

Medway Council
Meeting of Planning Committee
Wednesday, 26 June 2019
6.30pm to 9.35pm

Record of the meeting

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

Present: Councillors: Barrett, Bhutia, Bowler, Buckwell,
Mrs Diane Chambers (Chairman), Curry, McDonald, Potter,
Chrissy Stamp, Thorne and Tranter (Vice-Chairman)

Substitutes: Councillors:
Adeoye (Substitute for Hubbard)
Gulvin (Substitute for Etheridge)
Price (Substitute for Lloyd)
Rupert Turpin (Substitute for Sylvia Griffin)

In Attendance: Councillor Jane Chitty
Hannah Gunner, Senior Planner
Dave Harris, Head of Planning
Mike Hibbert, Highways Consultant
Joanna Horne, Planning Solicitor
Robert Neave, Principal Transport Planner
Mary Smith, Senior Planner
Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

87 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors, Etheridge, Griffin, Hubbard and Lloyd.

88 Record of Joint Meeting of Committees and Record of Meeting

The record of the Joint Meeting of Committees held on 22 May 2019 and the record of the meeting held on 29 May 2019 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as correct.

The Head of Planning drew attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet which set out the following updated information:

Minute 22 – Planning application MC/18/2553 – White Road Community Centre, White Road Chatham

- b) The Head of Planning had investigated whether the contribution of £8,788.30 for youth services referred to under planning reference

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

MC/18/2406 (Whiffens Avenue Car Park, Whiffens Avenue, Chatham) should be included in the Section 106 Agreement for the Whiffens Avenue application and if not, could it have been incorporated into the White Road Community Centre application.

He explained that the £8,788.30 for youth services was not included within the Whiffens Avenue Car Park application due to viability reasons and therefore was not an option to incorporate into the White Road Community Centre application.

- c) The Head of Planning had discussed with the Ward Councillors the possibility of including the Nursery and Greenvale Infants School being referred to in condition 6. This was agreed and condition 6 had been amended accordingly.
- g) The Head of Planning had provided clarity to Members of the Committee with regard to the covenant covering a section of land and confirmed there was no covenant.

Minute 29 – Planning application MC/19/0360 – 32 The Shoreway, St Mary’s Island, Chatham

The following reason for refusal was agreed with the Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson:

- 1. The development by reason of the presence of the raised platform to the rear creates an invasion of privacy by way of overlooking into the rear gardens and ground floor windows detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and contrary to Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and Paragraph 127f of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Minute 30 – Planning application – MC/19/0703 – 34 The Causeway, St Mary’s Island, Chatham

The following reason for refusal was agreed with the Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson:

- 1. The development by reason of the presence of the raised platform to the rear creates an invasion of privacy by way of overlooking into the rear gardens and ground floor windows detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and contrary to Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and Paragraph 127f of the National Planning Policy Framework.

89 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

There were none.

90 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests

Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

Other significant interests (OSIs)

Councillor Bowler declared an interest in planning application – MC/19/0996 – 314 City Way, Rochester on the basis that the application site was located in close proximity to the residence of another Councillor who was a Ward colleague and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of the planning application.

Councillor Buckwell declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3545 – Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling on the basis that one of the applicants was a close personal friend and a member of the same Conservative Association and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Curry declared an interest in planning application MC/18/1595 – Broom Hill Reservoir, Gorse Road, Strood, Rochester on the basis that he is Chairman of the Medway Urban Greenspaces Forum and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of the planning application.

Councillor Gulvin declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3545 – Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling on the basis that one of the applicants was a Cabinet colleague and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Gulvin also referred to the verbal update from the Head of Planning on the supplementary agenda advice sheet concerning Minute Number 22 of the meeting on 29 May 2019 (Planning application MC/18/2553 – White Road Community Centre, White Road, Chatham) and requested that his OSI declared at the meeting on 29 May 2019 be noted again in that he is a Director of the Medway Development Company.

Councillor Potter declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3545 – Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling on the basis that one of the applicants was a Cabinet colleague and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Potter also declared an interest in planning application MC/19/0575 – 1 Pepys Way, Strood, Rochester on the basis that this premises was attached to a property owned by a relative and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of the planning application.

Councillor Thorne declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3545 – Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling on the basis that

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

one of the applicants was a member of the same Conservative Association and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Rupert Turpin declared an interest in planning application MC/18/3545 – Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling on the basis that one of the applicants was a Cabinet colleague and a member of the same Conservative Association and he left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Other interests

Councillor Gulvin referred to planning application MC/19/0519 – 8 Oakhurst Close, Walderslade, Chatham and informed the Committee that as he wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor, he would remove himself from the Committee and take no part in the determination of this planning application.

Councillor Potter referred to planning application MC/18/3160 – Land off Lower Rainham Road (West of Station Road), Rainham, Gillingham and informed the Committee that as he wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor, he would remove himself from the Committee and take no part in the determination of this planning application.

Councillor Tranter sought legal clarification as to whether it was necessary for him to declare an interest in planning application MC/18/3545 – Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling on the basis that one of the applicants was a member of the same Conservative Association. He confirmed that he did not socialise with the individual concerned and had no prior knowledge of his involvement in the planning application. The Planning Lawyer provided advice and Councillor Tranter informed the Committee that he would remain as part of the Committee and would take part in the discussion and determination of the planning application.

91 Planning application - MC/18/1818 - Plot 1 Anthony's Way, Medway City Estate, Frindsbury, Rochester

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application and informed the Committee that an application for the construction of retail development at this site had previously been refused on 31 August 2017 under application number MC/16/1084. The reasons for refusal were set out on page 36 of the agenda. Following refusal, an appeal had been lodged but had subsequently been withdrawn to enable consideration to be given to a reduced scheme which was now the subject of this current application.

Full details of the current scheme, and a comparison between the previous scheme, were set out on page 42 of the agenda along with the views of the Council's retail consultants, Litchfields.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

It was confirmed that having undertaken a sequential test and an assessment of the impact on other retail areas, in accordance with sections 86 and 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Litchfields considered that the current proposal was acceptable.

However, in regard to the transport aspects of the current planning application, having sought the advice of TTHC consultants, based on the information provided to date, TTHC considered that the current application failed to properly assess the development's impact on the local highway network or the proportionate level of contribution towards off-site highway improvements.

Mike Hibbert, Highways Consultant informed the Committee of the work undertaken to date in trying to get a validated baseline assessment from the applicants. He confirmed that whilst discussions had been ongoing with the applicants, the current application had now been appealed on the basis of non-determination. Therefore, it was necessary for the Committee to determine what decision it would have made had it been in a position to make a decision on the application.

The Head of Planning explained that the application had taken a while to process as a result of the need to obtain the retail assessment, and the baseline highways information which remained outstanding, and it was unfortunate that the applicants were no longer prepared to engage in dialogue on the planning application but instead had submitted an appeal against non-determination.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that there were already issues with traffic congestion at peak times on the Medway City Estate. Whilst employment opportunities were welcomed, any development of this particular site would require significant measures to be put in place to accommodate any additional traffic on the highways network.

Decision:

Had the Committee been in a position to determine this planning application, it would have been refused on the ground set out in the report.

92 Planning application - MC/18/3160 - Land off Lower Rainham Road (West of Station Road), Rainham, Gillingham

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail and referring to the supplementary agenda advice sheet drew attention to a suggested amendment to the proposed Section 106, the request for delegated authority for him to consult with the occupiers of properties upon the proposed alternative parking arrangements and an amendment to proposed condition 24.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

In addition, the Head of Planning referred to revised wording for the planning appraisal section of the report as it related to development trip generation and impact. The revised wording stated that the Highways Authority was mindful of the current capacity pressures along Lower Rainham Road and, in particular, the signals adjacent to the Three Mariners Pub. Work on the emerging Local Plan included a Strategic Transport Assessment and whilst it was considered that development of this particular site would not result in severe highway capacity issues, it was likely that improvements would need to be undertaken and accordingly a request for highway improvements between the site access and Berengrave Lane had been requested to enlarge the bridge crossing to facilitate two way vehicle movements.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Potter addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and raised the following concerns:

- This application was a further encroachment onto open space in Rainham and when added to other developments already having received planning permission, it was now time to consider the cumulative impact of these developments and their impact on the area and in particular the highways network.
- This proposed development would impact upon traffic using Lower Rainham Road and would add to existing traffic congestion and extend journey times. Periods of congestion on this road were often variable and before any further development was approved for this area of Rainham, a full assessment of the usage of the highways network should be undertaken.
- If the Committee is minded to approve the application, the financial contribution under the Section 106 agreement for youth provision should be directed towards youth facilities in Rainham rather than Gillingham.

The Committee discussed the application having regard to the concerns raised by the Ward Councillor.

The Principal Transport Planner, referring to the National Planning Policy Framework advised the Committee that a planning application could only be refused on highway grounds where the impact of the development on traffic movement was severe. Having undertaken an assessment of this particular development, it was considered that whilst there would be some impact, this would not be at a level to meet the threshold of being severe.

In response to the Ward Councillor's comments that traffic congestion on the Lower Rainham Road tended to be variable, he commented that recent highways works on the A2 and Bloors Lane would have resulted in an increased level of traffic using Lower Rainham Road.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that the traffic impact study had taken into account all permitted developments, even those that were not yet in place.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

The Head of Planning also outlined the work that had been undertaken as part of the Local Plan process on identifying sites for development in Medway and in particular, residential development so as to meet the requirement to identify a 5 year housing land supply. Unfortunately, there were insufficient brownfield sites available to meet the required need.

The Committee noted that as part of this planning application, the applicant had offered to make available a section of land within the development for parking for the occupiers of the properties along the southern side of Lower Rainham Road (between the application site and junction of Station Road and Lower Rainham Road). If this was acceptable to the occupiers of these properties, a Traffic Regulation Order would be imposed providing parking restrictions on Lower Rainham Road and removing parking outside their properties.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

- a) A Section 106 agreement to secure:
 - i) 25% affordable dwelling units (equal to 16 dwellings).
 - ii) the following Education contributions:

Nursery: £86,117.76 towards expansion at one or more of Riverside Primary, Thames View Primary, or a new free school in the area.

Primary: £211,379.84 towards expansion at one or more of Riverside Primary, Thames View Primary, or a new free school in the area.

Secondary: £122,821.25 towards expansion at one or more of Rainham Mark Grammar School, Rainham Girls School, The Howard School, or a new free school in the area.
 - iii) A contribution of £4,890.88 towards youth provision to support young people in Rainham to access computer training for skill improvements with specific location of this expenditure being agreed in consultation with Ward Councillors.
 - iv) A contribution of £15,052.12 towards sport facilities to improve swimming pool and associated changing area.
 - v) A contribution of £159,342.72 towards open space and outdoor formal sport. To enhance open space facilities within the vicinity of the development including Berengrave Nature Reserve and/or Riverside Country Park and/or Berengrave Chalk Pit Allotments.
 - vi) A contribution of £53,000 towards ecological and public access provision management at Berengrave Nature Conservation site.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

- vii) A contribution of £3,200 towards surface improvement and signposts of the nearby PROWS GB5, GB6, GB44, GB1 to mitigate additional footfall.
- viii) A contribution of £39,491.20 to support the reconfiguration and equipping of the Rainham Healthy Living Centre to support new models for the provision of Local Care.
- ix) A contribution of £36,000 towards Lower Rainham Road highway improvement involving road widening west of Berengarve Allotment and east of Berengrave Lane and improvement to sustainable transport.
- x) A contribution of 15,335.04 towards bird mitigation measures.

Total £730,130.81 = £11,408.29 contribution per dwelling.

- b) Prior to issuing the decision notice, the Local Planning Authority shall carry out consultation with the occupiers of the properties along the southern side of Lower Rainham Road (between the application site and junction of Station Road with Lower Rainham Road) to establish whether they support the on site car parking provision that condition 24 will provide and the parking restriction that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will impose. Should the response of the occupiers of these properties be negative towards the provision of on site parking and the TRO, the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to seek the monetary value equal to cost associated with the delivering of the on site parking and TRO in order to carry out highway design capacity improvement in immediate area. Any monetary equivalent will be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement.
- c) Conditions 1 – 23 and 25 - 36 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and condition 24 amended as follows:

- 24. The reserved matters application shall provide details of on-site car parking provision with associated vehicular, pedestrian access and management for use by the residents of properties on the south side of Lower Rainham Road, between the application site and Station Road mini roundabout. The approved parking provision and associated access shall be provided prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenities of the local residents and in accordance with Policies, T1, T13 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

93 Planning application - MC/18/1595 - Broom Hill Reservoir, Gorse Road, Strood, Rochester

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail and informed the Committee of a change to the recommendation section of the report in that it should state 'A) Section 106 to secure'.

The Committee was advised that under the current planning application, a section of land would be transferred to the Friends of Broomhill and the reservoir would be filled in and landscaped. This would assist with safety issues and help to eradicate non-desirable activities in this area.

The Committee discussed the application and noted the unique design of the proposed development. It was suggested that in order to preserve the design, additional conditions be imposed to remove permitted development rights.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

- a) The applicant entering into a Section 106 agreement:
 - i) to secure the transfer of ownership of land marked red as identified in drawing 2066-124 Rev B as area A (about 3179msq) to the Friends of Broom Hill to be used as an integral part of Broom Hill Park.
 - ii) prior to the implementation (i) above to carry out fill and restoration works of the land shown in the drawing 2066-124 Rev B as area A involving fill of the site of the reservoir using cut and topsoil materials excavated from the area shown in drawing 2066/124 Rev B as area B (the application site) only.
 - iii) to pay a dowry of £42K towards long term management and up keep of the area A.
 - iv) revocation of planning permission granted under ref MC/16/2656 for two detached dwelling houses.
 - v) a contribution of £958.44 toward Habitats Regulations (mitigation against Wintering Birds).
- b) Conditions 1 – 16 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and further conditions 17 and 18 as follows:
 17. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Order) 2015 as amended no development within Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A,

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

D, E and F shall be carried out without the permission of the Local Planning Authority.

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

18. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) all dwellinghouses herein approved shall remain in use as a dwellinghouse falling within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) and no change of use shall be carried out unless planning permission has been granted on an application relating thereto.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control such development in the interests of amenity, in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

94 Planning application - MC/19/0888 - Stoke Road Business Centre (Land South of Stoke Road), Hoo St Werburgh, Rochester

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined this planning application in detail.

It was suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve this application, proposed condition 1 be amended to reflect new plans received.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that a total of 367 allocated parking spaces were to be provided within this scheme with each of the houses having 2 allocated spaces within the curtilage of the house and the flats having parking courts. In addition to this, there would be an additional 94 spaces spread throughout the whole site allocated for visitor use.

Not included within the 2 cars per house allocation were a further 137 garages, which, although not meeting the Council's Residential Parking Standards of 7m x 3m, were still usable parking spaces if required. It was explained that all of the garages proposed would be 6m x 3m so could be used as additional parking or as storage/utility space.

Some Members expressed concern that garages were being provided within new developments which fell short of the Council's Residential Parking Standards by virtue of their limited size.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

Decision:

Approved with condition 2 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and condition 1 amended as follows:

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

6653-03 Rev A, 6653-02 rev B, 6653-04 Rev B, 6653-05 Rev B, 6653-06 Rev B, 6653-07 Rev B, 6653-08 Rev B, 6653-09 Rev B, 6653-10 Rev B, 6653-11 Rev B, 6653-12, 6653-20 Rev B, 6653-21 Rev B, 6653-22 Rev B, 6653-23 Rev B, 6653-24 Rev B, 6653-25 Rev B, 6653-26 Rev B, 6653-27 Rev B, 6653-28 Rev B, 6653-29 Rev B, 6653-30 Rev B, 6653-31 Rev B, 6653-32 Rev B, 6653-33 Rev B, 6653-34 Rev B, 6653-35 Rev B, 6653-36 Rev B, 6653-37 Rev B, 6653-38 Rev B, 6653-39 Rev A, 6653-40 Rev B, 6653-42 Rev B, 6653-50 Rev A, 6653-51 Rev A, 6653-52 Rev A, 6653-53 Rev A, 6653-54 Rev A, CSA/4148/104, CSA/4148/105, CSA/4148/106, 5429-1610 P1, 5429-1551 P4, 5429-1550-P4 and 1222-KC-XX-YTREE-TTP01RevB received 5 April 2019; 6653-13 Rev A received 29 May 2019; 6653-01 Rev J and 6653-41 Rev C – received 3 June 2019; CSA/4148/100 Rev A, CSA/4148/101 Rev A, CSA/4148/102 Rev A, CSA/4148/103 Rev A , CSA/4148/107 Rev A , CSA/4148/108 Rev A, CSA/4148/109 Rev A, CSA/4140/111 Rev A and CSA/4148/112 Rev A received 14 June 2019.

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

95 Planning application - MC/19/0273 - Garage Block rear of 15 - 17 Doddington Road, Twydall, Gillingham

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application and drew attention to an amendment to the proposal section of the report in that the number of on-site parking spaces should be 12 not 13.

In addition, she informed the Committee that since despatch of the agenda, the applicant had submitted further information to support the application and a summary of the points raised were set out in the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

The Senior Planner advised that should this application be approved it would be necessary for refuse to be collected from the site by way of a private contract as regular sized refuse vehicles would not be able to access the site without the removal of a number of on-street parking spaces in Doddington Road which was not considered acceptable.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

The Committee noted that the access road was sufficiently wide to permit access for emergency vehicles.

Some Members expressed concern as to the narrow access into the site which would not permit vehicles to pass and could cause conflict for vehicles and pedestrians. However, the Senior Planner pointed out that this site had previously been used for 26 lock up garages and therefore had been accessible by vehicles in the past.

The Committee generally felt that the proposed development constituted an overdevelopment of the site and that a lesser number of properties would be preferable and suggested that the application be deferred to enable officers to undertake further discussions with the applicant on the possible reduction in the number of properties to be provided at this site.

Decision:

Deferred to enable officers to undertake further discussions with the applicant on the possible reduction in the number of properties to be provided at this site.

96 Planning application - MC/19/1002 - 42 Chattenden Lane, Chattenden, Rochester

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application in detail.

It was confirmed that the application was for four x 3 bedroomed houses.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

- a) A Section 106 to secure £736.68 towards Bird Mitigation; and
- b) Conditions 1 – 12 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

97 Planning application - MC/19/0575 - 1 Pepys Way, Strood, Rochester

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Chitty addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and set out the following concerns:

- The proposed development is out of character with the street scene and constitutes over development.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

- The road is very narrow and already has considerable parking issues and the proposed development will exacerbate the problem because the site plan is misleading in that it indicates that there is access from Broom Hill Road, but this is not the case and therefore it will not be possible to park at the rear of the site.
- Without the ability to park on site, this will add pressure for on-street parking in the vicinity of the site.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that he had visited the site and that it appeared that few garages were currently being used for vehicles. In the light of the information from the Ward Councillor concerning the access to the site, he requested that consideration of the application be deferred to enable this to be further investigated. In addition, he wished to check whether the occupiers of premises in Pepys Way and Drakes Close had been consulted on the planning application as this was not indicated in the case file.

Decision:

Consideration of this application be deferred to enable clarification as to the rights of vehicular access over the rear alley and to ensure that the required notices have been served by the applicant.

98 Planning application - MC/19/0885 - 25 William Street, Rainham, Gillingham

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application and informed the Committee that since despatch of the agenda, amended plans had been received, details of which were set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

It was confirmed that the proposed changes did not overcome the objections to the development as the revised position for bedroom 2 with windows to either side would still result in overlooking of neighbouring gardens at close range and the appearance of a substantially glazed frontage would not alter.

In addition, although the amended plans showed two spaces for each dwelling in an attempt to meet adopted standards, there would be insufficient space for vehicles using these spaces to turn and manoeuvre safely. Therefore the officers' recommendation to refuse the application remained unchanged.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that whilst the application had 52 letters of support, only four were from residents in William Street and the others had been from further afield including some from other towns.

It was generally considered that to provide a 3 bedroomed detached chalet bungalow with associated parking in the rear garden of an existing semi-detached house would not only be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality but would also be harmful to the amenities of neighbours by reason

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

of perceived overlooking. Furthermore, it had not been demonstrated that there was adequate parking provision for the existing and proposed dwelling which could create increased competition for limited on-street parking.

Decision:

Refused on grounds 1 and 2 as set out in the report.

99 Planning application - MC/18/3545 - Land adjacent 1 Marshgate Cottages, Main Road, Cooling

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application and drew attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet which set out a change to the recommendation, an amendment to the proposal to remove the words 'integral garage', a summary of representations received from KCC Ecology and a change to the reason why the application had been referred to Committee for determination.

Decision:

- a) Approved subject to conditions 1 – 9 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report subject to additional ecological information being submitted and the securing of any mitigation measures by condition, if necessary, following the submission of that additional ecological information.
- b) The Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to impose any further conditions deemed necessary in relation to the additional ecological information.

100 Planning application - MC/19/0996 - 314 City Way, Rochester ME1 2BL

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application.

In response to a question, the Senior Planner confirmed that there would not be any overshadowing of adjacent properties.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 4 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

101 Planning application - MC/19/0519 - 8 Oakhurst Close, Walderslade, Chatham

Discussion:

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Gulvin addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and made the following points:

- Whilst the relocation of the detached outbuilding had provided some improvement, the structure continued to dominate the scene and provide overlooking into neighbouring gardens.
- Whilst it was not being suggested that the structure be removed, it would be helpful if the structure could be lowered by the removal of the plinth on which the structure had been placed so that the structure could be set at ground level.

The Senior Planner advised that it was possible that the structure had been placed on a plinth as a result of the land levels and that as it appeared to be a concrete plinth, this would not be easy to remove.

A Member expressed concern that the structure could be used for a business use such as holiday rental and the Senior Planner advised that a further condition could be added to state that the detached outbuilding will not have business use.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 3 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and a further 4 as set out below:

4. The development hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the related dwellinghouse and no trade or business shall be carried out therefrom.

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

102 Performance Report 1 January to 31 March 2019

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out planning performance and activity on the Local Plan for the period 1 January – 31 March 2019.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee of complimentary comments received by an ISO accreditor during a recent inspection and the Committee expressed their congratulations to the Head of Planning and his team.

Planning Committee, 26 June 2019

Decision:

The Committee noted the report.

103 Report on Appeal Decisions 1 January - 31 March 2019

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out appeal decisions for the period 1 January – 31 March 2019.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that whilst it was disappointing that a high number of appeals had been allowed during the period, having assessed those decisions overturned by a Planning Inspector, he was still of the view that the officers original decision to refuse a number of the applications had been correct and he supplied visual examples.

Decision:

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

Date:

Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

Telephone: 01634 332012

Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk