

Medway Council
Planning Committee
Wednesday, 18 August 2021
6.30pm to 10.47pm

Record of the meeting

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

Present: Councillors: Adeoye, Barrett, Buckwell (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Diane Chambers (Chairman), Curry, Etheridge, Hubbard, Opara, Thorne and Tranter

Substitutes: Councillors:
Howcroft-Scott (Substitute for McDonald)

In Attendance: Kemi Erifevieme, Planning Manager
Dave Harris, Head of Planning
Joanna Horne, Planning Solicitor
Robert Neave, Principal Transport Planner
Councillor Mark Prenter
Councillor Wendy Purdy
Councillor Chrissy Stamp
Carly Stoddart, Planning Manager
Councillor Rupert Turpin, Portfolio Holder for Business Management
Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

251 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bowler, Hackwell, McDonald, Potter and Chrissy Stamp.

During this period, due to the Coronavirus pandemic, it was informally agreed between the two political groups to run Medway Council meetings with a reduced number of participants. This was to reduce risk, comply with Government guidance and enable more efficient meetings. Therefore, the apologies given reflects that informal agreement of reduced participants.

252 Record of meeting

The record of the meeting held on 21 July 2021 was agreed and signed by the Chairman as correct.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

The Committee noted that following the meeting on 21 July 2021, the following had been agreed by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and opposition spokesperson:

Minute 160 – MC/21/0332 - Garages adjacent to No.53 Danson Way, Norfolk Close, Rainham

Refused on the following ground:

- 1 The proposal represents an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site that will result in a development that causes concerns regarding overbearing and overlooking of neighbouring properties which will be harmful to the amenities that occupiers of those properties could reasonably expect to enjoy. In addition, the loss of garaging and available parking on site will result in increased pressure in relation to on street parking in the immediate area to the detriment of the amenities of residents living in the area and trying to park near to their property. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policies BNE1 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the NPPF 2021.

Minute 161 – MC/21/0921 - British Pilot, Avery Way, Allhallows

Additional condition 14 as follows:

- 14 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the plant noise impact assessment reference 89688/NIA, dated 14 January 2021. All measures required for the mitigation of noise shall be completed before any part of the development is brought into use and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenities of neighbouring property in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

Minute 163 – MC/21/1262 - 42 New Road, Chatham

Refused on the following ground:

- 1 The proposed bedroom 7 in the loft space with no direct access to a toilet/shower facility either en-suite or on the same floor level with the closest toilet/shower facility being located on the lower floor (first floor) and then as a shared facility with bedroom 6, would result in an unacceptably poor living accommodation for the intended occupants in an accommodation where all the occupants should reasonably expect to have either en-suite facilities or close access on the same floor level to personal shower/toilet. The proposal as such would be contrary to Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

Minute 164 – MC/21/1502 - 117 Watling Street, Gillingham

Refused on the following ground:

- 1 The proposed A5 hot-food takeaway will be located within a parade where the current takeaway premises take up over 23% of the linear frontage, consisting of shops extending from the junction with Derby Road to the Post Office/convenience shop in this Neighbourhood Centre and if allowed would increase this to approx. 30% of the linear frontage, as such exceeding the 15% threshold (set out in the Hot Food Take Away Guidance note 2014) for A5 uses in the linear frontage of the centre. Consequently, if permitted the proposed change of use would result in an overconcentration of A5 units in this Neighbourhood Centre impacting negatively on the vitality and viability of the centre as a whole. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policy R18 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and Section 5.12 of the Hot Food Take Away Guidance Note 2014. In addition, the Council's Public Health are concerned that the proposal would contribute to obesity problems currently faced in Medway, as expressed in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of the Hot Food Take Away Guidance Note 2014.

253 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

There were none.

254 Chairman's announcements

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chairman informed the Committee that due to the level of additional information received from a number of parties since despatch of the agenda, planning application MC/21/0302 – Land South of Berwick Way, East of Frindsbury Hill and North and West of Parsonage Lane (known as Manor Farm), Frindsbury had been deferred from consideration at this meeting.

A Member referred to planning application MC/21/1534 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and sought clarification as to whether it was appropriate for the Committee to consider this application at this meeting taking into account police investigations into allegations of fraud concerning some letters submitted in support of the application. In response, the legal officer advised that the Monitoring Officer was aware of the criminal investigation but had determined that this was not a matter for the Planning Committee and the application should be considered and determined on its planning merits.

255 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests

Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

Other significant interests (OSIs)

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Diane Chambers, referred to planning application MC/21/1534 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and informed the Committee that although she had no social contact with the applicant and did not use the facility, as the applicant was a member of the same Conservative Association as herself, she would not take part in the consideration and determination of this planning application and the Vice Chairman would chair the meeting.

Councillor Barrett referred to planning application MC/21/1534 – Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham and informed the Committee that although he had no social contact with the applicant and did not use the facility, as the applicant was a member of the same Conservative Association as himself, he would not take part in the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Other interests

There were none.

256 Planning application - MC/21/0302 - Land South of Berwick Way, East of Frindsbury Hill and North and West of Parsonage Lane (known As Manor Farm), Frindsbury, Rochester

Decision:

Consideration of this application was deferred.

257 Planning application - MC/21/1286 - Land adjacent to B2097, Maidstone Road, Rochester ME1 3AU

Discussion:

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application in detail and informed the Committee that the application site listed on the agenda required amendment to read 'Rochester West'.

He outlined the background to the application and advised that that temporary planning permission had been granted for a grounds maintenance depot at the Deangate Golf Course site for a period of 18 months under planning reference MC/19/1911 and that prior to that temporary period being granted, and during the course of the permission running, an extensive search has been undertaken for a location for a permanent site for the depot. Details of the various sites considered were set out in the agenda.

The Head of Planning advised that historically, planning permission had been refused on the current application site for employment use and Medway Council had also objected to similar development across the boundary to the

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

South in Tonbridge and Malling. However, more recently Tonbridge and Malling had approved employment uses on land to the South within their district and, as that created changed circumstances and visual context, planning permission been granted by Medway Council on land to the south side of Stoney Lane adjacent to the application site for a transport distribution hub. More recently a new access had been approved on the application site from Maidstone Road but without any change of use of the land.

The Committee was advised that if it was minded to approve the application, final agreement on air quality and ecology mitigation measures had yet to be resolved.

The Committee discussed the application and concern was expressed that the proposed depot did not maximise opportunities of embracing new climate change technologies.

The Committee also sought an assurance that sufficient car parking was available on site for staff and that consideration had been given to those staff who were reliant on walking to work or used public transport and that the landscaping would provide suitable screening as soon as possible.

In response, the Head of Planning confirmed that sufficient car parking provision was available on site and in recognition of the fact that many staff either walk, cycle or rely on public transport, this had been a consideration on the criteria for the site.

The landscaping on site would include a mix of planting and discussions would take place with the applicants to ensure that suitable screening plants would be included in the landscaping.

With regard to the various suggestions concerning climate change technologies, these would be further discussed with the applicants and their Council representatives.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

- a) The final agreement of air quality mitigation measures and ecology mitigation measures.
- b) Conditions 1 – 20 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.
- c) The Head of Planning being granted delegated authority to resolve any outstanding issues and amend or add to the conditions as considered necessary.

258 Planning application - MC/21/1534 - Avenue Tennis Club, Glebe Road, Gillingham

Discussion:

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman chaired the meeting for this planning application.

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application and in doing so referred to the planning history of the site. He advised of those aspects of the current application which had been undertaken by the applicants to address previous concerns.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillors Chrissy Stamp and Purdy addressed the Committee as Ward Councillors and made the following summarised points:

Councillor Chrissy Stamp

- There are concerns that some of the letters of support for this application are fraudulent and currently under investigation by the police.
- Whilst the application is for one less house than the previous application, it now includes two detached garages.
- The application constitutes backland development and is an overdevelopment of the site which will be cramped in appearance, provides small gardens for the occupiers of the proposed houses and will cause significant harm to the character of the surrounding area.
- The access and egress to and from the site is dangerous with no clear sight lines.

Councillor Purdy

- The proposed properties are still sited too close to the boundaries.
- The application will result in the loss of green space which has always been an area of recreation for local people.
- The application will pose a flood risk, create pressure on sewage facilities and have a detrimental impact on biodiversity and the ecology of the reptile habitat.

The Committee discussed the application having regard to the concerns expressed by the Ward Councillors and the decision of the Planning Inspectorate on 31 July 2020 to dismiss an appeal for planning application MC/19/2404 along with the reasons stated by the Planning Inspector.

The Committee considered that very little had changed with the current application to address the previous concerns.

Decision:

Refused on the following ground:

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

The proposed development by reason of its layout and scale would result in a cramped form of development that would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal as such would result in overdevelopment of this backland site and would not result in a clear improvement of the local area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H4, H9 and BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan, and paragraphs 124 and 127 of the NPPF.

259 Planning application - MC/21/1004 - Land West of Layfield Road, Gillingham ME7 2QY

Discussion

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail and suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, the words '(including site clearance)' be deleted from the first sentence of proposed condition 15.

The Committee discussed the application and, in particular, the access into and out of the site from a very busy road. The Principal Transport Planner advised that the scheme had been accessed by the Road Safety Audit Team and was considered acceptable and it replicated a similar development on the other side of the road at Mariners View.

It was noted that Section 106 funding had not been requested for this application as the proposed development would provide 100% affordable housing subject to a successful bid for grant funding for shared ownership housing. Information was sought as to what the position would be if the grant application was unsuccessful. The Head of Planning informed the Committee that whilst there was no guarantee that the application for grant funding would be successful, this had not been an issue on other sites of similar applications.

The Committee also expressed a view that the proposed development could be improved using relevant new climate change technologies and in response, the Head of Planning stated that whilst he appreciated the Committee's desire for developers to be installing new climate change technology, this would need to be a gradual stepped process. For current planning applications, the Council could only require developments to comply with current Building Regulations. However, he confirmed that when receiving applications for new developments, officers challenged and pushed for climate change and energy efficiency improvements where possible.

Decision:

Approved subject to the full SAMMS mitigation payment and conditions 1 – 14 and 16 - 30 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and condition 15 amended as follows:

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

15. No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Environmental Management Plan shall include amongst other matters details of hours of construction working; measures to control noise affecting nearby residents; dust control measures; pollution incident control and site contact details in case of complaints. The construction works shall thereafter be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Reason: Required before commencement of development in order to minimise the impact of the construction period on the amenities of local residents with regard to Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

260 Planning application - MC/21/0993 - 22-32 Canterbury Street, Gillingham, ME7 5TX

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

The Committee noted that the materials had yet to be submitted for consideration by the Council's Urban Design Officer.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 16 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

261 Planning application - MC/20/2541 - 5-7 Mill Road & 4 Fox Street, Gillingham ME7 1HL

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail and advised that as the existing buildings had no architectural merit, there was no objection to their loss. However, as the buildings had formerly housed Jubilee Clips, it was intended that the name of the new development would include reference to 'Jubilee'.

The Planning Manager also advised that although the proposed parking provision fell below the Council's parking standards, the site was in close proximity to Gillingham Hight Street and had suitable cycle provision.

The Committee discussed the application.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

- a) the applicant entering into a legal agreement under the terms of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure:
- i. £52,785.50 green space contribution towards improvements to the local area.
 - ii. £3,881.90 towards waste containment for the development, maintenance and improvement of location bring centres and waste education.
 - iii. £1,756.92 towards youth provision in Gillingham for young people between 819.
 - iv. £4,110.48 towards community facilities within the vicinity of the site.
 - v. £3,704.80 towards library improvements at Gillingham Library.
 - vi. £14,185.38 towards health improvements in Gillingham South and Medway Central locality primary care networks.
 - vii. £5,390 towards public realm improvements to Gillingham Town Centre.
 - viii. £6,386.16 towards heritage improvements at Upnor Castle.
 - ix. £5,508.58 towards strategic measures in respect of the coastal North Kent Special Protection Areas (SPAs)/Ramsar sites.
 - x. Meeting the Council's costs.
- b) Conditions 1 – 24 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

262 Planning application - MC/20/2696 - Kingdom Hall, Bloors Lane, Rainham, Gillingham

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail and suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, proposed condition 6 be replaced as set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

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

- The development will create overlooking and loss of privacy and light for existing residents.
- The proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site and brick walls will be constructed close to the boundaries of existing properties.
- There will be extra demand for parking to the detriment of existing residents.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

- The site is located close to a school and the additional traffic generated by this development will be a highway safety to school children.

Whilst there was sympathy for the concerns expressed by the Ward Councillor, the Committee was reminded that the Kingdom Hall had formed part of a previous planning application MC/98/0252MG/60/0288 which had been implemented due to the construction of the Kingdom Hall. This particular planning application had also allowed for a 40 bed care home for the elderly and 13 three and four bed roomed terraced dwellings. Therefore, it was still possible for these elements to be constructed on the site due to the planning permission being extant given that it had been implemented through the construction of the hall.

Decision:

Approved subject to:

- a) A Section 106 Agreement under the terms of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 being entered into to secure the following developer's contributions:
 - i) £20,000.00 towards the upgrade of the existing zebra crossing, on Bloors Lane, in the vicinity of Thames View Primary School, to "Halo" type LED Belishas.
 - ii) £1,050.00 towards improvements to signage/information and any relevant surface improvements to the GB5/6A and associated paths around Bloors Community woodland.
 - iii) £106,028.88 towards expansion of the closest and most suitable schools:
 - Nursery education: £28,121.60 at one or more of Thamesview Primary, St Thomas of Canterbury and Mierscourt Primary
 - Primary education: £21,693.70 at one or more of Thamesview Primary, St Thomas of Canterbury and Mierscourt Primary
 - Secondary education: £53,128.59 at one or more of the Howard School, Rainham Girls, Robert Napier and Rainham Mark
 - Sixth form education: £3,084.99 at one or more of the Howard School, Rainham Girls, Robert Napier and Rainham Mark
 - iv) £3,368.00 towards improved facilities and equipment at Rainham Library.
 - v) £4,900.00 towards the development of new square/civic space in Rainham Precinct Shopping Centre and improvements to the Precinct gateway by the car park and the High Street.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

- vi) £1,597.20 towards programme delivery for young people (ages 8-19 and up to 25 for with disabilities) in the Rainham area. Which may include facilities, providing access, supplies, equipment, programme delivery and/or instructors.
 - vii) £3,529.00 towards the provision, improvement and promotion of waste and recycling services to cover the impact of the development.
 - viii) £52,032.60 towards enhancement of open space facilities within the vicinity of the development.
 - £49,430.97 to enhance open space facilities within the vicinity including Cozenton Park and/or nearby allotment facilities.
 - £2,601.63 to Medway's Metropolitan park – Great Lines Heritage Park.
 - ix) £12,895.80 towards the provision to support the foundation and development of the Rainham locality Primary Care Network including the supporting infrastructure, IT, training and equipment
 - x) £5,007.80 towards Designated Habitats Mitigation.
- b) Conditions 1 – 5 and 7 - 20 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and new condition 6 as set out below:

- 6 No development shall take place until the tree protection measures and methods of working as shown on the tree protection plan (drawing number BL/TPP/1764-03-A) and in the Arboricultural Report (reference number SA/1764/20-A). The tree protection measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: Required prior to commencement to protect the trees, in accordance with Policy BNE43 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

263 Planning application - MC/21/1348 - 16 Hollywood Lane, Wainscott, Rochester

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

The Committee noted that Councillors Williams and Elizabeth Turpin had wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillors on this application but had been unable to attend the meeting and therefore they had supplied a brief joint statement and requested that the Committee permit the Head of Planning to read it out on their behalf. The Committee accepted this request.

The Head of Planning therefore read out their joint statement summarising the following concerns:

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

- The application constitutes backland development in an already high-density area.
- The development will impact upon amenity and privacy and create a significant increase in noise and disturbance.
- The development will result in a loss of outdoor space and could set a precedent.

The Committee discussed the application and concern was expressed that this application constituted backland development and that the site had limited access and vehicular movements in and out of the site would have a detrimental impact upon the occupiers of no. 18 Hollywood Lane.

The Committee also considered that the proposed development, if approved would be out of character with other properties in the locality and could create a precedent for the development of other rear gardens in the area.

Decision:

- a) Refused on the following grounds:
 1. The development constitutes backland development which would be harmful to the character of the area and if approved would give rise to setting a precedent for similar development in the vicinity.
 2. The proposed development does not bring any improvements to the area.
 3. Vehicular access to the development would be alongside the garden of no. 18 Hollywood Lane and would be detrimental to the occupiers of no 18.
 4. The development would have a detrimental impact upon those residents whose properties back onto the site.
- b) The Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to agree the wording of the refusal grounds with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson outside of the meeting.

264 Planning application - MC/20/2846 - Texaco City Way Service Station, 342 City Way, Rochester

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application and informed the Committee that since despatch of the agenda, the Planning Agent had written to advise that the proposal was an upgrade of an existing mast share that is currently located on the forecourt of the garage rather than establishing a new site elsewhere and that the existing two operators would continue the share the proposed mast.

The Committee discussed the application and it was suggested that if approved, officers undertake further negotiations with the applicant on the

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

location and an additional condition be approved concerning the colour of the mast.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 3 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and an additional condition 4 as follows:

4. The colour of the mast to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

265 Planning application - MC/21/1365 - 197 Grange Road, Gillingham, ME7 2TL

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

The Committee discussed the application noting that this property was one of a row of bungalows and concern was expressed that the proposed extension of this property both in terms of height and with extensions to the front, rear and side would be out of character and not in keeping with neighbouring properties and would have a detrimental impact upon the street scene.

It was noted that whilst the properties were sited significantly below the street level and located a fair distance from the road, the proposed extensions would have a detrimental impact upon the daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties.

The Committee considered that the extent of the proposal would result in the loss of so much of the original bungalow that it almost constituted demolishing the existing bungalow and the construction of a new house on the site.

Decision:

a) Refused on the following ground:

Due to the extent of the proposed extensions, the proposed property would be out of character with the row of existing bungalows along this stretch of Grange Road and will result in harm to the appearance of the street scene and the amenity of the adjoining neighbours in terms of overshadowing.

b) The Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to agree the wording of the refusal ground with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Planning Spokesperson outside of the meeting.

266 Planning application - MC/21/1773 - 248 Maidstone Road, Chatham ME4 6JN

Discussion:

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail and explained how the current application differed from that previously submitted at MC/21/0661 and which was refused. She suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application a new condition 6 be approved to address the concerns raised about loss of privacy, details of which were set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

In addition, she drew attention to two further letters of representation received from the neighbour at no. 250 Maidstone Road, details of which were summarised on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

Councillor Rupert Turpin had also objected to the application and with the agreement of the Committee outlined his summarised concerns as follows:

- The extension is very large compared to the size of the original property, more than doubling the original footprint.
- The development is excessive in its scale and appearance and will be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.
- If approved, the neighbour to the south at 250 Maidstone Road will suffer loss of daylight and consideration of the application should be deferred to enable an amenity assessment to be undertaken.

The Committee discussed the application noting that the majority of properties in Maidstone Road were large and therefore the proposed development of no 248 would not be out of context with the street scene.

The Planning Manager explained that the current application aimed to scale back the previous proposal under MC/21/0661 by reducing the projection of the proposed double storey rear extension by 2m and offsetting the first floor of the proposed double storey side extension by approximately 1m.

Decision:

Approved with conditions 1 – 5 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and new condition 6 as follows:

- 6 The windows on the flank (south) elevation serving the study on the ground and bathroom on the first floor of the extension shall be fitted with obscure glass and apart from any top-hung light, that has a cill height of not less than 1.7 metres above the internal finished floor level of the room it serves, shall be non-opening. This work shall be completed before the room it serves is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

Reason: To ensure the development does not prejudice conditions of amenity by reason of unneighbourly overlooking of adjoining property, in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

267 Performance Report: 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out performance for the period 1 April – 30 June 2021.

The Head of Planning drew attention to staffing issues in the Planning Team due to a shortage of Senior Planners to fill vacant posts and therefore he had employed a Consultant on a 4 month contract to cover some of the short term workload and options were now being considered in relation to a longer term solution.

The Committee was reminded that a temporary process increasing delegated powers to the Head of Planning had been introduced on 1 April 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic and such delegations had operated until the lifting of Covid restrictions by the Government in July 2021. As the process was considered to have worked well and enabled the Committee to focus on the large scale or contentious applications, a report was being prepared for Full Council recommending that the powers be extended permanently.

The Head of Planning also informed the Committee that following continued receipt of some in-depth additional representations after despatch of the committee agenda and, in particular for an application due to be considered at this meeting, following discussions with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Planning Spokesperson for this meeting, it was also proposed that Council would be requested to change the cut off time for the receipt of additional representations for planning applications from 12 noon on the day before the Committee to a week before the date of the Committee meeting so as to give officers time to research and prepare a response and for the supplementary agenda advice sheet to be circulated to the Committee earlier.

The Committee discussed the performance report and in particular the benchmarking referred to at Appendix B.

Overall, the Committee generally supported the proposed change to the cut off date for the receipt of additional representations as suggested by the Head of Planning noting that this had been discussed with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Planning Spokesperson for this meeting in the light of the continued receipt of high volumes of additional representations the day before the meeting.

Decision:

The Committee noted the performance report for the period 1 April – 30 June 2021.

Planning Committee, 18 August 2021

268 Report on Appeal Decisions 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021

Decision:

Consideration of this report was deferred.

269 Report on Section 106 Agreements April to June 2021

Decision:

Consideration of this report was deferred.

Chairman

Date:

Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

Telephone: 01634 332012

Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk