status.

- 1.4 The costs of preparing the planning policy document have been covered by the approved service budget.

2. Background

- 2.1 In April 2012 Medway Council submitted a Technical Evaluation to Government seeking the next available date to nominate Chatham Dockyard and its Defences as a World Heritage Site. Feedback suggested much of the evaluation was strong, and Medway Council was invited to consider how it ensures planning protection mechanisms are applied.
- 2.2 In-house work on a bespoke planning policy for Chatham Dockyard and its Defences began in early 2013 with the purpose of providing guidance to help developers make successful applications. Following Cabinet approval, it was launched for public consultation on 16 September 2013.
- 2.3 A further Technical Evaluation was submitted to Government in October 2013. Feedback on this occasion noted concerns that “that the quantity and position of recent development have compromised the potential for understanding and presenting the dockyard and its defences as a single functioning entity”. The assessment panel recommend that Chatham did not proceed to nomination.
- 2.4 In January 2014 the Chatham World Heritage Steering Group (now the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group):
- noted that the international significance of Chatham’s heritage was not in doubt
 - noted that it was satisfied that the balance sought and achieved between regeneration and heritage in Medway was appropriate
 - expressed disappointment that this view had not been supported nationally, or challenged on an earlier occasion.
 - agreed that it would not continue to pursue a World Heritage Site nomination.
 - noted that the Planning Policy Document remained highly valuable
- 2.5 In September 2014 the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group tasked the Heritage and Social Regeneration Manager with preparing the document for formal adoption, taking into account the comments received during consultation, and reflecting revised site nomenclature by removing references to World Heritage Site status.
- 2.6 A list of consultation responses received and how they have been incorporated into the final document is attached as Appendix 2.

3. Options

- 3.1 The alternative option to adopting the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document is to continue to support the balance of heritage and regeneration via the existing suite of planning policies i.e. take no specific action.

3.2 As the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document is ready for adoption, this would offer neither time nor cost savings.

3.3 The advantages of adoption include:

- increased clarity for potential developers
- a single point framework for decision-making for Medway Council's officers and Members
- enhancing the means of effective protection and promotion of the balance between heritage and regeneration.

3.4 Therefore the preferred option is that Cabinet recommend the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document for adoption by Full Council.

4. Advice and analysis

4.1 The Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document has three parts. The first provides an outline of existing planning policy guidance, drawing together the various existing policy documents which relate to the site. It includes reference to key management plans for significant components of the site, which contain detailed advice about how individual heritage assets or groups thereof will be managed

4.2 The second part describes how some of the site's principal heritage assets are represented in key views and how these should be managed to ensure that the uniqueness of Chatham Dockyard and its Defences is protected and enhanced.

4.3 Part three of the document sets out the methodology, in line with national guidance, that will be used to assess future development and regeneration proposals within and around the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences site.

4.4 The full document is attached as Appendix 1 (Supplementary Agenda No.1).

4.5 The Planning Policy Document has been produced by Medway Council's Planning Service team, with input from Regeneration and Economic Development and the members of the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group. This included two half-day workshops, and considerable additional support from English Heritage, Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust and the Homes and Communities Agency. It is therefore considered to be a comprehensive document, with sustainability at its core.

4.6 A Diversity Impact Assessment screening report is attached as Appendix 3. The conclusion of this report is that a full Diversity Impact Assessment is not required.

5. Risk management

5.1 There are considered to be limited risks associated with this work. The main risks are failure to adopt the document, or related to legislative change. These are summarised below:

Risk	Description	Action to avoid or mitigate risk	Risk rating
Failure to proceed.	This is considered unlikely, since not adopting the document offers neither time nor costs savings.	Proceed to full adoption.	E2
National policy changes	A change to the national approach to heritage protection could affect the core assumptions of the Planning Policy Document.	Careful monitoring of national policy changes.	F3

6. Consultation

- 6.1 The Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document was produced in close consultation with members of the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group (see Appendix 4 for members). Workshops were held on 21 February and 17 May 2013, and consultations on the developing draft ran from 30 May until 10 June, and from 1 August to 8 August 2013.
- 6.2 On 15 August 2013, Regeneration Community and Culture's Directorate Management Team endorsed the progression of the draft planning policy document through Cabinet.
- 6.3 On 3 September 2013, Cabinet agreed that the draft planning policy document proceed to formal consultation (decision 144/2013).
- 6.4 A six-week public consultation period took place from 16 September to 27 October 2013. This was advertised on line (on both the Medway Council and Chatham World Heritage websites), via email or post to all members of the Chatham World Heritage Partnership and to all individuals who had expressed a general interest in consultations in Medway, and via posters / leaflets sent to parish councils, libraries, contact points and community centres. A presentation was prepared for interested groups, and was requested by the Chatham Town Centre Forum.
- 6.5 The Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the Planning Policy Document on 12 December 2013 and agreed that the forthcoming adoption of the Planning Policy Document be supported. Full details are set out in Appendix 5 to the report.
- 6.6 Eight sets of consultation responses were received, and are summarised in Appendix 2, alongside details of how the Planning Policy Document was amended in response.
- 6.7 The Cabinet considered this report on 16 December 2014. The Cabinet agreed to recommend to Full Council the adoption of the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document (Appendix 1 to the report) –

decision number 202/2014 and the Cabinet also authorised the Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture, in consultation with the Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, to approve any minor corrections and factual amendments to the draft document prior to its adoption by Full Council which might improve its clarity and consistency (decision number 203/2014).

- 6.8 However, it has not proved necessary to exercise this delegation as no further minor corrections/factual amendments were required to the document.

7. Financial and legal implications

7.1 The Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document has been prepared to have the status of, and the same planning weight as, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It is the Council's intention to adopt the Planning Policy Document as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), once it has adopted its new Local Plan. Until this time, it is intended that the Council approves the Planning Policy Document as an amendment to the current policy framework. Therefore, approval of the Planning Policy Document is a decision for Full Council.

7.2 The Planning Policy Document will be a material consideration to which the Council's Planning Committee will have to give appropriate weight when determining planning applications affecting the Dockyard area.

7.3 The costs of preparing the Planning Policy Document were covered by the approved service budget.

8. Recommendation

- 8.1 The Council is asked to agree the adoption of the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document (Appendix 1).

Lead officer contact

Joanne Cable
Heritage and Social Regeneration Manager
Gun Wharf
01634 331176
joanne.cable@medway.gov.uk.

Background papers

None

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document

Appendix 2 – List of consultation responses

Appendix 3 – Diversity Impact Assessment screening report

Appendix 4 – List of members of the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group

Appendix 5 – Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 12 December 2013

Appendix 2:

Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document: Consultation Responses and Feedback

Responses were received from six individuals and two organisations. They were assessed in by a Medway Council Officer Panel consisting of:

- Heritage and Social Regeneration Manager
- Senior Conservation Officer
- Senior Landscape Officer
- Planning Policy and Design Manager

The comments received, and the panel's feedback are shown below

Consultation Question 1: Does the range of policies identified in Part I reflect the full range of existing protection for the site?

Respondent	Comments	Feedback
VP (resident)	Yes	Comment noted, with thanks.
AT (resident)	<p>In the main, Part 1 is a fair reflection.</p> <p>It would assist if online pdf files bore the same titles as the planning policy documents which are referenced – or some other means to aid access.</p> <p>The 'Future Status of this Document' paragraph should include the Appendix 4 reference to the fact that in cases of policy conflict, the CWHPP supersedes other documents.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the end dates of the period of international significance (1700 to 1865) were justified by reference to specific events.</p>	<p>Noted, we will endeavour to change this wherever we can.</p> <p>Agreed, change made.</p> <p>This is addressed in outline in the Executive Summary and further information sources are suggested in the 'References' section.</p>

	<p>The document could better explain the criteria for determining 'attributes'.</p> <p>Part 1 could be strengthened by clear definition of the criteria used to establish the boundaries for the site and buffer zone.</p> <p>The draft does include knowledge of all existing planning policy guidance but is not able to be used alone without reference to these documents and, as such, is not a stand alone planning policy document.</p> <p>There is broad consensus of aspiration and interpretation between the draft CWHPPD, the MWRS, SHSPPDS, GWM, ILSPD, AHDB, BLCAA, UCAA, GLHPMMP, and HDCCMP.</p> <p>Re: the RRDB - If development criteria within the corridor between Fort Amherst and Rochester Castle and Cathedral are to be consistent, then it is hard to see justification that this area is not within the buffer zone. The entire area is within the vista of views 7A and 7C. This is similar in he CCWDB.</p> <p>The MRF lacks depth in the context of CWH.</p> <p>In terms of illustrating intended intervention, the PPD would benefit from enumerating specific pro-active measures key partners are prepared to commit to.</p> <p>BHP – the statement that new higher buildings could create a cluster in Chatham Centre to mitigate the bulk of</p>	<p>Further information sources are suggested in the 'References' section</p> <p>Further information sources are suggested in the 'References' section</p> <p>The document is intended as a single point of reference, rather than stand alone policy document, and is to act as a signpost to more comprehensive planning guidance.</p> <p>Comment noted, with thanks.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in future reviews of the Rochester Riverside Development Brief.</p> <p>The Medway Regeneration Framework was a high-level document created in 2006, and therefore was not intended to reference specific actions.</p> <p>The PPD is intended to provide a framework for the development of pro-active measures from a range of actors, rather than define specific actions from a few.</p> <p>Comment noted. This position has been considered previously, with the conclusion that a cluster of buildings</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Mountbatten and Anchorage Houses is inconsistent with the sight corridor of Fort Amherst and Fort Pitt.</p> <p>The document sets out a definition for a high building but states that in sensitive locations the council may choose to apply the BHP to lower heights. This is ambiguous and clearer criteria would strengthen this statement – in the context of the potential WHS, a one-storey development could be too high in some areas, whereas more than six could be acceptable in others.</p> <p>CCWDB – the sight corridor between Forts Pitt and Amherst would benefit from being specifically protected in the PPD.</p> <p>CCWDB – seems inconsistent with regard to the GLHP and the intent of CWH.</p> <p>The impact of the statement ‘the reinstatement of the defences (the Barrier Ditch) is a key part of the waterfront proposals’ would benefit from illustration.</p> <p>PCDB – the PPD notes ‘no high buildings or major extensions are proposed...’ but the PCDB notes (and illustrates) ‘there is an opportunity to create a new town centre landmark that draws visitors towards the centre’ – conflict of interpretation need to be resolved.</p>	<p>would allow strategic views to be maintained.</p> <p>The Building Height Policy aims to reflect a multitude of circumstances, and in some cases indeed a single-storey building could fall within its remit. The policy creates the framework and provides the flexibility for each site to be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>The importance of this relationship is addressed by Viewing Point 5.</p> <p>Comment noted, although we tend to disagree - the Chatham Centre and Waterfront Development Brief was written in full knowledge of the Great Lines Heritage Park plans, and Chatham’s heritage significance.</p> <p>Comment noted. See photograph on p53, also now included alongside Executive Summary.</p> <p>Noted, with thanks. Change made.</p>
BT (resident)	No (no further detail given)	Comment noted. No action taken as no further information provided.
JG (resident)	Most definitely. Striking the balance between development and heritage requirements is admirably addressed here.	Comment noted, with thanks.

Consultation Question 2: Does the range of views in Part II adequately reflect the uniqueness of the Site?

Respondent	Comments	Feedback
VP	Yes	Comment noted, with thanks.
AT	The views chosen give an adequate reflection of the potential WHS and serve as a broad backdrop to the PPD. However, a more comprehensive context would include the view from Rochester Riverside. In terms of guidance throughout the buffer zone, this could be strengthened by the addition of secondary corridor views such as that at the top of Gibraltar Hill, so that sense of place relationships are maintained.	Sense of place relationships are dealt with by A Building Height Policy (2006) which retains its important policy role, and includes a number of secondary views
BT	No (no further detail given)	Comment noted. No action taken as no further information provided.
JG	Very much so. Any more and part 2 would simply be repeating itself. Also it highlights the heritage value of sites that would not spring immediately to mind in this context like Sun Pier or St Mary's Island.	Comment noted and support welcomed, with thanks.

Consultation Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed methodology for assessing development proposals in Part III?

Respondent	Comment	Feedback
VP	Yes	Comment noted, with thanks.
AT	I am broadly in agreement. The title 'Assessment' could be more specific: 'Assessment of Development Proposals'. Under Step 1 'The assessor' – the addition of 'Planning Officer, Committee or Inspectorate' would aid understanding.	Noted, with thanks. Change made. Please see paragraph 2, p 60.
BT	Yes	Comment noted, with thanks.
Jerry Gilder	I love it! Clinical, succinct. Targets the relevant points	Comment noted and support welcomed, with thanks.

instantly.

Consultation Question 4: Does the overall document strike the right balance between heritage and regeneration?

Respondent	Comment	Feedback
VP	No – it doesn't bite the bullet over eyesores and still allows buildings up to six storeys high in prominent positions.	Comment noted. We consider that the document does address eyesores (see Mapping and Mitigation, p17). We agree that high buildings are allowed, but this is in carefully controlled circumstances.
AT	In general, this document strikes a reasonable balance. The name 'buffer zone' is ambiguous – perhaps 'complementary zone' or a name that indicates the intention of balance could be considered. It could be extended to the limit of the Rochester conservation area (map example provided).	Comment noted, with thanks. This has been amended. (Following the decision not to proceed with a WHS nomination we are no longer bound by UNESCO terminology).
BT	No (no further detail given)	Comment noted. No action taken as no further information provided.
Jerry Gilder	Yes. Skyline, viewpoint and conservation issues-considerations balanced with regeneration requirements. This document would not be out of place on the curriculum of our local schools.	Comment noted and support welcome, with thanks.

Consultation Question 5: Does the document contain all the information you need to understand it? Are the format and layout clear, and the language appropriate?

Respondent	Comment	Feedback
VP	What is appendix 3 about?	Please see extra detail provided on p67 to explain this extract.
AT	Beyond above comments, yes.	Comment noted, with thanks.
BT	No (no further detail given)	Comment noted. No action taken as no further information provided.
JG	Yes, I didn't need to reach for my dictionary once!	Comment noted, with thanks.

Consultation Question 6: Any other comments?

Respondent	Comment	Feedback
VP	<p>Why not knock down Anchorage House, Mountbatten House and Victoria Tower – there is plenty of office space elsewhere – and replace parts of Victoria Tower and Brompton Hill development.</p> <p>No more high buildings please, we've made a mess with the ones we already have – maximum four storeys please. For clarity, A Building Heights Policy needs to be changed.</p> <p>It's not consistent to get rid of Anchorage House and Victoria Tower and not Mountbatten House.</p>	<p>These are long-term aspirations. They are not immediately achievable due to ownerships issues (none of these are owned by Medway Council) and the availability of funding.</p> <p>Comment noted. We disagree, and consider that this document, and A Building Height Policy seek to show how tall buildings can be achieved with respect for significance.</p> <p>Comment noted. We consider Mountbatten House a different case due to its city centre location, and the regeneration focus therein. Mountbatten House is considered intrusive as much because of its monolithic slab appearance as its height, and this can be mitigated by clustering.</p>
AT	<p>The document as a whole fulfils the criteria set for planning policy appropriate to heritage protection. The comments above are primarily ones of detail and are intended to be supportive of the extensive work done.</p>	<p>Comment noted, and support welcome, thank you.</p>
BT	<p>Lower Upnor Depot is subject to planning application MC/13/1804 which inadequately protects the site. (Includes a summary of the representation against the application submitted to the planning officer.)</p>	<p>Comment noted. This will be dealt with as a separate matter by the planning application process.</p>
Church Commissioners	<p>Church Commissioners' land including Manor Farm Barn and the surrounding area is located within the proposed World Heritage Site Buffer Zone.</p> <p>The Manor Farm site has significant potential for future</p>	<p>Comment noted. Medway Council cannot speak on behalf of the South East Design Review Panel. The Panel will be objective and make an impartial judgement taking into account all available and appropriate guidance.</p>

	<p>residential development to contribute to Medway's housing need. The Church Commissioners respect the aspiration to protect Chatham Dockyard through the designation of a World Heritage site.</p> <p>The Church Commissioners have development aspirations for the Manor Farm site in the medium to long term. It is therefore important that should the Church bring forward a planning application, the South East Regional Design Review Panel will not be unnecessarily onerous in their requirements so as to restrict the development potential of the site.</p> <p>It is equally important that, the Council is sufficiently flexible with regard to the quantum and form of enabling development to ensure that the Barn's refurbishment and rehabilitation becomes a reality. As such, we request that the following text is added to the final paragraph on page 16: "The South East Regional Design Review Panel will adopt a presumption in favour of sustainable development when considering development proposals within the proposed World Heritage Site and its buffer zone. The Panel will not be unnecessarily onerous in their requirements and will work to ensure that developments coming forward comprise an appropriate balance between minimising the impact of development on the Chatham World Heritage Site through sensitive design and development viability".</p>	
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>We welcome the recognition of the importance of landscape, landscape character and the need to use Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment when considering change.</p> <p>Although it is disappointing that no reference is made to</p>	<p>Comment noted, and support welcome, thank you.</p>

	protecting the embedded habitats and biodiversity of the area as part of the any changes, we recognised that this is effectively supplementary planning guidance, and that relevant policies in national and local planning documents will apply.	
JG	None really, just to say thanks for all you are doing for our towns.	Comment noted, and support welcome, with thanks.
Countryside Properties	Re: the section on St Mary's Island referring to 5 storey apartments (p27): we would prefer it if this section was updated to say something like "up to 5 or 6 storeys" in order that it would not adversely affect our potential future application.	Comment noted, and change made (note that this will be subject to visual impact assessment).

Diversity impact assessment

Appendix 3

TITLE <i>Name/description of the issue being assessed</i>	Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document
DATE <i>Date the DIA is completed</i>	14/11/14
LEAD OFFICER <i>Name of person responsible for carrying out the DIA.</i>	Joanne Cable Heritage and Social Regeneration Manager
1 Summary description of the proposed change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is the change to policy/service/new project that is being proposed?</i> • <i>How does it compare with the current situation?</i> 	
<p>The Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Planning Policy Document has been drafted to provide a single-point framework for decision making to support the effective balance of heritage and regeneration within Chatham Dockyard and its Defences and surrounding areas.</p> <p>It assimilates the guidance and recommendations of 16 existing planning policy documents and related plans, and identifies seven strategic viewing locations of particular importance to the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences site.</p>	
2 Summary of evidence used to support this assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Eg: Feedback from consultation, performance information, service user records etc.</i> • <i>Eg: Comparison of service user profile with Medway Community Profile</i> 	
<p>The planning policy document was developed by a group of experienced council officers, supported by the Chatham World Heritage Steering Group (now the Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group). The draft was widely consulted on, in line with Medway's Statement of Community Involvement, in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The mandatory press notice, plus a press release ▪ Notice on the websites of Medway Council and Chatham World Heritage ▪ Copies placed in all of Medway's libraries ▪ Emails/letters send to over 1,000 residents, businesses and stakeholders, who were either members of the Chatham World Heritage Partnership, or who had expressed a general interest in policy consultations in Medway. ▪ During a staffed exhibition at Fort Amherst on Tuesday 24 September (10am – 4pm), Thursday 26 September (12noon – 6pm) and Saturday 28 September (2pm – 4pm) ▪ In a meeting of the Chatham World Heritage Partnership on 24th October ▪ In a presentation to the Hempstead Residents' Association on 2nd Oct (at their request) ▪ In a presentation to the Chatham Town Centre Forum on 23rd Oct (at their request) <p>No consultation responses noted an impact on any of the protected characteristic groups.</p>	

Diversity impact assessment

3 What is the likely impact of the proposed change?

Is it likely to :

- Adversely impact on one or more of the protected characteristic groups?
- Advance equality of opportunity for one or more of the protected characteristic groups?
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't?

(insert ✓ in one or more boxes)

Protected characteristic groups	Adverse impact	Advance equality	Foster good relations
Age	No impact foreseen		
Disability	No impact foreseen		
Gender reassignment	No impact foreseen		
Marriage/civil partnership	No impact foreseen		
Pregnancy/maternity	No impact foreseen		
Race	No impact foreseen		
Religion/belief	No impact foreseen		
Sex	No impact foreseen		
Sexual orientation	No impact foreseen		
Other (eg low income groups)	No impact foreseen		

4 Summary of the likely impacts

- Who will be affected?
- How will they be affected?

- Developers - as all relevant policy for development within and around Chatham's internationally significant heritage sites will be contained within a single point of reference.
- Medway Council – as the framework for decision-making will be within a single point of reference
- Residents, businesses, workers and visitors to Chatham's internationally significant heritage sites, as the balance between heritage and regeneration will be effectively promoted and protected by a single point of reference.

5 What actions can be taken to mitigate likely adverse impacts, improve equality of opportunity or foster good relations?

- Are there alternative providers?
- What alternative ways can the Council provide the service?
- Can demand for services be managed differently?

Diversity impact assessment

The planning policy document is the only way to ensure that Medway has an established single-point policy framework to effectively balance heritage and regeneration, and is considered an effective means of demonstrating that this balance is at the heart of Medway Council's decision-making.

6 Action plan

- *Actions to mitigate adverse impact, improve equality of opportunity or foster good relations and/or obtain new evidence*

Action	Lead	Deadline or review date
N/A		

7 Recommendation

The recommendation by the lead officer should be stated below. This may be:

- *to proceed with the change implementing action plan if appropriate*
- *consider alternatives*
- *gather further evidence*

If the recommendation is to proceed with the change and there are no actions that can be taken to mitigate likely adverse impact, it is important to state why.

The recommendation is to proceed with the adoption of the planning policy document.

8 Authorisation

The authorising officer is consenting that:

- *the recommendation can be implemented*
- *sufficient evidence has been obtained and appropriate mitigation is planned*
- *the Action Plan will be incorporated into service plan and monitored*

Assistant Director

Date

17 November 2014

Contact your Performance and Intelligence hub for advice on completing this assessment

RCC: phone 2443

email: annamarie.lawrence@medway.gov.uk

C&A: phone 1031

email: paul.clarke@medway.gov.uk

BSD: phone 2472 or 1490

email: corppi@medway.gov.uk

PH: phone 2636

email: david.whiting@medway.gov.uk

Send completed assessment to the Corporate Performance & Intelligence Hub (CPI) for web publication

Appendix 4: List of Chatham Dockyard and its Defences Heritage Co-ordination Group members 2013-14.

Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust
Chatham Maritime Trust
Regeneration and Economic Development, Medway Council
Chatham World Heritage Partnership
Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Design and Conservation, Medway Council
English Heritage
Fort Amherst Heritage Trust
Green Space Services, Medway Council
Homes and Communities Agency
Housing and Regeneration, Medway Council
ICOMOS-UK
Lower Lines Trust
Mid Kent College
Peel Holdings
Royal Engineers Museum, Library and Archive
Royal School of Military Engineering and Chatham Garrison
Tourism, Medway Council
Universities at Medway

**Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny
Committee – 12 December 2013**

Chatham World Heritage Planning Policy Document

The Committee received a detailed report setting out progress towards the adoption of the Chatham World Heritage Planning Policy Document.

It was explained that the Chatham World Heritage Planning Policy Document had been prepared to have the status of, and the same planning weight as, a Supplementary Planning Document. The document had been drafted with significant stakeholder involvement and had been the subject of public consultation in accordance with the Medway Statement of Community Involvement and conformed to the National Planning Policy Framework and Development Plan for Medway.

It was confirmed that the Planning Policy Document would be considered for adoption by Cabinet on 14 January 2014 and Council on 20 February 2014.

It was explained that the Chatham World Heritage Planning Policy Document had three parts. The first provided an outline of existing planning policy guidance, drawing together the various existing policy documents relating to the site. It included reference to key management plans for significant components of the site, and contained detailed advice about how individual heritage assets or groups thereof would be managed.

The second part described how some of the site's principal heritage assets (known as attributes) were represented in key views and how these could be managed to ensure that the uniqueness of Chatham Dockyard is protected and enhanced.

Finally, part three of the document set out the methodology, in line with national guidance, that would be used to assess future development and regeneration proposals in the context of Chatham's world class heritage and its bid for World Heritage Site Status.

The full draft document was appended to the report.

The consultation draft had been produced by Medway Council's Planning Policy and Design Team, with input from Chatham World Heritage, Development Management, and the members of the Chatham World Heritage Steering Group. This has included two half-day workshop sessions, and considerable additional support from English Heritage, Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust and the Homes and Communities Agency. It was therefore considered to be a comprehensive draft, with sustainability at its core.

Members referred to a recent politics show broadcast on television and expressed concern that in this programme the issue of World Heritage sites

and its affect on planning had been ridiculed. In response, the Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration advised the Committee that the broadcast had been a 13 minute slot on BBC South East and that the vast majority of speakers had been supportive of World heritage sites. He confirmed that both the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth and a representative of the Chatham Historic Dockyard had been interviewed. However it was unfortunate that the only section of the broadcast shown on the news was a short section that had been critical of the proposals. Officers were currently taking media advice on a formal response.

A member referred to the site buffer zone and expressed the view that he would not wish this to hinder future employment opportunities at the Medway City Estate. In response the Chatham World Heritage Manager confirmed that the Chatham World Heritage Development Steering Group had a protocol of commenting on planning applications and she confirmed that World Heritage Status must work for Medway and not limit activities on the Medway City Estate.

A member referring to 'Victoria Tower' advised that locally this was known as 'Melville Court Tower' and it was suggested that it may be appropriate to change the report to reflect this.

Decision:

The forthcoming adoption of the Chatham World Heritage Planning Policy Document be supported.