

MC/17/1250

Date Received: 10 April, 2017

Location: Chatham Quayside, (Formerly Colonial House), Quayside, Chatham ME4 4YY

Proposal: Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to condition 1 of MC/14/3631 for outline planning permission with all matters reserved for future consideration, except access, for demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment for a mixed development of up to 253 apartments and houses and up to 339 sq.m (3,650 sq.ft) of Class A1 floorspace (as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)) together with vehicular and pedestrian access, formal and informal public open space, hard and soft landscaping and associated services.

Plus an application for non-material amendment to planning permission MC/14/3631 to the main access design from Quayside and details pursuant to conditions 11, 12, 13, 21 & 28.

Applicant: Medway Energy Ltd, Chatham Quayside Ltd, Terance Butler Ltd & Persimmon Homes Lt

Agent: Mr C Thurlow The Cabins Aylesford Lakes Rochester Road Aylesford, Kent ME20 7DX

Ward River

Case Officer Chris Butler

Contact Number 01634 331700

Recommendation of Officers to the Planning Committee, to be considered and determined by the Planning Committee at a meeting to be held on 30 August 2017.

Recommendation - Approval with Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawings received 10/04/2017

Drawing Numbers: 4179_PL_10; 4179_PL_50; 4179 PL 1052 Rev B; 4179 PL 1053 Rev C; 4179 PL 1054 Rev C; 4179 PL 1055 Rev C; 4179 PL 1058 Rev A;

4179 PL 1059 Rev A; 4179 PL 3100 Rev C; 4179 PL 3300 Rev B; 4179 PL 3301; 4179 PL 4100-02 Rev C; 4179 PL 4100-03 Rev C; 4179 PL 5100-02 Rev C; 4179 PL 5100-03 Rev C; 4179 PL 6100-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 6100-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 6100-03 Rev B; 4179 PL 7101-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7102-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7102-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7103-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7103-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7104-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7104-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7105-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7106-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7107-01 Rev A; 4179 PL 7107-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7108-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7109-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7110-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7111-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7112-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7113-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7114-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7115-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7116-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7117-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 7211-02; 4179 PL 7212-02; 4179 PL 7311; 4179 PL 7312; 4179 PL 7313; 4179 PL 7321; 4179 PL 7331; and 4179 PL 7341; Rev A.

Drawings received on 13/07/2017

Drawing Number: 4179 PL 7105-02 Rev D.

Drawings received on 14/07/2017

Drawing Numbers: 4179 PL 1051 Rev D; 4179 PL 1060 Rev A; 4179 PL 4100-01 Rev F; 4179 PL 4100-01 Rev F; 4179 PL 5100-01 Rev F.

Drawings received on 18/07/2017

Drawing Numbers: 4179 PL 1000 Rev F; 4179 PL 1001 Rev C; 4179 PL 1002 Rev D; 4179 PL 1003 Rev C; 4179 PL 1004 Rev D; 4179 PL 1020 Rev C; 4179 PL 1030 Rev D; 4179 PL 1050 Rev D; 4179 PL 1057 Rev B; 4179 PL 1090 Rev E; 4179 PL 3200 Rev G; 4179 PL 4200-1 Rev G; 4179 PL 4100-01 Rev F; 4179 PL 4100-02 Rev G; 4179 PL 5200-1 Rev J; 4179 PL 5200-2 Rev G; 4179 PL 6200-1 Rev H; 4179 PL 6200-2 Rev G; 4179 PL 7101-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7106-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7108-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7109-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7110-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7111-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7112-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7113-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7114-01 Rev C; 4179 PL 7115-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7116-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7117-01 Rev C; 4179 PL 7201-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7201-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 7202-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7202-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 7203-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7203-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 7204-01 Rev B; 4179 PL 7201-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 7205-01 Rev E; 4179 PL 7205-02 Rev B; 4179 PL 7206-01 Rev A; 4179 PL 7206-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7207-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7207-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7208-01 Rev E; 4179 PL 7208-02 Rev E; 4179 PL 7209-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7210-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7211-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7212-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7213-01 Rev D; 4179 PL 7213-02 Rev D; 4179 PL 7214-01 Rev C; 4179 PL 7214-02 Rev C; 4179 PL 7214-03 Rev E; 4179 PL 7215-01 Rev C; 4179 PL 7215-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7216-01 Rev C; 4179 PL 7216-02 Rev A; 4179 PL 7217-01 Rev C; 4179 PL 7217-02 Rev B; and 4179 PL 7217-03 Rev D

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 2 Prior to the development proceeding above ground level, design codes for the whole of the development site, which accord with the design guide received by the Council on the 7th August 2017, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by Local Planning Authority. The design code will accord with the principles established in the design guide submitted to the LPA with the reserved matters application and will be prepared in accordance with a content of components to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Following the written approval of the design code by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall only be undertaken in accordance with that design code.

Reason: Specific design details, such as materials to be used, are vague. Therefore design details are required to ensure the satisfactory design and quality of the development. Such details are required to ensure compliance with paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved Policies H4 and BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall only be undertaken in accordance with the noise mitigation measures described in the noise assessment (Report Reference: 140801/2) dated 27 November 2014, as amended by the Noise Assessment - Supplementary Report (Report Reference: 140801/SUPP) dated 5th June 2017.

Reason: To safeguard conditions of amenity within the scheme of development permitted, in accordance with Paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the National Planning Practice Guidance: Noise and DEFRA's Noise Standard for England 2010.

For the reasons for this recommendation for approval, please see Planning Appraisal Section and Conclusions at the end of this report.

Proposal

This submission relates to an application that is seeking the approval of reserved matters, being: appearance; landscaping; layout; and scale, pursuant to condition 1 of MC/14/3631. The outline planning permission, MC/14/3631, was granted with all matters reserved for future consideration, except access, for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment for a mixed development of up to 253 apartments and houses and up to 339 sq.m (3,650 sq.ft) of Class A1 floorspace (as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)) together with vehicular and pedestrian access, formal and informal public open space, hard and soft landscaping and associated services.

In this reserved matters submission the applicant advises that they have taken into account the views of the Council's Planning Committee when they considered the outline planning submission. The applicant noted Members desire to: Reduce the number of apartments in favour of houses; Reconsider the housing layout framing Dock Square, with a preference for housing over apartments; Ensure roads within the development are of a reasonable standard in terms of width, alignment and footways even if not being offered for adoption; and that the development meet the Council's

parking standard whilst reducing the amount of visible surface car parking.

In the light of the above, this reserved matters submission relates to 200 residential units, as apposed to the 253 residential units the applicant's could have sought under the outline. The proposed mix of residential units consists of 126 houses made up of 4 differing house types (The Greyfriars; The Longford; The Lydford; and The Wolvesey) and 74 apartments. The housing mix is detailed in the table below:

Description of residential unit	Number of units	Type of Unit	Height	Location
3b4p	16	Terrace	3	Terrace* 1 and 3.
3b5p	34	Terrace	3	Terrace* 1, 2, 3, 11,12, 13, 14, 15.
3b5p	18	Semi	3	Terrace* 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.
4b6p	23	Terrace	3	Terrace* 2, 4, 5, 6 & 7.
4b7p	33	Terrace	3	Terrace* 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 &16.
4b7p	2	Semi	3	Terrace* 8.
Total	126			

Legend
3b4p = 3 bed 4 person residential unit
3b5p = 3 bed 5 person residential unit
4b6p = 4 bed 6 person residential unit
4b7p = 4 bed 7 person residential unit

*Applicant's Description

The apartment are formed in 3 blocks, with blocks 'A' and 'B' being 4 storeys in height, whilst block 'C' is stepped in terms of its height which is 4 storeys where it adjoins block 'B', increasing to 5 storeys. The mix of the types of apartments are detailed in the table below:

Description of apartment unit	Number of units	Location
1b2p	8	Block C
2b3p	66	Blocks A, B & C
Total	74	

Legend
1b2p = 1 bed 2 person residential unit
2b4p = 2 bed 4 person residential unit

In addition to the above, the applicant is seeking to amend the main access design from Quayside, as approved under planning permission MC/14/3631 and is seeking to discharge planning conditions: 6 (Details of landscaping); 9 (Details of Lighting); 10 (Details of utility services (pre-ducting)); 11 (Groundworks/Construction Condition); 12 (Details of piling and foundation design); 13 (Details of a Code of Construction Practice) (CoCP); 21 (Details of noise protection); and 28 (Details of refuse storage arrangements).

Site Area/Density

Site Area: 3.3 hectares (ha) (8.23 acres)

Site Density: 60.60' dph (24.527 dwellings per acre (dpa))

Relevant Planning History

- | | |
|------------|--|
| MC/16/2486 | Application for a non-material amendment to remove condition 15 on planning permission MC/14/3631
Decision Approval With Conditions
Decided 06 July 2016 |
| MC/15/4014 | Details pursuant to condition 17 (Scheme for improving vehicular access from Quayside) of planning permission MC/14/3631
Decision Condition discharged
Decided 07 January 2016 |
| MC/15/2454 | Application for non-material amendment to planning permission MC/14/3631 to amend condition 23 (flood risk).
Decision Approval With Conditions
Decided 10 August 2015 |
| MC/14/3631 | Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for future consideration, except access, for demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment for a mixed development of up to 253 apartments and houses and up to 339 sq.m (3,650 sq.ft) of Class A1 floorspace (as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)) together with vehicular and pedestrian access, formal and informal public open space, hard and soft landscaping and associated services
Outline Consent granted - 18 May 2015 |
| MC/13/1693 | Town and Country Planning Act (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 - request for a screening opinion as to whether EIA is necessary for a mixed use development
EIA not required 2 August, 2013 |
| MC/13/2115 | Prior notification of a proposed change of use from office (B1) to dwelling (C3) |

No Application Required 15 October, 2013

MC/13/0847	Details pursuant to condition 1 of planning permission MC/12/2568 - Prior notification of proposed demolition of the whole Colonial House building including part constructed on piers over adjoining basin Discharge of Conditions 29 April, 2013
MC/12/2568	Prior notification of proposed demolition of the whole Colonial House building including part constructed on piers over adjoining basin Application Required 21 November, 2012
MC/07/1140	Change of use of offices to 180 bedroom hotel with conference, office and banqueting facilities and construction of first floor extension over car park to provide a health club Approval with Conditions 1 October, 2007
GL/89/91/90/323	Proposed amendments to the erection of the Headquarters Building as approved on 14th April 1989. Reference GL/89/91. Approval with Conditions 08/06/1990
GL/89/91	Erection of a Headquarters Office Building with car parking and servicing for owner/occupier Approval with Conditions 14/04/1989

Representations

The application has been advertised on site and in the press and by individual neighbour notification to the owners and occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The Chatham Maritime Trust, EDF Energy, The Environment Agency, The Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Service, Kent Police, The Medway Ports Authority, Natural England, NHS Medway Clinical Commissioning Group, Southern Gas Networks, Southern Water have also been consulted.

The **Environment Agency** (EA) have made the following summarised comments in relation to this reserved matters submission:

In terms of Flood Risk the EA have no objection to these reserved matters, noting that proposed finished floor levels are in accordance with their previous advice and the condition attached to the outline permission; .

In terms of groundwater and contaminated land the EA have noted the scope of works to address any contamination issues at this site and confirm that they agree that the proposals are acceptable and in accord with their previous understanding of the site. However, they stress that the planning conditions covering land contamination issues should not be fully discharged until relevant verification of all works carried out, including summaries of removed or imported materials, have been submitted and

agreed.

Kent Police have written advising that they have considered the submission with regards to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) matters, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (Section 7 Para 58 & Section 8 Para 69) and the DCLG Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 (Design Section - Paras 10 & 11) – Crime Prevention, the Kent Design Initiative (KDI) - Design For Crime Prevention document dated April 2013.

They state that having reviewed the online plans and documentation, the applicant/agent has considered crime prevention for this application as detailed with the Planning Application Supporting Statement (Incorporating Design and Access Statement) dated April 2017 at Sections: 4.22; 5.1 and 5.4 having also reviewed the conditions that may impact on CPTED in particular, they consider that conditions: 01 (Layout); 06 (Landscaping); 09 (Lighting); 16 (Parking/cycle parking and storage); and 28 (Refuse storage) can be discharged.

Southern Water have written advising they *"...would have no comments to make with regards to appearance, landscaping and scale or the conditions being subject of consultation."* However, they also point out that they *"...would not accept the proposed layout until the applicant can demonstrate that, in order to avoid odour, vibration and noise nuisance, habitable buildings are constructed outside of 15 metres exclusion zone of the public sewerage pumping station."*

Local Representations

One local business has written objecting to the development on the following summarised grounds:

- The proximity of the proposed residential units to adjoining manufacturing operations, which operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week will have the potential for residents to complain about business operation of the adjoining occupiers. This will have the potential to cause difficulties to the adjoining businesses and may result in the imposition of conditions. Such risks to business operations must be avoided as such restrictions would potentially have an impact on: the future of adjoining businesses, in this location; future investment; and employment;
- The proposal represents a threat to long term manufacturing and port operations at Chatham Docks. There has already been an impact on businesses since the development at Chatham Docks and Gillingham Marina and local businesses have already felt this impact with new residents raising noise complaints and adjoining businesses are having to direct resources to investigate these complaints rather than using those resources in relation to business operations. The new occupiers are some 200 metres away from adjoining businesses whereas the proposed development will only be some 50 metres away. As a result any impact would be more evident;
- The traffic congestion at St Mary's Island junction by the entrance to the Medway Tunnel and the Medway Tunnel itself is already problematic, especially during rush hour periods. If this development were to proceed it would exacerbate an already difficult situation that could result in delays for staff and despatches and receipt of goods to and from the Docks.

One Local resident has written objecting to this reserved matters submission on the following summarised grounds:

- The building is beautiful and should remain. The outlook across Basin 2 is good and more favourable than the proposed view that would be created by the development;
- The landscape is good as it is and would be less costly if retained rather than redeveloped;
- There is no explanation as to whether alternative uses have been explored and the existing building should be reused. The writer suggests a number of alternatives including: Dockside 2; Spa/Health Unit; Social Care; Extension to Medway Hospital; Relocation of London based businesses to Medway; Hotel; Extension to the Universities; Social Housing; Homeless Solution/rehabilitation Facility; or a combination of the above uses;

Development Plan

The Development Plan for the area comprises the Medway Local Plan 2003 (the Local Plan). The policies referred to within this document and used in the processing of this application have been assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and are considered to conform.

Planning Appraisal

Principle of Development

The principle of residential development on this site has already been established through the granting of outline planning permission MC/14/3631. The main determining issues therefore relating to this reserved matters application are: Whether the design and visual appearance of the development is acceptable; Whether it is acceptable in terms of its impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and future occupiers of the development itself; and whether it is acceptable in highway and landscape terms.

Principles of Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and as such an assessment of the sustainable credentials of the development is appropriate. At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. The three dimensions to sustainable development are economic, social and environmental.

The proposed development is a high density, mixed use development, which makes efficient use of previously developed land. It is located in an urban area where people can access services on foot, bicycle or by public transport rather than having to rely on the car. Retail uses are located close by and employment destinations can be accessed via alternative modes of transport other than being reliant on the private motor vehicle. Accordingly the proposal is considered to satisfy key sustainable

objectives of promoting the more efficient use of land, of reducing the need to travel and ensuring good access to services.

The principle of residential development on this site has already been established through the granting of outline planning permission MC/14/3631, albeit that application incorporated some 339 sqm (3,650 sq ft) of retail floorspace. However, due to the proximity of the development to a significant amount of retail floorspace provision, the applicant has removed the retail element from this subsequent reserved matters submission as it is not considered that a retail unit would be viable on this site. Dockside and the shopping parade at the Ship and Trades public house are located less than 5 minutes walk away.

The current application seeks to build upon the broad parameters previously considered as part of the former outline planning consent and as such is generally considered to be acceptable in principle.

Density and design

Policies BNE1 and H5 of the Medway Local Plan respectively state that the '*design of new development...respects the scale, appearance and... visual amenity of the surrounding area,*' and that '*high-density development must meet a high standard of both design and quality if it is to make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area*'.

During the processing of this reserved matters submission various concerns were raised by the Council in regard to the layout and cramped nature and appearance of the development. This especially relates to the three blocks of residential apartments which are located along the south-western boundary, where the site adjoins Pier Road. Significant improvements have been negotiated resulting in parts of the housing units shifting north-east increasing the element of amenity land and landscaping space within the development. Alterations have also been made in regard to the carriageways within the development, enabling enhanced landscaping. Alterations to the podium landscape feature have also been negotiated. Additionally, the applicant's have submitted drawings, which they refer to as street-views and a document they refer to as a 'Design Guide'.

Members will recall that broad parameters of the scale, mass and height were set out as part of the outline submission and this development is broadly consistent with those parameters albeit that the number of residential units has reduced from 253 residential units to 200 residential units. The density at 60.60' dph (24.527 dwellings per acre (dpa) is considered appropriate for this location and will amount to an appropriate level of development in this location which will fit well on this brownfield redevelopment site.

All of the details submitted, including the aforementioned documents, the layout, floorplans and elevations have all been reviewed and are considered to be appropriate in this location. Improvements to the layout and design and quality of the scheme have been secured and the street-views, whilst being somewhat stylised are acceptable in terms of the developments massing and the developments relationship with its surroundings. It is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the wider streetscape and is acceptable in terms of its general layout, scale and massing.

The submitted design guide is limited and clearly a work in progress. The point of the design guide in this instance is to set the parameters against which later conditions can be negotiated particularly in the case of Architect/Landscape Architects not being retained into the later stages of the development proposal. The design guide looks to ensure consistency exists in terms of the delivery of different part of the development such as landscape, public realm and buildings, should they be built out at different stages or built out by different developers. Since the proposed development has been designed to the same level, it is inevitably that the Design Guide has ended up a being a document that reads like an elaborate Design and Access Statement. However, it picks up the nuances/differences between blocks within the scheme and make the phases more controllable.

Should this reserved matters consent be forthcoming, the Design Guide should be conditioned, to ensure it is complied with in terms of subsequent submission of conditions such as the discharge of materials, Etc. Whilst the applicant's architect has submitted a materials reference guide (Document reference 4179 PL 0010 Rev A) which goes some way as to providing comfort as to the general appearance of the buildings being acceptable in terms of the general materials specified, their nature and finish/colour, the details are only vague and need to be conditioned to ensure they are acceptable in detail. This could form part of the Design Guide.

In terms of the proposed landscaping, it is considered that this is of a high quality and will provide for a sense of place and good quality street scape.

In conclusion, with appropriate conditions, the proposal will result in the creation of a development of acceptable quality and design, which is also considered to be appropriate in terms of it layout and scale. With the landscaping detailed the proposal will result in a development that has a 'a sense of place' and good character in terms of the streetscape it will be seen within. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and complies with policies H4, H5 and BNE1 of the local plan and meets the aspirations of the NPPF.

Residential unit size and unit mix

The revised details indicate the construction of 200 dwellings within 3 main phases. However, the applicant has shown each phase as having sub-phases with: phase 1 having 6 sub-phases; phase 2 having 7 sub-phases; and phase 3 having 5 sub-phases. The housing mix proposed 126 new dwelling houses and 74 residential apartments. In terms of the apartments 66 of these units (22 per apartment block) will be 2 bedroom, 4 person units; whilst the remaining 8, which are all located in block 'C', will be 1 bed, 2 person units. In terms of the residential dwelling houses these are a mix of semi detached units (20 units) and terrace units (106 units).

The applicant has advised that the decision to reduce the number of residential unit sought from that proposed at the outline stage was informed by the Members debate when they considered the outline submission, as well as being informed by their own design of the external appearance of the buildings, their knowledge of market demand and their experience of marketing new homes within the Medway area.

Policy H10 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 supports the delivery of a mix of dwellings including different types and sizes. The NPPF seeks that redevelopment applications should *'deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities'*.

In the light of the above, the residential mix in this instance is considered to be appropriate and in accordance with both the NPPF and Policy H10.

In terms of residential amenity, the Government's Technical Housing Standards (GTHS) set out internal liveability standards, whilst the Council's own interim Medway Housing Design Standards (MHDS) set out the standards sought for external amenity standards. Such standards are material consideration in the assessment of this proposal in that they seek to guide developers to produce residential units that will provide adequate amenity for occupiers throughout the lifetime of the development and thereby allows for consideration of amenity against Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan. The table below assesses the compliance with the development against these standards.

Description of residential unit	Number of units	House type	Type of Unit	Height	Government Technical Housing Standard (GTHS) Requirement for Gross Internal Area (GIA) in square metres.	Proposed (GIA), as specified in submitted documentation in square metres.	GTHS Bedroom floor space Gross Internal Area (GIA) in square metres = 11.5 - Double or twin beds (D) and 7.5 for a Single bed (S) space.	GTHS width of Bedroom in metres - Double/twin (D) - first room = 2.75, thereafter 2.55. Single (S) 2.15	GTHS Minimum Floor to ceiling height in metres. Requirement is 2.3 metres for at least 75% of floor area.
1b2p	8	Apartment	Apartment	N/A	50	50	Bed 1 (D) = 12.6	Bed 1 (D) = 2.9	100%
2b4p	66	Apartment	Apartment	N/A	70	From 72-74.6	Bed 1 (D) = 12.9; Bed 2 (D) = 12.1.	Bed 1 (D) = 2.9; Bed 2 (D) = 2.7.	100%
3b4p	16	Lydford	Terrace House	3	90	122.1	Bed 1 (S) = 9.7; Bed 2 (D) = 11.5; & Bed 3 (S) = 7.5.	Bed 1 (S) = 2.2; Bed 2 (D) = 2.8; & Bed 3 (S) = 2.6.	100%
3b5p	34	Greyfriars	Terrace House	3	99	97.2	Bed 1 (D) = 11.6; Bed 2 (S) = 10.0; & Bed 3 (D) = 11.5.	Bed 1 (D) = 4.0; Bed 2 (S) = 4.0; & Bed 3 (D) = 4.0.	100%
3b5p	18	Greyfriars Pavilion	Semi-detached house	3	99	99.9	Bed 1 (D) = 11.6; Bed 2 (S) = 10.0; & Bed 3 (D) = 11.5.	Bed 1 (D) = 4.0; Bed 2 (S) = 4.0; & Bed 3 (D) = 4.0.	100%
4b6p	23	Wolvesey	Terrace House	3	112	122.1	Bed 1 (S) = 9.7; Bed 2 (D) = 11.5; Bed 3 (S) = 7.5; & Bed 4 (D) = 11.5.	Bed 1 (S) = 2.2; Bed 2 (D) = 2.8; Bed 3 (S) = 2.6; & Bed 4 (D) = 2.8.	100%
4b7p	33	Longford	Terrace House	3	121	124.8	Bed 1 (D) = 13.3; Bed 2 (D) = 11.5; Bed 3 (S) = 8.3; & Bed 4 (D) = 12.9.	Bed 1 (D) = 3.0; Bed 2 (D) = 3.1; Bed 3 (S) = 2.15; & Bed 4 (D) = 3.2.	100%
4b7p	2	Longford	Semi-detached house	3	121	124.8	Bed 1 (D) = 13.3; Bed 2 (D) = 11.5; Bed 3 (S) = 8.3; & Bed 4 (D) = 12.9.	Bed 1 (D) = 3.0; Bed 2 (D) = 3.1; Bed 3 (S) = 2.15; & Bed 4 (D) = 3.2.	100%

Legend
1b2p = 1 bed 2 person Residential Unit
2b4p = 2 bed 4 person Residential unit
3b4p = 3 bed 4 person residential unit
3b5p = 3 bed 5 person residential unit
4b6p = 4 bed 6 person residential unit
4b7p = 4 bed 7 person residential unit

All the dwellings with the exception of the 'Grayfriars' meet the GTHS and that unit only marginally falls below the standard by 1.8 square metre, which in the context of the wider scheme is not considered to warrant a recommendation of refusal

There is no policy objection to the principle of the development as residential development and the unit size mix proposed is considered to comply with policy H10 of the Local Plan and the objectives of the NPPF in terms of creating mixed and vibrant communities.

Amenity considerations

Planning policy requires that the amenities of neighbours around the site and those of future occupiers of the development are adequate in regard to suitable internal space, privacy, outlook, overshadowing impact, daylight, disturbance from noise and activity from the development, (including during construction phase), that air quality is acceptable, that residents are not exposed to hazardous uses in the area or contamination, waste management is adequate and that personal safety and security measures are adequate. These matters are the subject of various national and Local Plan policies.

Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan requires that current and future occupiers of the proposed units and neighbours should be protected in part with regard to privacy, daylight and sunlight.

As discussed in the section above the proposed units are considered to provide an acceptable size and layout of units for future occupiers. The apartment blocks all face onto the side elevations to the proposed dwelling houses within the scheme and all exceed the 11 metres distance the Council would normally seek in cases of a primary elevation facing a flank elevation. Indeed in this instance the apartment blocks look out over the street, with the closest side/flank elevation being some 12 metres increasing to 16 metres on the south-eastern side of the site. The primary elevations of the dwellings have been sited a minimum of 20m apart to ensure a high level of privacy for each unit and the scheme has been developed to take into account and maximize sunlight and daylight to each dwelling as well as to maximize river views, where possible.

In terms of the apartments, each unit will benefit from private amenity space in the form of balconies or terrace, which meets the MHDS. In addition to this the residents will benefit from the use of the communal amenity space around the apartment buildings and within the development itself, including the podium area.

In terms of adjoining occupiers amenities, none of the adjoining properties are residential in nature and there will be no impact, arising from the development on the general amenities of those adjoining commercial properties. In terms of the reverse considerations, the applicants have undertaken acoustic assessments, the most recent of which was submitted in June 2017 in the form of a supplementary report. These assessments have been reviewed by my Environment Protection Section who have advised that whilst they had initial concerns related to noise surveys showing that night time noise from the port had changed in character since the time of the original noise survey, the review of the evidence submitted and the subsequent

supplemental noise assessment report has addressed those concerns, and has provided further clarification with respect to the proposed noise mitigation measures. The Environmental Protection Section note that as a result, additional noise mitigation measures are required for some of the units and subject to the provision of those mitigation measures they have confirmed that they are happy to recommend discharge of condition 21 (Details of noise protection).

In conclusion of this section, the proposed houses and flat designs are considered to be acceptable in terms of their density, height, scale and form in this location. The development will not harm the character or appearance of the location generally. The developments have been carefully sited, orientated and the windows to habitable rooms located in such ways that adequate privacy distances between the houses themselves and the existing dwelling adjoining the site can be maintained. This being the case and bearing in mind the design of these dwellings, no loss of amenity, including sunlight/daylight, to the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings is considered to occur. Nor will there be any loss of amenity to the future occupiers of this development. The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of Policies BNE1 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

Landscaping

In terms of landscaping, Condition 06 of the outline planning consent stipulated what details need to be submitted in terms of the reserved matters submission and specified that that the landscaping details needed to include the: Overall hard and soft landscape framework for the development; Typical landscape treatment for the primary and secondary highway network; Typical landscape treatments for any open space areas; Strategy for the provision of play equipment to a standard of a LEAP; Management plans for the provision of the hard & soft landscaping, the Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) and Informal/formal open space; and timescale for implementation of these landscaping details.

The general arrangement of the landscaping of the site is shown on drawing number 01-586-100 Rev D and the general arrangement details as shown on drawing numbers: 01-586-101 Rev C; 01-586-102 Rev D; 01-586-103 Rev C; and 01-586-104 Rev C.

In terms of the street tree planting, this has been increased following negotiations and is welcomed as it breaks up the architectural elevations. Other tree planting in soft landscape areas as indicated on the submitted landscape drawing is considered to be acceptable. In addition to the additional tree planting the applicant has agreed to the removal of parking bays at the entrance to the LEAP; updated the pavement and carriageway layouts at junctions; and realigned the refuse bins, as they were considered to be highly visible at the entrance to the site.

The applicant has also undertaken alterations to the configuration of terraces 2, 3, 4 and 5, to increase the area of the car barns and providing room for the repositioned alleyways. There is no longer an alleyway in the centre of the terraces and increased tree planting has been provided between the property frontages and the car parking bays which is an improvement.

In terms of the external boundary wall types, the wall types have been revised to agree

with the layout changes and these alterations are considered to be acceptable.

In terms of the apartment block key elevations and individual bloc elevations, these have been updated to take account of the landscape revisions providing additional trees, as have the drawing related to the terrace elevations. These revisions are all considered to be acceptable in landscaping terms.

With regard to the LEAP, the overall design of the play area is welcomed as it has interesting level changes and sensory aspects and goes beyond a traditional play facility. The LEAP will provide 6 pieces of equipment including a see-saw, climbing frame with net, a multi swing, large slide, roundabout and stepping stones. It will also provide an area for sand play and a sensory area. Initially concerns were raised in regard to various matters, but the applicant has addressed those concerns in their revised details, which ensure that the path now forms an integral play feature within the LEAP as its curved horizontal form and variation in vertical elevation will encourage exploration of its route and movement along it. More variation has been provided in the surface treatment by way of patterns and shapes which will add to the path's interest.

The applicant advises that the LEAP has been designed following the Council's own guidance with the play equipment being specified to include for the older group. The applicant considered that the form of the LEAP is well suited to a range of child ages, which includes the older age group too.

In terms of the proximity of the LEAP to adjoining dwellings there are two main areas where the LEAP would be within the normal 20 metre distance sought. However, these incursions are considered to be relatively minor and the LEAP layout has been modified to 'pull back' the slide and landing area from the 20m buffer to the façade of properties opposite. The only exception to this is the Sensory Play Area. However, the façade of the nearest property which faces this feature is a blank façade and as the use of such area is for quiet' play use the location of this element of the LEAP is considered to be acceptable

All in all the landscaping details proposed, including the detail of the LEAP, are all considered to be acceptable. The exception to this is that there is a lack of detail related to the maintenance of the landscape areas and the LEAP.

Bearing this in mind, the description will be amended to delete reference to the discharge of condition 06 (Landscaping) and advise the applicant by way of informative that the details of the hard and soft landscaping are acceptable, but the maintenance details are lacking and therefore at this time the Council has been unable to discharge planning condition 06 (Hard and Soft Landscaping).

Highway Issues

Highway and pedestrian access were considered as part of the outline planning submission. However the applicant is proposing alterations to the access into the site, which they refer to as non-material and has reduced the mix and nature of the units, thereby changing the parking requirements, when assessed against the Council's interim parking standards.

Dealing firstly with the alteration to the access. These works have already been carried out with the previous entrance having been removed and then the whole extent of the site entrance having been taken to form the site entrance, being tarmaced. This alteration to the access is not considered to be unacceptable in terms of highway and pedestrian safety and no concerns are raised to those alterations. The principle of the development is established by the outline consent and the amended layout plans is unlikely to result in any highway-related concerns. Shared surfaces in this location are acceptable. Vehicle tracking submitted with the application demonstrates suitable access and manoeuvring for various types of vehicle; and whilst some of the sightline distances at the internal junctions are on the low side, these are located in what will be a low-speed residential area. Indeed the Government document 'Manual for Streets' indicates that such distances in such locations are likely to be appropriate and acceptable. Furthermore, rumble strips are proposed at intersections, which will serve as traffic calming features.

In terms of the Council's interim parking standards, this reserved matters submission proposes a total of 407 parking spaces which consists of: 252 spaces related to the housing provision and 107 spaces related to the apartments and 48 visitor spaces. The arrangement of the bays will generally discourage on-street parking in most locations. Visitor parking is generally well positioned throughout the development and the shared space proposals will allow more space for short-term parking (i.e. deliveries). The off street parking provision proposed by the applicant complies with these standards and is considered to be acceptable. The development is considered to comply with Policy T13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003

Conditions

As part of this submission the applicant has sought to discharge conditions: 6 (Details of landscaping); 9 (Details of Lighting); 10 (Details of utility services (pre-ducting)); 11 (Groundworks/Construction Condition); 12 (Details of piling and foundation design); 13 (Details of a Code of Construction Practice) (CoCP); 21 (Details of noise protection); and 28 (Details of refuse storage arrangements) of MC/14/3631. Conditions: 6 (Details of landscaping) and Condition 21 (Details of Noise protection) have been dealt with above. In terms of the other conditions these are detailed below:

In terms of Condition: 9 (Details of Lighting); and 10 (Details of utility services (pre-ducting)), the applicant has not submitted revised lighting or utility service details following the above mentioned revisions to the layout of the development. This being the case, it is proposed to amend the description to delete reference to the discharge of condition 9 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) and Condition 10 (Details of utility services (pre-ducting)) and advise the applicant by way of informative that these details are not discharged at this time.

With regard to Condition: 11 (Groundworks/Construction Condition); 12 (Details of piling and foundation design); and 13 (Details of a Code of Construction Practice) (CoCP). The details submitted pursuant to this condition were forwarded to the Environment Agency and the Council's Environmental Protection Team. Neither consultee has raised any concern with regard to the content of the details submitted pursuant to these conditions. In this regard, should this reserved matters consent be

forthcoming an informative is included advising the applicant that the details submitted pursuant to these conditions are acceptable, but they are still required to undertake the development in accordance with the details submitted in accordance with the implementation aspect of these conditions.

Condition 28 (Details of refuse storage arrangements). The details submitted pursuant to this condition were forwarded to the Council's Waste Minimisation Team, who have advised that the proposal appears to be a very good development in regards of waste and recycling collection. They have requested that the applicant be advised to ensure that the roads are constructed to adoptable highway standard so as to ensure they are capable of taking the size and weight of the Council's appointed contractors refuse vehicles and that the road surface is of a sufficient standard to ensure it can withstand heavy use. Additionally the Waste Minimisation Team have asked that the applicants attention be drawn to certain design guidance in relation to the bin storage within the apartment blocks and proximity of such storage to parking bays. Should this reserved matters consent be forthcoming the guidance of the Council's Waste Minimisation Team will be forwarded to the applicant in the form of an informative.

In the light of the comments from the Council's Waste Minimisation Team the details submitted pursuant to this condition are considered to be acceptable and it is recommended that Members discharge that part of Condition 28 which required the submission and approval in writing of the details of the refuse storage arrangements.

In conclusion of this condition section of the report

The details submitted pursuant to Condition 11 (Groundworks/Construction Condition); 12 (Details of piling and foundation design); 13 (Details of a Code of Construction Practice); 21 (Details of noise protection); and 28 (Details of refuse storage arrangements), which required them to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their approved in writing are considered to be acceptable and these aspects of these aspects of these conditions are recommended to be discharged accordingly.

In terms of Conditions 9 (Details of Lighting); and 10 (Details of utility services (pre-ducting)) these details cannot be discharged as the details submitted have not be amended to reflect the revised layout. Therefore, should this reserved matters consent be forthcoming, these condition will need to be deleted from the description of the development and an informative added advising what the applicant needs to do to overcome the matters which would result in the Council having to refuse to discharge these conditions should they be maintained within the description of the development.

Finally, in regard to condition 6 (Details of landscaping), whilst the majority of the details submitted are considered to be acceptable, the maintenance details are lacking and therefore at this time the Council is unable to discharge this condition. Therefore, should this reserved matters consent be forthcoming this condition will need to be deleted from the description of the development and an informative added advising the applicant that whilst the majority of the details of the landscaping are considered to be acceptable, in the absence of a detailed maintenance programme the Councils unable to discharge this condition at this time.

Bird Mitigation

Bird mitigation, due to the application site lying within 6km of the North Kent Marshes SPA/Ramsar Sites, was considered at the outline planning application submission. However, at that time the provisions related to impact of development on the North Kent Special Protection Areas (SPAs)/Ramsar sites and recreational disturbance on the over-wintering bird interest was not in place and it was concluded that the bird mitigation contribution could not be pursued in relation to the outline submission. Having sought advice from the Council's legal section, the Council's position is that in this instance the bird mitigation contribution cannot be pursued in relation to this reserved matters submission.

Local Finance Considerations

None

Conclusions and Reasons for Approval

The application seeks Reserved Matters consent for the erection of 200 residential units. The principle of development on site has been granted Outline Consent by virtue of MC/14/3631. The appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the development are considered to be appropriate to their setting and will allow for the creation of a sustainable development that results in a desirable place to live, work and visit. The redevelopment of this brownfield site is also considered to be a benefit to the wider area. The proposal satisfies key sustainable objectives within the NPPF that promotes the more efficient use of land, whilst seeking to reduce the need to travel and ensuring good access to services.

The proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of policies BNE1, BNE2, BNE4, BNE6, BNE8, BNE24, H5, H10, T13, and CF13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003, The NPPF, the GTHS, and The MHDS

This application would normally fall to be determined under delegated powers, but is being reported for Members consideration due to the scale of the application proposal and the fact that the Planning Committee have considered previous applications on this site.

Background Papers

The relevant background papers relating to the individual applications comprise: the applications and all supporting documentation submitted therewith; and items identified in any Relevant History and Representations section within the report.

Any information referred to is available for inspection in the Planning Offices of Medway Council at Gun Wharf, Dock Road, Chatham ME4 4TR and here <http://publicaccess.medway.gov.uk/online-applications/>