

Medway Council
Meeting of Planning Committee
Wednesday, 13 February 2019
6.30pm to 9.50pm

Record of the meeting

Subject to approval as an accurate record at the next meeting of this committee

Present:	Councillors: Bhutia, Bowler, Mrs Diane Chambers (Chairman), Etheridge, Gilry, Griffiths, Hicks (Vice-Chairman), McDonald, Potter, Royle, Tranter and Wicks
Substitutes:	Councillors: Saroy (Substitute for Tejan) Turpin (Substitute for Gulvin)
In Attendance:	Martin Aust, Viability Consultant Councillor Rodney Chambers, OBE Kemi Erifevieme, Planning Manager Dave Harris, Head of Planning Robert Neave, Principal Transport Planner Vicky Nutley, Assistant Head of Legal Services Councillor Wendy Purdy Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

791 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gulvin and Tejan.

792 Record of meeting

The record of the meeting held on 16 January 2019 was agreed and signed by the Chairman as correct.

The Committee noted that the wording of the refusal grounds for the following planning applications had been agreed with the Chairman and Opposition spokespersons outside of the meeting:

Minute 704 - Planning application – MC/18/3007 – 20 Pattens Lane, Rochester ME1 2QT

1. The proposed use of this semi detached property as a children's home (class C2) would result in unacceptable general disturbance and loss of amenity to neighbouring residents, particularly those in the attached property at 18 Pattens Lane. In addition due to the limited capacity

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

within the property, particularly for needs such as quiet rooms etc, the property if not considered suitable for a childrens home. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policies BNE2, H2 and H8 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 8(b), and 127 of the NPPF 2018.

Minute 707 - Planning application – MC/18/3165 – 61 Lingley Drive, Wainscott, Rochester

1. The proposed development would result in a large, boxy dormer to the rear that would dominate the rear roof space of the original dwellinghouse and the hipped roof of the existing two storey rear extension, as well as resulting in a number of different extensions to the property of varying architectural styles, which overall, would appear contrived and therefore harmful to the appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and the visual amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties when viewed from their rear gardens, contrary to Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

793 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman referred to the recent sad passing of Councillor David Carr who had been a valuable Member of the Planning Committee.

The Committee held a minute's silence in memory of Councillor David Carr.

794 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

There were none.

795 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests

Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

Other significant interests (OSIs)

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Diane Chambers declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham on the basis that the applicant was known to her. However, she advised that she had only visited the Avenue Tennis Club when she had been invited to the official opening as Chairman of the Planning Committee and that she had not attended any other meetings at the venue. She left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application. In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman took the chair for consideration of this planning application.

Councillor Griffiths declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham on the basis that he lives in close

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

proximity to the application site and left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Potter declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Royle declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Tranter declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3662 – Land off Curtis Way, Rochester on the basis that he had provided assistance to the applicant and therefore he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Wicks declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Other interests

Councillor Etheridge referred to planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and advised the Committee that whilst he had received a number of emails about the planning application, no Ward Councillor had spoken to him about the application and he did not know the applicant and therefore he would take part in the consideration and determination of the planning application.

Councillor Potter referred to planning application MC/18/1307 – Bakersfield Phase 2, Station Road, Rainham and advised the Committee that as he had declared that he was opposed to large scale developments in the Rainham area, he wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor on this planning application and would therefore not take part in the determination of this planning application.

Councillor Saroy referred to planning application MC/18/3114 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and advised the Committee that she wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor and would therefore not take part in the determination of this planning application.

Councillor Turpin referred to planning application MC/18/3662 – Land off Curtis Way, Rochester and advised the Committee that he wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor and would therefore not take part in the determination of this planning application.

796 Planning application - MC/18/1555 - Former Redvers Centre, Glencoe Road, Chatham

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application and reminded the Committee that this planning application had been considered by the Committee on 16 January 2019, following which the Committee had determined that whilst the planning application was acceptable in design terms, Members still had concerns regarding viability. The Committee therefore removed the design reason for refusal and deferred the application to enable officers to undertake further negotiation on viability issues.

Martin Aust, Viability Consultant advised upon the outcome of discussions with the applicant's consultants and advised that an amended viability assessment had been undertaken dated 31 January 2019. This concluded that the proposed development did not generate a development surplus which could be allocated to Section 106 contributions. The amended viability assessment had since been assessed independently by Pathfinder and they had come to the conclusion that for the scheme to be marginally viable, house prices would need to rise by 10%. They considered that sales values would need to rise to 14% before policy compliant levels of Section 106 payments could be achieved. Therefore, it was considered that the scheme was not viable and no Section 106 contributions could be paid.

However, as the applicant was keen to begin development of the site as soon as possible, the applicant had agreed to enter into an agreement for a clawback clause which would enable profits from the development to be re-assessed when completed. The applicant considered that this provided the Council with a measure of security. In the light of this, it was suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, such permission should include a condition that the development begin before the expiration of 18 months from the date of the permission rather than 3 years.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that if it was minded to approve the application, proposed conditions 1 – 11 were set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet and proposed condition 1 would require amendment to reflect the suggested change from 3 years to 18 months. He also drew attention to a proposed Section 106 contribution towards bird mitigation.

The Committee discussed the application and Members expressed concern that to approve this planning application without any Section 106 contributions, with the exception of bird mitigation, would have a detrimental impact on local facilities and services in the locality and could set a precedent for future planning applications and should therefore be refused.

Decision:

Refused on the ground set out in the report.

797 Planning application - MC/18/3114 - Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham

Discussion:

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, Councillor Hicks took the chair for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail and drew attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet on which there was a correction to the wording of the proposed Section 106 agreement.

In addition, she drew attention to two letters from Rehman Chishti MP that he had received relating to this planning application, details of which were appended to the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

The Planning Manager advised that eleven additional representations, including two from one household had been received reiterating concerns already addressed within the committee report. New matters raised concerned a covenant, loss of view and loss of house value but these were not material planning considerations.

The Planning Manager also advised that Councillor Purdy, as Ward Councillor had submitted a petition containing 111 signatures objecting to the development of houses on the site.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillors Purdy and Saroy addressed the Committee as Ward Councillors and outlined the concerns of residents including the following:

- The proposed development will have an impact on those residents living in Glebe Road and this has not been taken into account.
- Vehicular exit from Glebe Road into Second Avenue is already very difficult owing the restricted sight lines and this development will exacerbate this problem resulting in road safety issues.
- Many residents have objected to this proposed development.
- The application site is in a Conservation Area.
- The application constitutes backland development
- The development will place a strain on the existing sewage and drainage system and could result in flooding.
- The proposed houses will have very small gardens.
- The provision of three storey houses is out of keeping with the character of the area and will be overbearing.
- The committee report and presentation do not give the full picture of the area and if the Committee is minded to approve the planning application, then prior to doing so a site visit should be undertaken.
- The proposed development is an overdevelopment of the site and will result in overlooking and block light and result in a loss of privacy.

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

- On street parking in the vicinity of the application site is at a premium and should this proposed development be approved, it will result in an increase in the demand for on-street parking.

The Committee discussed the application and expressed concern that the proposed development was cramped and overbearing. In addition, plots 7 and 8, being three storeys high were considered to be excessive in height and out of character with houses in the surrounding area.

Members also expressed concern that although there was parking provision on site, the proposed parking provision and, in particular, visitor parking was inadequate and would likely result in increased competition for on street parking in surrounding roads.

Other concerns expressed by members of the Committee included an unacceptable loss of trees, lack of reassurance that the ecological and reptile surveys were up to date and the lack of a footpath into and out of the site. A Member also sought information as to the collection point for household refuse and re-cycling.

In response to concerns about the lack of a footpath, the Principal Transport Planner confirmed that the width of the proposed access road was 4.8m and that when reviewing the scheme, the Council's Highways Team had not requested that a footpath be provided. It was also confirmed that the access road would be sufficiently wide enough for a refuse vehicle to access the properties and therefore refuse and recycling could be collected from the front of properties.

Some Members referred to emails received from residents objecting to the planning application and whilst appreciating residents' concerns about the proposed development, concern was expressed about the tone of some of the emails and the inference that some Members the Planning Committee would not be unbiased in their consideration of the planning application. Members from across the Committee wished it to be known that the Committee undertakes its role seriously and responsibly, listens to points raised by all parties and considers each planning application upon its individual merits having regard to material planning considerations.

The Head of Planning advised the Committee that at the request of Ward Councillors, he had held a public meeting with residents and the case officer at which discussion had ensued as to the proposal and those factors which could and could not be taken into account as a material planning consideration. In addition, it had been explained as to how residents could make their views known, including sending their objections direct to Members of the Planning Committee if they so wished. On the whole, those residents at the meeting understood the role of the Planning Committee and it was therefore unfortunate that one or two individuals had chosen to send emails along the lines referred to.

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

A Member drew attention the planning history for the site as listed in the committee report and commented that planning applications MC/15/1751, MC/16/3217 and MC/15/3205 required deletion as they related to a development by the Avenue Tennis Club which was not at the same site as the current planning application. In response, the Head of Planning agreed that reference to these three planning applications were not relevant.

Following consideration, the Committee considered that whilst it did not object to the principle of development of the site, this particular planning application was unacceptable.

Decision:

- a) Refused on the following grounds:
 - 1. Although not within a Conservation Area, the site is located not far from a Conservation Area and the proposed development constitutes overdevelopment of the site which will be harmful to the area by virtue of the height of plots 7 and 8 and overlooking.
 - 2. The development is out of character of the area.
 - 3. The proposed gardens are too small and therefore provide a lack of amenity for prospective occupiers.
 - 4. Lack of visitor parking which could have a detrimental impact on competition for on street parking in the vicinity of the application site.
 - 5. The increase in traffic movements in and out of the site could lead to road safety issues owing to the sight lines at the junction with Second Avenue.
 - 6. The lack of provision of a pedestrian footpath into and out of the site.
- b) The Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to approve the wording of the refusal grounds with the Vice Chairman and opposition spokesperson outside of the meeting.

798 Planning application - MC/18/3662 - Land off Curtis Way, Rochester

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail and suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, proposed conditions 2, 6 and 7 be amended as set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

In addition he drew attention to an amendment to the proposal and planning appraisal sections of the report, details of which were also set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

He reported the receipt of one further letter of representation expressing concern that some trees had been removed from the site.

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

In addition, the Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT) had written and expressed a number of concerns relating to the proposed location of the coach park, details of which were summarised on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

The Head of Planning reminded the Committee that when the Council had approved the redevelopment of Rochester Riverside, such development was conditional upon the provision of a new coach park. He advised that extensive investigations had been undertaken into identifying possible alternative sites, most of which had been considered unacceptable and the outcome had resulted in the current planning application. Although the proposal would result in the loss of some public open space, the development would lead to some enhancement of the remaining open space.

He stated that although the site was close to residential properties, it was located as far away as possible and it was considered that any impact upon residents would be negated by the provision of landscaping and restricted hours of use.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Turpin addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and outlined residents' concerns which included:

- Although the site was now no longer to be operational for 24 hours, the hours of use had not been reduced sufficiently and were not in line with the hours of use of the coach park located at the Visitor Information Centre in Rochester.
- There is no footpath provision into and out of the site.
- The play area could benefit from refurbishment and this development has not included provision for this work.
- There is a lack of provision on site for coach drivers.

The Committee discussed the application and in response to questions concerning the hours of operation, the Head of Planning explained the reason for the hours requested but stated that he considered it would be acceptable for the hours of access to and from the coach park to be amended to start at 07.00 as opposed to 06.00.

Members questioned whether it was possible to change the hours at the end of the day so as to be earlier than 22.30 and the Head of Planning advised that this matter would require discussion with the applicant.

In response to concerns relating to the lack of a footpath, the Principal Transport Planner advised that it was intended that a footpath would be provided but that this had not formed part of the planning application.

In response to the concerns as to the lack of facilities for coach drivers, it was noted that there were several locations close to the coach park, including a large supermarket where coach drivers would be able to acquire drinks, food and use facilities.

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

Decision:

Approved with:

- a) Conditions 1, 3 - 5, 8 - 11 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and conditions 2, 6, 7 amended as follows and 12 amended as set out in b) below:
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 9T078/CW/130/01 rev 01 (site location plan);
 - 'Extent of Medway council Freehold Ownership' plan (no plan number but shows red and blue lines);
 - 9T078/CW/120/01 rev 01 (existing site layout);
 - 9T078/CW/110/01 rev 01 (proposed site layout);
 - D001 rev * (existing site sections);
 - D002 rev * (proposed site sections);
 - CW-001 rev A (proposed planting plan);
 - Top junction drawing on drawing no. 9T078/CW/110/02 rev 02;
 - ENG-001-01 rev A (Bollard detail sheet)
 - 03/0857 rev F (A229 City Way/Marconi Way - proposed modifications);
 - Technical sheets for the Traffic light, control cabinet and bollards, received on 8 January 2019;
 - photographs of entrance 'traffic light', bollards and control cabinet, all received on 8 January 2019;
 - AT Access technical sheet for bollards also both received on 8 January 2019.
 6. Prior to the first operation of the coach park hereby approved the package of highway works to Curtis Way, including the strengthening of the highway carriageway if required, as detailed in the 'Transport Statement 02' and the relocation of the existing height restriction barrier and installation of highway waiting restrictions, as shown on drawing 9T0768/CW/110/01 rev 01 shall be completed and retained as such thereafter.
 7. Prior to first operation of the coach park hereby permitted the earth bund shown on landscape drawing CW-001 rev A (proposed planting plan) shall be constructed in accordance with the section drawing shown on that drawing. The soft landscaping of the bund shall take place in accordance with the implementation details shown on drawing CW-001 (proposed planting plan) within the first planting season following the construction of the bund and the ongoing maintenance of the soft landscaping shall take place in accordance with the maintenance details shown on drawing CW-001 (proposed planting plan).

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

- b) Condition 12 with access into the coach park being amended to state 07.00 hours start and with the Head of Planning being granted delegated authority in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and opposition spokesperson to agree the hours that access to the site shall cease (currently set at 22.30 hours) with a view to this being earlier if possible. In the event that a time cannot be unanimously agreed, the planning application be deferred and resubmitted to the Committee for determination.

799 Planning application - MC/18/1307 - Bakersfield Phase 2, Station Road, Rainham

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail and suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the planning application, an additional condition 27 be approved as set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

In addition, he drew attention to a revised section of the committee report relating to contamination also set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Potter addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and outlined concerns including:

- The committee report did not include reference to a petition that he had submitted containing over 1000 signatures objecting to large scale development in Rainham.
- Whilst the principle of development at Bakersfield had already been established, development of this orchard land would have a detrimental impact upon the highways network should other proposed developments in Rainham be progressed.
- The proposed development does not include any mitigation for alleviating traffic congestion.
- The total proposed Section 106 agreement for open space facilities should be directed to open spaces in Rainham.
- There should be an additional condition requiring a Site Management Plan taking into account issues that have arisen with the existing development on adjoining land at Bakersfield.

The Head of Planning advised the Committee that petitions were frequently received by the Council objecting to potential developments and, whilst the concerns of those who had signed the petitions were respected, if they did not relate to specific planning applications and contain objection reasons specific to a planning application they could not be considered by the Committee when determining a planning application. He explained that should 'non -specific' petitions form part of the planning application process and be taken into account when refusing a planning application, this could affect any later

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

planning appeal and could result in costs being awarded against the Council. It was for this reason that petitions which did not relate to specified planning applications were not referred to within planning application reports.

In response to highway concerns, the Head of Planning advised that when considering applications for large scale developments in Rainham, the impact on the highway was an issue that would need to be carefully considered. However, as this particular application was for 27 properties and formed phase 2 of the Bakersfield development, officers were of the opinion that this development was acceptable on highway grounds.

In response to the issue of open space contributions, the Head of Planning advised that the Committee had previously recognised the Great Lines Heritage Park as an asset to Medway as a whole and, as only 5% of the proposed Section 106 contribution was to be used for the Great Lines Heritage Park this was not considered unreasonable.

He referred to the Site Management Plan and advised that he had already met with the Site Manager at the adjoining development and if this planning application was approved, the Site Management Plan would be carried forward onto this site.

The Committee discussed the report and, in particular, the section of the report concerning flooding. It was noted that the Environment Agency's 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water' indicated that the north and western parts of the site were at risk of flooding. Members expressed concern that the proposed conditions required that development of plots 19 – 27 should not commence until a scheme to address/resolve the surface water flooding that affects these proposed dwelling houses has been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

The Committee acknowledged that as the applicant was currently working on the adjacent site, it would wish to begin works on Phase 2 of the development without unnecessary delay, but considered that the drainage concerns needed to be addressed before planning permission could be granted for the full scheme. It was considered that if the drainage issues could not be easily resolved, the applicant may wish to consider submitting a revised scheme for those properties unaffected by potential flooding.

Decision:

Consideration of this application be deferred pending further discussions with the applicant on the surface water drainage scheme for the development with a view to the application being re-submitted to the next meeting for determination.

800 Planning application - MC/18/3446 - Manor Farm Quarry, Parsonage Lane, Strood, Rochester

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

The Committee discussed the report and Members expressed concern that whilst infilling of the quarry was taking longer than originally anticipated, the application for an extension of hours and days of operation would have a detrimental effect upon traffic congestion especially at peak times when traffic is leaving the Medway City Estate.

A Member expressed concern that following a visit to the site, he had been advised that the wheel washing facility was currently broken and, as a result an excessive amount of mud and silt was being deposited on the highway and subsequently being washed into the drains.

The Head of Planning advised that the issue of wheel washing could be enforced both on planning and highway grounds.

Following discussion, it was considered that this planning application should be deferred to enable officers to undertake further discussion with the applicant on concerns relating to the lack of wheel washing facilities on site and to enable officers to undertake a review of the potential impact of the extension of hours and days of operation on the highways network in particular, the anticipated number of vehicle movements between 16.30 and 17.30 Mondays to Fridays.

Decision:

Consideration of this application be deferred to enable officers to undertake further discussions with the applicant on concerns relating to the lack of wheel washing facilities on site and to enable officers to undertake a review of the potential impact of the extension of hours and days of operation on the highways network in particular, the anticipated number of vehicle movements between 16.30 and 17.30 Mondays to Fridays.

801 Planning application - MC/18/1405 - Keepers Barn, Upper Bush Farm, Upper Bush Farm Road, Cuxton

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the report in detail.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 13 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

802 Planning application - MC/18/3061 - 126 Hempstead Road, Gillingham, Kent

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Rodney Chambers OBE addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and set out the concerns of residents including the following:

- The proposed development, being a 3 storey structure is out of character with the street scene.
- The proposed development will have a detrimental impact upon loss of light in habitable rooms of no. 124 Hempstead Road.
- The application constitutes an overdevelopment of the site.
- On the third floor of the proposed properties, there will be a third bedroom and a study, but the study could be converted to a fifth bedroom at a later date.

The Committee discussed the planning application and supported the concerns of the Ward Councillor.

Decision:

a) Refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site and, being a 3 storey development is out of keeping with the character of the area and the street scene.
2. The proposed development will have a detrimental impact upon the habitable rooms at no. 124 Hempstead Road, Gillingham by virtue of loss of light.

b) The Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to approve the wording of the refusal grounds with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and opposition spokesperson.

803 Planning application - MC/18/3523 - 89 Cooling Road, Strood, Rochester, Kent

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

- a) Securing a contribution of £239.61 towards Bird Mitigation.
- b) Conditions 1 – 4 as set out in the report for the reasons stated on the report.

804 Planning application - MC/18/3617 - 47 - 49 High Street, Rochester ME1 1LN

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

The Committee discussed the application and it was suggested that as there are a number of residential properties in and around the vicinity of the application site, the variation of hours from 11pm to 1am could not be supported and that the closing time of this premises should be restricted to 12 midnight on Fridays and Saturdays.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 6 and 8 - 11 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and condition 7 amended as follows:

- 7 The use hereby permitted shall only operate between the hours of 08:00 to 23:00 Monday to Thursday, 08:00 to 24:00 Friday and Saturday and 10:00 to 22:00 on Sunday and Public Holidays.

Reason: To regulate and control the permitted development in the interests of amenity including in view of the cumulative effect of a number of late night uses in the High Street and the presence of residential properties in close proximity to the site and with regard to with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

805 Planning Committee - Constitutional Issues

Discussion:

The Head of Planning introduced a report setting out proposed changes the provision of the employee scheme of delegation relating to triggers for the escalation of planning applications from officer to Committee level.

The report also asked the Committee to formalise the existing process whereby Ward Councillors address the Committee on planning applications and enforcement matters.

Decision:

The Committee agreed:

- a) to approve a change to the scheme of employee delegations relating to the determination of planning applications, as set out in paragraph 2a

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

and shown as tracked changes in Appendix A to the report and agreed that the consequential changes to the Constitution be approved by the Monitoring Officer as minor changes under his delegations.

- b) approved the formalisation of the procedure for Ward Councillors speaking on planning applications/enforcement issues as set out in paragraph 2b and shown as tracked changes in Appendix B to the report and agreed that the consequential changes to the Constitution be approved by the Monitoring Officer as minor changes under his delegations.

806 Performance Monitoring - 1 October to 31 December 2018

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out performance for the period 1 October – 31 December 2018 and advising upon the latest position on the Local Plan.

The Head of Planning advised the Committee that he only had one Enforcement Officer at the moment but was hoping to progress recruitment shortly.

Decision:

The Committee noted the report.

807 Report on Section 106 Agreements October - December 2018

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out information concerning Section 106 Agreements for the period October – December 2018.

Decision:

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

Date:

Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

Planning Committee, 13 February 2019

Telephone: 01634 332012

Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk