

MC/20/1180

Date Received: 22 May 2020
Location: 89 Ingram Road Gillingham
Medway ME7 1SH
Proposal: Construction of a block comprising of three 1-bedroom and six 2-bedroom flats with associated parking, cycle and refuse store
Applicant: Windmill Construction
Paul Giles
Ward: Gillingham
Case Officer: Doug Coleman
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 23rd June 2021.

Recommendation - Refusal

- 1 The provision of an additional 4 dwellings on the site, without a corresponding increase in on-site parking, would increase pressure on existing on street parking and have an adverse impact on residential amenity. In addition, the proposal, fails to make appropriate provision for secure cycle parking. The proposal results in overdevelopment of the site and is contrary to Policies BNE2, T4 and T13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
- 2 The proposal results in an unacceptable level of amenity in terms of outlook for the occupiers of Flat 18 due to the proximity of two parking spaces within the communal parking area and the large bin store to the front of the living room and bedroom windows of Flat 18 which would directly overlook these areas. The application results in overdevelopment of the site and is contrary to Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and Paragraph 127f of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

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

Proposal

This application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a block comprising three 1-bed and six 2-bed flats with associated parking, cycle and refuse storage.

This application site relates to part of a wider development site for which planning permission was granted for two flat blocks under reference MC/17/3455 on 2 May 2019. The planning permission was for 22 residential units and 22 parking spaces. Block A was shown located to the front and included 15 units and Block B shown to the rear for 7 units.

Further to this, planning permission was subsequently granted under reference MC/19/2588 for a variation to planning permission MC/17/3455 to allow for the reconfiguration of the units and parking within the site which in turn allowed for larger refuse vehicles to safely enter and exit the site. The amendments approved resulted in an increase in the number of units within Block A from 15 flats to 17 flats and a reduction in units within Block B from 7 flats to 5 flats. The reconfiguration also showed a loss of two parking spaces taking the total across the site from 22 to 20 spaces.

This current application specifically relates to Block B at the rear together with the access road and two parking spaces which would be located in the undercroft area of Block A currently being used for refuse and cycle storage for residents of Block A.

This application has been submitted in an attempt to regularise the currently unauthorised situation. The application is retrospective. The changes proposed from what has previously been granted is that the ground floor now comprises three flats (one 1-bed and two 2-bed) instead of a communal lounge, bin and cycle storage and a laundry and storage room; the second floor now comprises three flats instead of two (one 1-bed and two 2-bed); and the refuse and cycle storage has now been provided externally around the site.

Overall, the resultant accommodation within Block B is as follows:

- Ground floor: Entrance lobby, one 1-bed flat and two 2-bed flats
- First floor: one 1-bed flat and two 2-bed flats
- Second floor: one 1-bed flat and two 2-bed flats

As originally approved under MC/17/3455, the refuse storage for Block B was to be provided adjacent to the southern boundary in a similar location to the now proposed two parking spaces. These two parking spaces were the two that were introduced as part of the reconfiguration of the site approved under MC19/2588 when the refuse storage was also relocated to the ground floor of Block B.

The current proposal shows a larger refuse storage area located along the southern boundary much closer to Block B and a second even larger refuse storage area located to the northern boundary in front of two parking spaces and the now shown Flat 18 which is located at ground floor level of Block B.

The cycle store, which was previously shown to be located within the ground floor of Block B is now shown as cycle hoops located within the parking area adjacent to the refuse storage area along the southern boundary.

There is no provision of a communal lounge and laundry area as shown on the ground floor of the previously approved drawings of MC/19/2588 nor is there a plant room shown on the second floor which was shown as part of the same application.

Since this current application was submitted, development across the whole site has continued and Block A is now occupied.

Site Area/Density

Site Area: 0.2 hectares (0.49 acres)

Site Density: 45 dph (18 dpa)

Relevant Planning History

- | | |
|------------|--|
| MC/21/0504 | Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission MC/19/2588 for the re-wording of conditions 11 (parking), 12 (cycle store), 14 (refuse) and condition 17 (parking management plan) to allow a phased occupation of the development.
Decision: Approved
Date: 7 April 2021 |
| MC/21/0478 | Submission of details pursuant to conditions 8 (Materials) and 19 (Restrictive views) related to planning permission MC/19/2588 demolition of existing buildings and re-development of the site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking, access and infrastructure works.
Decision: Approved
Date: 1 April 2021 |
| MC/20/2110 | Details pursuant to conditions 4/5 (contamination), 9 (boundary treatment), 10 (acoustic), 13 (external lighting), 15 (electric charging points), 16 (ecological) and 17 (parking management) on planning permission MC/19/2588 - Variation of condition 2 (drawing numbers) on planning permission MC/17/3455 (demolition of existing buildings and re-development of the site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking, access and infrastructure works) to allow a minor material amendment for additional 2 flats to block A, re-siting of bin/cycle store, reduction of 2 flats to block B, provision of communal lounge with wi-fi to ground floor, amendments to undercroft parking, repositioning of parking spaces, retention of garage walls to boundary and provision of substation.
Decision: Split Decision
Date: 26 February 2021 |

MC/19/2835	<p>Details pursuant to conditions 11 (Materials) of planning permission MC/17/3455 for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking and infrastructure works.</p> <p>Decision: Approved Date: 21 January 2020</p>
MC/19/2855	<p>Variation of condition 2 (drawing numbers) on planning permission MC/17/3455 (demolition of existing buildings and re-development of the site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking, access and infrastructure works) to allow a minor material amendment for additional 2 flats to block A, re-siting of bin/cycle store, reduction of 2 flats to block B.</p> <p>Decision: Approved Date: 5 June 2020</p>
MC/19/2659	<p>Details pursuant to conditions 3 (CEMP), 5 (Contamination investigation), 6 (Remediation scheme) 7 (Implementation scheme) and 10 (Archaeological works) of planning permission MC/17/3455 for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking and infrastructure works.</p> <p>Decision: Split Decision Date: 5 December 2019</p>
MC/17/3455	<p>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking, access and infrastructure works.</p> <p>Decision: Approved Date: 2 May 2019</p>

Representations

The application has been advertised on site and by individual neighbour notification to the owners and occupiers of neighbouring properties. Southern Water has also been consulted.

27 letters (from 24 households) have received raising the following:

- Overdevelopment
- Overlooking.
- Overshadowing of rear gardens.
- Security gate is to be removed.
- Development is an eyesore.
- Additional traffic will add to congestion.
- Proposal would add to on-street parking.

- Impact on local services – schools, hospital, utilities.
- Additional block of flats would be out of character.
- Impact on Conservation Area.
- Building is too high.
- Additional flats would result in more noise and disturbance.
- Development has already been carried out.
- Concerns relating to existing development.

Cllr. Mrs P Cooper has written making the following comments:

- The site is too small for extra flats.
- Block B is already an imposing edifice.
- Ingram Road is already busy with a school opposite.
- Proposal would result in more traffic movements in Ingram Road.
- Parking is already difficult in the area.

Southern Water have written providing guidance on the positioning of infrastructure and landscaping.

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 2019 and are considered to conform.

Planning Appraisal

Background

Planning permission (MC/17/3455) for the demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 22 residential apartments alongside associated parking, access and infrastructure works was granted by the Planning Committee on 2 May 2019 subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement. The approved development comprised two blocks – Block A: a four-storey building to the front comprising 15 flats (four 1-bed and eleven 2-bed) and Block B: a three-storey building to the rear comprising 7 flats (three 1-bed and four 2-bedroom). 22 car parking spaces were proposed under that scheme (one per dwelling).

A subsequent application to vary Condition 2 of planning permission MC/17/3455 to allow a minor material amendment was approved on 5 June 2020 (under reference MC/19/2588). The amendments included 2 additional flats in Block A and a reduction of 2 flats in Block B. The development, as now approved, should be: Block A - 17 flats (three 1-bed and fourteen 2-bed) and Block B - a three-storey building to the rear comprising 5 flats (one 1-bed and four 2-bed). Other changes forming part of the minor material amendment were the provision of a communal lounge, refuse and cycle storage and a laundry/storeroom to ground floor of Block B, the removal of the

undercroft parking at Block A, re-positioning of parking spaces, retention of garage walls to boundary and provision of sub-station. As a result of the changes to the parking layout 2 spaces were lost, resulting in 20 spaces for 22 dwellings.

Principle

The principle of the development of 22 flats on the site was considered acceptable when previous planning permissions were granted. No new matters of principle are raised by the current application. The issue for consideration in respect of this application is the impact of 4 additional units in terms of the level of activity and traffic generation, and the impact of the proposed changes in terms of design and appearance and amenity.

Design, Appearance and Effect on the Character of the Conservation Area

When the previous applications were considered, the design was considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies BNE1 and H9 (vi) of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 124 and 127 of the NPPF.

Regard was also paid to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and as the building would hardly be visible from the Conservation Area, no objection was raised in this regard under Policy BNE14 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 192 of the NPPF.

No changes to the external appearance of the building are proposed under the current application. External changes are proposed in terms of the re-positioning of refuse stores and cycle storage. The refuse storage areas are quite large, particularly the storage area to the front of Flat 18. The provision of the refuse storage and cycle storage around the site is at the expense of the quality of the landscape environment within the site. Soft landscaping was limited anyway in terms of the approved plans, but this has been further reduced by the relocation of the stores and cycle storage outside of the building.

Amenity

The additional flats would comply with the DCLG's Nationally Described Space Standard and no new issues are, therefore, raised in terms of occupier amenity by the proposed amendments with regard to availability of internal floorspace.

Similarly, the proposed amendment would not raise any adverse impacts in terms of loss of light, privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties. The internal layout of Block B was designed so that there were no habitable rooms with windows on the south facing elevation that would result in unacceptable overlooking, towards the rear of the properties in Grange Road. To the north, the rear gardens to the properties in Gillingham Green are separated from the site by an alleyway and the garden depths of these properties are approx. 25m. The north elevation of Block B is approx. 28m from the rear elevation of these houses. As with the approved scheme, there are habitable room windows on the first and second floors of Block B facing towards the

rear of these properties, but in view of the separation distances described above, there would not be any unacceptable overlooking.

The latest proposal raises a concern with regard to the outlook from one of the additional flats now proposed (Flat 18). The outlook from the habitable rooms of the lounge and bedroom from this flat are directly onto two parking spaces and the larger of the two external refuse stores. It is acknowledged the previous permissions (MC/17/3455 and MC/19/2588) allowed for two parking spaces in a similar location and therefore this is not new. However, the original MC17/3455 planning permission showed the siting of these two spaces to be further west and north so as to provide a gap between the habitable room patio doors of the lounge within the flat at ground floor and the parking spaces.

The later planning permission, MC/19/2588 shows the two spaces currently in front of Flat 18 to be in the same location as this current proposal. The difference in relation to this current proposal and the MC/19/2588 proposal is that the affected windows relate to Flat 18 as opposed to the previously approved communal lounge. The communal lounge benefitted from a number of other windows serving the room and given that it's function was as a semi-public space rather than the habitable space of a flat as currently shown, the arrangement of the parking spaces in relation to these windows in terms of its impact is different.

This is especially the case given the introduction of the large refuse storage area as a permanent feature which is new and has arisen as a result of the unauthorised flats at ground floor level forcing the refuse storage and cycle storage out of the building. The siting of these two parking spaces and the refuse store results in a poor level of outlook which is harmful to the amenity for the future occupiers of Flat 18. Furthermore, the siting of the parking spaces directly to the front of this refuse store make it difficult to use the refuse storage facility without potentially causing damage to the vehicles that may be parked in these spaces. This is likely to have an impact on the use of these spaces or the refuse store potentially either rendering the storage facility or the parking spaces redundant. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 127f of the NPPF.

Highways

The scheme, as originally approved (MC/17/3455) showed 22 parking spaces for 22 flats, which amounted to one space per unit. Under the minor material amendment (MC/19/2588), 2 spaces were lost, resulting in the provision of 20 spaces for 22 units (0.9 space per unit). Whilst it was not considered ideal to lose the parking spaces, it was felt that the loss of the two spaces could be justified in order to comply with the Waste Development Guidance 2018 in terms of enabling larger vehicles to safely enter and exit the site in a forward gear. To address the impact of the loss of these spaces an additional condition was imposed requiring the submission and approval of a parking management plan.

Under the current proposal, the 2 undercroft parking spaces at Block A would be reinstated, increasing the number of spaces to 22 (the same as originally proposed

under MC/17/3455). However, the original planning permission (MC/17/3455) was for 22 units. This current proposal would provide 22 spaces to serve 26 flats (0.85 space per unit) and would result in the loss of the refuse and cycle storage areas for Block A. It is considered that the provision of these 4 additional flats and with the likely uplift in visitor trips, without a corresponding increase in on-site parking, would add to pressure on existing on-street parking and an objection is raised in this regard.

The applicants have attempted to justify the reduction in overall parking provision and have suggested mitigation measures.

Initially the applicants provided Census Data with references to car ownership with certain home-ownership groups. This Census data was considered but concerns remained. It was noted that the 2011 Census data is significantly dated, and the applicants had not provided any validation of this data through survey work to demonstrate that the Census data is representative of the likely car ownership levels (both in the location or similar development trips) and therefore just by providing historic Census data did not by itself provide sufficient evidence to justify the parking provision as being acceptable.

The applicant has continuously sought to compare this site with other sites within Medway with regard to on-site parking provision and cycle storage.

In terms of cycle storage, the applicants refer to another of their sites at 55 Marlborough Road, Gillingham. Whilst each application is assessed on its own merits, there are two key considerations, the first is provision. The proposal for the Marlborough Road application provided sufficient cycle storage for each flat, this current application does not. The second is condition 8 of that permission which requires details of secure private cycle parking in the form of individual lockers for residents and hoops for visitors to be submitted and for the approved storage to be provided before the development is occupied.

It should be noted that the development at 55 Marlborough Road is not complete.

For the current proposal at Ingram Road, the applicant outlines that bicycles can simply be stored in communal areas. This would not provide secure storage for bicycles and having any bicycles left in the communal areas of the stairways and hallways is likely to impinge on the free flow of movement within the flat block and is therefore considered detrimental to the amenity of those residents within the block.

The approved scheme showed secure cycle parking within the building. This secure cycle parking, together with the bin storage area and other facilities have been removed from the building in favour of providing the additional unauthorised flats. The current proposal shows external cycle stands, which are poorly located and not considered to be secure. They would also be open to the elements making it less likely that people would use them. This is likely to further discourage people opting to cycle as a preferred method of travel over using a vehicle, which in turn, does not contribute to any attempt to justify less parking provision within the site. As the cycle parking shown does not appear to be secure and given the constrained nature of the

site as a result of overdevelopment, it is not possible to see where secure cycle storage could be satisfactory relocated, an objection is raised under Policy T4 of the Local Plan.

With regard to car parking, the applicant again makes reference to the development at Marlborough Road as well as another development at Westcourt Arms, Gillingham. However, the location of these development sites are within controlled parking zones and both planning permissions benefit from conditions related to parking management.

The Council, therefore, does not agree that the comparison is sufficient to justify the situation at this site.

A later email from the applicant dated 27 January 2021 suggests that a development for 10 units at Land Rear of 12 New Road Avenue, Chatham with planning permission (MC/18/3209), for a reduced number of parking spaces is also comparable. Again, the Council does not agree. This site is in close proximity to the railway station at Chatham, the town centres of both Rochester and Chatham and there is on-street parking more widely available within the vicinity. The planning permission for this site also includes a condition for a parking management plan as well as a condition requiring the provision of secure private cycle parking provision in the form of individual lockers.

Two further cases cited by the applicant in an email from 8 April 2021 as being comparable are MC/13/3290 – 65 Ingram Road for 4 units and MC/20/2920 – Land at the Corner of Ingram Road and Railway Street for 2 units.

These applications are significantly different. In terms of 65 Ingram Road, this was a conversion of an existing property into four 1-bed flats with the property having the benefit of three spaces. This is not considered to be an equal comparison.

In terms of the application at Land at the corner of Ingram Road, in his comments to the case officer, the Highways Officer's response noted that, *'the existing site suffers from inconsiderate parking, whereby vehicles regularly cross the footpath to park adjacent to the billboards, creating a highways safety risk.'*

The Highway Officer concluded that:

'Therefore, whilst there could be a slight increase in additional parking pressure resulting from this small development, on balance this would be offset by the removal of a highway safety hazard.'

Each application is assessed on its own individual merits and it should be noted that these applications were materially different. For example, conditions could be applied to prevent unacceptable harm to the public highway, which is not an option here.

Turning to the level of parking provision proposed for this current application. It is noted that the two additional parking spaces have limited visibility when reversing out

due to the building structure and therefore given could give rise to potential conflict with vehicle and pedestrian movements entering/exiting the site.

The table below indicates the provision as required by the parking standards

Parking Demand				Parking Demand				Parking Demand			
MC/17/3455	units	parking requirement		MC/19/2588	units	parking requirement		MC/20/1180	units	parking requirement	
1 bed	5	1	5	1 bed	4	1	4	1 bed	6	1	6
2 bed	17	1.5	25.5	2 bed	18	1.5	27	2 bed	20	1.5	30
Vistor		5	5	Vistor		5	5	Vistor		6	6
		22 Total	35.5			22 Total	36			26 Total	42
Parking Provided			22	Parking Provided			20	Parking Provided			22

This demonstrates that with the increase of units that parking demand significantly increases from a requirement of 36 to 42. Nevertheless, the Medway Parking Standards do indicate that reductions in standards may be considered in sustainable locations. Given the siting of the application site on the edge of the town centre, a reduction was previously accepted as shown by planning permissions MC/17/3455 and MC/19/2588. However, previous acceptance of a reduction does not allow and justify a continuous drop in parking levels against an increase in number of units. Each time there is a change to the proposal, it needs to be considered on its own merits and the impact on the parking pressure on the surrounding network is part of that consideration.

The applicant referenced the DCLG report in justifying its parking provision. It is important to note that this report specifically outlines that local considerations should be taken into account, i.e. existing car ownership. As stated in the applicant's email, current car ownership levels within the location are 0.94. It is noted that the applicants also referred to lower rates under shared ownership, however given that these flats are eligible under right to buy, this lower ownership rate cannot be guaranteed.

It is also important to note that with an extra four units, visitor demand is likely to increase and therefore the minimal capacity that was available under the previous car parking survey is likely to be exceeded particularly in the evening peak periods.

Even if DCLG car ownership levels (0.78) were taken into account, this would only just cover residents demand and leave limited space for visitors and therefore overflowing onto Ingram Road. The applicant has not carried out a car parking survey themselves. Instead, they seek to rely on a car park survey completed over three years ago (DHA) which in itself outlined high parking pressure on Ingram Road and other neighbouring street and a survey in a different location to the development site.

As can be seen when visiting the site, Ingram Road in particular suffers from inconsiderate and hazardous parking with a poor accident record, with vehicles frequently obstructing the footpath or parking on junctions. Given the proximity of the site to a local primary school, it is considered that any potential overspill is likely to result in further detrimental harm and therefore conflict with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

An objection is, therefore, raised in terms of parking under Policies T1, T3 and T13 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

In an email dated 10 February 2021, the applicant suggested that a car club would be a potential solution to address the lack of parking provision within the site. The initial information regarding the use of car club and how it would work at the site was very limited. There were no details as to whether the car club would be provided on site or by use of another existing car club located elsewhere. On 23 February 2021, the applicant advised of two other development sites in Medway where reference to a car club is made in conditions. These are MC/19/0038 – Bardell Wharf and MC/20/0932 – St Clements House.

Further details of the car club proposal was submitted on 25 February 2021 outlining two options. Option 1 to be provided off site and Option 2 to be provided on site. With Option 1, the document submitted effectively outlines that the car club provision can be provided at Gillingham Pier. Concerns are raised with this approach given the distance between the application site and the potential car club space at Gillingham Pier (over 1km) and the reliance of external developer to make this proposal acceptable.

With regard to Option 2, the document submitted outlines providing a vehicle on site. Concern is raised regarding the viability, the document states that this would be a one year rolling contract. The concern is that if after a year the car club is not sustainable (as residents have chosen to use their own cars), the car club gets removed. The applicants have not provided any information in this regard and if the Car Club is removed, how they would manage any potentially hazardous parking occurring on Ingram Road as a result. It would not be considered acceptable to effectively secure a car club for a year and then for it to disappear with no mitigation strategy in place.

An email from the applicant dated 27 April 2021 confirms that the car club proposal would comprise Option 1 as outlined above and would be for the occupants of Block B only who would join the existing car club at Victory Pier. Further details were provided on 28 April 2021. This additional information included the document from Surrey County Council 'Guidance on Car Clubs in New Developments – Draft' dated August 2018. This document is not adopted by Medway Council and does not carry any weight. However, in considering it as part of the applicant's submission, the document shows a development of this size would not be recommended for a car club, instead using an existing car club which the applicants have confirmed is their intention. However, as previously stated, the use of the Victory Pier car club is not supported as an acceptable form of mitigation by the Council as it is considered to be too far away to be a viable option. This also appears to be supported by the Surrey document given that it states that the suitability of the roads in close proximity to the development as being not more than 5 minutes walk from the development. The walk to Victory Pier approach is 15 minutes from the development site.

Developer contributions

The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 provide that in relation to any decision on whether or not to grant planning permission to be made after 6 April 2010, a planning obligation (a Section 106 agreement) may only be taken into account if the obligation is (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

When the previous planning application for 22 flats was considered, the following developer contributions were sought and secured by Section 106 agreement:

- 1) A contribution of £10,294.90 based on an occupancy ratio of 2.45 persons per unit and £191 per person as set out under the HUDU model. The contribution is to be used for improvements to Railway Street surgery.
- 2) A contribution of £4,243.20 based on an occupancy ratio of 0.03 pupils per two-bedroom unit and £8,320 per pupil for nursery education. The contribution is to be used for improvements at Saxon Way Primary School
- 3) A contribution of £12,729.60 based on an occupancy ratio of 0.09 pupils per two-bedroom unit and £8,320 per pupil for primary education. The contribution is to be used for improvements at Saxon Way Primary School
- 4) A contribution of £12,199.20 based on an occupancy ratio of 0.06 pupils per two-bedroom unit and £11,960 per pupil secondary education. The contribution is to be used for improvements at Chatham Girls Grammar School
- 5) A contribution of £4,066.40 based on an occupancy ratio of 0.02 pupils per two-bedroom unit and £11,960 per pupil sixth form education. The contribution is to be used for improvements at Chatham Girls Grammar School
- 6) A contribution of £37,397.01 based on an occupancy ratio of 1.33 persons per one bedroom unit and 2.44 persons per two-bedroom unit, resulting in an occupancy of 48.13 persons and a contribution of £777 per unit to be used on improvements to Queen Elizabeth Fields and/or Hillyfields Community Park.
- 7) A contribution of £4,918.76 towards bird mitigation is the North Kent Special Protection Areas.

Whilst this is a standalone application and developer contributions are not usually sought for developments comprising 9 units, the scheme was part of a wider development proposal. Should this application be approved, it would result in a total of 26 units across the wider site. Therefore, the contributions as set out above would need to be increased, pro rata to accommodate the 4 additional units, and where appropriate updated.

It is considered the best way to secure this is through a deed of variation to the existing s106. This variation would continue to secure contributions for the 22 units in Blocks A and B as previously approved and at the rates previously secured and then include the additional 4 units within Block B at the rates applicable at the time of submission of this current application.

The additional contributions would result in the following being sought:

- 1) Health: $4 \times \text{£}644.79 = \text{£}2579.16$.
- 2) Nursery education: $2 \times \text{£}1,406.08 = \text{£}2,812.16$.
- 3) Primary education: $2 \times \text{£}3,451.27 = \text{£}6,902.54$.
- 4) Secondary education: $2 \times \text{£}2,734.56 = \text{£}5,469.12$.
- 5) Sixth form education: $2 \times \text{£}719.83 = \text{£}1,439.66$.
- 6) Open space: $4 \times \text{£}2,601.63 = \text{£}10,406.52$.
- 7) Bird mitigation: $4 \times \text{£}250.39 = \text{£}1,001.56$.

If planning permission is refused, the applicant would still be under an obligation to meet the Section 106 contributions previously agreed and should they wish to appeal against the refusal, a completed deed of variation to the s106 should be submitted as part of the appeal.

Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

The applicant has indicated that all materials to be used will exceed the requirements of the latest building regulations and in particular Part L (Energy Use) and will utilise materials that meet the BRE Green Guide A+ rating. (Materials which have the lowest overall environmental impact over the lifecycle of a product as calculated by BRE Environmental Assessment Method).

All new windows are to be double-glazed windows which will significantly reduce noise and improve heat insulation. Low NOx boilers and electric car points will also be provided, while all hardstanding's will be self-draining.

Conclusions and Reasons for Refusal

It is considered that the provision of an additional 4 dwellings on the site, without a corresponding increase in on-site parking, would add to pressure on existing on-street parking and have an adverse impact on residential amenity and highway safety.

In addition, as a result of the loss of the cycle and refuse storage within the buildings, the proposal fails to make appropriate provision for secure cycle parking and the inconsiderate siting of the large refuse storage area to the front of Flat 18 and the two

parking spaces in the same locality results in a poor level of amenity for the occupier of Flat 18 on the ground floor.

The application results in overdevelopment of the site and is contrary to Policies BNE2, T1, T4 and T13 of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 109 and 127f of the NPPF and is recommended for refusal.

The application would normally fall to be determined under Officer delegated powers but is being reported to Committee for determination due to the fact that the previous two applications were reported to Committee.

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 on Medway Council's Website <https://publicaccess1.medway.gov.uk/online-applications/>