

**Medway Council**  
**Planning Committee**  
**Wednesday, 13 October 2021**  
**6.30pm to 10.15pm**

**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, Hackwell, McDonald, Opara, Potter, Chrissy Stamp, Thorne and Tranter

**Substitutes:** Councillors:  
Price (Substitute for Hubbard)

**In Attendance:** Dylan Campbell, Senior Planner  
Dave Harris, Head of Planning  
Joanna Horne, Planning Solicitor  
Robert Neave, Principal Transport Planner  
Carly Stoddart, Planning Manager  
Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

**362 Councillor Bowler**

The Committee paid tribute to Councillor Bowler who had sadly passed away on Tuesday 12 October 2021.

Councillor Bowler had served on the Planning Committee since 2000 and had been the spokesperson for the Labour and Co-operative Group since 2001. His passion for planning was acknowledged and his contribution to the work of the Committee would be greatly missed.

Members and officers present held a moment of reflection in memory of Councillor Bowler.

**363 Apologies for absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Hubbard.

**364 Record of meeting**

The record of the meeting held on 18 August 2021 and the Special Meeting on 2 September 2021 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as correct.

The Committee was informed of the following, approved by the Head of Planning under delegated powers in consultation with the Chairman, Vice

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson as set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet:

Planning Committee 18 August 2021

### **Minute 263 (Planning application MC/21/1348 - 16 Hollywood Lane, Wainscott, Rochester)**

Refused on the following grounds:

- 1 The proposed development would represent an unacceptable form of backland development that would represent a form of development that, as a result of the use of an existing extended driveway to serve 2 additional units, would appear contrived, while the development of the rear garden area would result in a form of development out of character with area. The use of the driveway, particularly as it narrows and may result in vehicles reversing, while also increasing the number of vehicular movements directly on the boundary with no.18 Hollywood Lane would cause unacceptable noise and disturbance and therefore have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of residents of that property. The increase in the use of the driveway and access from and egress onto Hollywood Lane would increase the likelihood of accidents on this busy road. The proposal does not therefore comply with the backland criteria set out in Policy H9 of the Local Plan, 2003, would cause a loss of amenity contrary to Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan, while the contrived nature of the proposal and loss of a significant part of the garden would not result in a clear improvement to the area and is therefore contrary to Policies BNE1 and H4 of the Local Plan. For these reasons the proposal is also contrary to paragraphs 71, 126 and 130 of the NPPF 2021.
- 2 The application fails to address the impact of the proposal on the Special Protection Areas of the Thames Estuary and Marshes and the Medway Estuary and Marshes through either the submission of details to allow the undertaking of an Appropriate Assessment or via a contribution towards strategic mitigation measures. In the absence of such information or contribution, the proposal fails to comply with the requirement of the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010 and is contrary to Policy BNE35 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 180,181 and 182 of the NPPF.

### **Minute 265 – Planning application MC/21/1365 - 197 Grange Road, Gillingham**

Refused on the following ground:

- 1 Due to the extent of projection to the front, rear and increase in height of the property, the proposal would result in a prominent form of development that is out-of-character with the line of bungalows within the immediate locality and within the context in which it sits. The proposal results in harm to the appearance of the street scene and the amenity of the adjoining

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

neighbours at numbers 195 and 199 Grange Road in terms of overshadowing contrary to Policies BNE1 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

### **365 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances**

There were none.

### **366 Chairman's announcements**

The Chairman informed the Committee that planning application MC/21/2134 – The Everglades, Hempstead, Gillingham had been withdrawn from the agenda and would not be considered at this meeting.

### **367 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests**

Members sought clarification as to whether they should declare a 'significant interest' on a planning application and leave the meeting for determination of a planning application purely by virtue of an applicant being a member of the same political association. The Legal Adviser informed Members that just being in the same political association did not automatically mean that they had a close association with the individual concerned and ultimately, it was for each individual Member to consider this and to determine whether they considered that they had an interest that warranted declaring a significant interest and withdrawing from the Committee for the determination of the application.

#### Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

#### Other significant interests (OSIs)

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Diane Chambers referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that as the applicant had been a former Medway Councillor and had served on the Planning Committee she would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

The Vice Chairman, Councillor Buckwell referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that as the applicant was a member of the same Conservative Association and he personally was Chairman of that Association, he would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Barrett referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

although he had not had any contact with the applicant for 3 years, as he had been known to him in the past he would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Thorne referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that as the applicant was a member of the same Conservative Association, he would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Potter referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that as the applicant had been a former Medway Councillor and had served on the Planning Committee he would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration and determination of this planning application.

Councillor Potter also referred to planning application MC/21/1239 – St Thomas Moore RC Primary School, Bleakwood Road, Walderslade, Chatham and informed the Committee that he would withdraw from the Committee for the consideration and determination of this planning application on the basis that this was a grant maintained school and he was the Portfolio Holder for Education and Schools.

### Other interests

Councillor Tranter referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that although the applicant had been a former Medway Councillor, he did not socialise with the individual and therefore would remain in the meeting for the determination of this application.

Councillor Etheridge referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that although the applicant had been a former Medway Councillor and was a member of the same Conservative Association, he had no relationship with the individual and did not socialise with him and therefore would remain in the meeting for the determination of this application.

Councillor Opara referring to planning application MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling, informed the Committee that although she had known the applicant in the past she would remain in the meeting for the determination of this application.

Councillor Adeoye referring to planning application MC/21/2643 (42 New Road, Chatham) informed the Committee that she wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor on this application and therefore would take no part in the determination of the application.

**368 Planning application - MC/20/1431 - Land North of Medway Road, Gillingham ME7 1NY**

**Discussion:**

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application and reminded the Committee that there had been a number of planning permissions granted in relation to this scheme but which had been successfully challenged by judicial review by a third party objector on various grounds, details of which were set out within the report. She advised that there was a judicial review in relation to the most recent grant of planning permission (MC/20/3077) and this permission had since been quashed by consent order signed and dated 10 September 2021.

Given the fact that they had been quashed, those previous grants of permission did not constitute material considerations but for the sake of completeness a summary of the reasons why they had been quashed had been set out in full within the report.

Attention was drawn to proposed condition 5 which had been duplicated within the report and it was suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, the first printed version be deleted.

In addition, the Planning Manager drew attention to changes to the appraisal and conclusion sections of the report and referred to amendments detailed on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

Attention was drawn to page 50 of the agenda setting out consultation responses to the current planning application and, in particular, the objections received from the third party objector along with the applicant's response. The Committee was informed that following the quashing of MC/20/1431 planning permission on 21 January 2021, the application was subsequently live again. The Planning Manager informed the Committee that a revised Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Doc Ref: CW/190320/FRA/RevD (dated April 2021) had been submitted on 20 April 2020 and a 21 day consultation had been issued.

The application had then been included on the Planning Committee agenda on 21 July 2021 but had been withdrawn by officers due to a printing error omitting a section of the report. A letter had then been received from Shoosmiths on behalf of the third party objector raising a number of issues which had now been addressed in the Planning Appraisal section of the current report.

The Committee discussed the application and expressed the view that the applicants had undertaken all they could to address the issues raised by the third party objector to the satisfaction of officers and it was clear that this was a continued attempt by a competitor business in trying to block competition.

The Committee noted that the provision of a supermarket at this site had been supported by local residents.

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

A Member who was relatively new to the Committee and therefore had not been involved in considering previous planning applications for this site questioned why the Trafalgar Centre site in High Street Chatham had not been considered suitable for the siting of a supermarket. In response, the Planning Manager and Principal Transport Planner advised that the site would not be able to accommodate the parking which would be required for deliveries and servicing arrangements necessary for the supermarket and was therefore not considered suitable.

### **Decision:**

Approved with conditions 1 – 4 and 6 – 27 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and condition 5 amended as follows:

5. No development shall take place until a scheme based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority.

The scheme shall include (where applicable):

- i. Details of the design of the scheme (in conjunction with the landscaping plan where applicable).
- ii. A timetable for its implementation (including phased implementation).
- iii. Operational maintenance and management plan including access requirements for each sustainable drainage component.
- iv. Proposed arrangements for future adoption by any public body, statutory undertaker or management company.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: Required prior to development to manage surface water during and post construction and for the lifetime of the development as outlined at paragraphs 167 and 169 of National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Policy CF13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### **369 Planning application - MC/21/2235 - Deangate Ridge Golf Course, Deangate Ridge Sports Complex, Dux Court Road, Hoo St Werburgh**

### **Discussion:**

The Head of Planning outlined the planning application and explained the background as to why the applicant was seeking an extension to a temporary change of use as a grounds maintenance depot up to 31 October 2023 at this site.

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

He reminded the Committee that the applicant had originally been granted temporary permission to use this site in 2019 whilst an alternative permanent site could be identified. After an extensive search for an alternative site, details of which had been set out in the report to the Committee on 18 August 2021, the applicant had subsequently secured a site in Maidstone Road, Rochester and this had been approved by this Committee in August 2021, subject to ecology matters being addressed (reference MC/21/1286). Work to prepare the site was due to commence imminently but until such time that the site was ready, the applicant was seeking a temporary 2 year extension for the current site at Deangate Ridge Golf Course.

He confirmed that once the applicant had moved off the current site and it had been cleared, the site would be reinstated.

Drawing attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet, the Head of Planning advised that 3 additional letters of objection had been received setting out concerns already addressed within the report.

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

- At the time of approving the initial use of this site as a grounds maintenance depot, the Committee had stipulated that it did not wish to see any further extensions beyond October 2021.
- There is a great strength of feeling in the local community that this use should cease in 2021 with 125 objection letters and 2 general Deangate related petitions containing over 8000 signatures in total.
- The siting of a grounds maintenance depot at this site impacts on the local community due to increased vehicular movements and in particular vehicles travelling through the Four Elms Hill Air Quality Management Area.
- The site should be returned to the community and turned into a Country Park for local residents.

The Committee discussed the application and some Members expressed sympathy for the views of the Ward Councillor and suggested that it may be appropriate to defer the application and consider other alternative sites.

Concern was also expressed that to extend the use of this site as a grounds maintenance depot could put the site at risk of being designated a brownfield site at a future date and it was suggested that if the temporary extension was approved, proposed condition 1 be strengthened to require the applicant to undertake further restoration work to facilitate turning the site into a Country Park once they had vacated the site.

In considering the application, the Committee also had regard to the services provided by the applicant across the whole of Medway and the consequences should the service delivery be disrupted if the applicant was required to transfer to an alternative site until the site at Maidstone Road was ready.



## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

The Head of Planning confirmed that the applicant did not own the land on which it was currently located that it was unreasonable in planning terms to require the applicant to do more than restore the site to its former condition once vacated. He therefore suggested that Condition 1 remain as printed in the report but that the Local Planning Authority request that the Council, in its capacity as landowner, consider doing more to aid reinstatement of the site.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that the applicant was confident that it would vacate the current site by 31 October 2023 and following discussions, a level of contingency had also been built into this timeline. He assured the Committee that he would be constantly reviewing the situation with the applicant and offered to provide an update to the Committee in 12 months should the application be approved.

### **Decision:**

- a) Approved with conditions 1 – 4 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.
- b) It be noted that the Head of Planning will continue to monitor the applicant's progress in relocating to its new site and will provide an update to the Committee in 12 months time.
- c) The Council, as landowner, be requested to take necessary action to ensure that the current site is reinstated upon vacation of the applicant.

### **370 Planning application - MC/21/2289 - Medway Norse Depot, Pier Approach Road, Gillingham**

#### **Discussion:**

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application in detail and explained the reason for the request for a temporary extension for the continued siting of a temporary building up to 31 October 2023.

In response to questions, the Head of Planning informed the Committee that the applicant had originally requested a longer extension but officers were only recommending a 2 year extension so as to keep pressure on the applicant to find an alternative site. He advised that the applicant was in discussions concerning a possible alternative site but it was considered that this may not be ready by 31 October 2023. The limited temporary extension would keep the pressure on for this to be resolved.

#### **Decision:**

Approved with conditions 1 and 2 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.



**371 Planning application - MC/21/1186 - Buckland Lake Reserve, Buckland Road, Cliffe, Rochester**

**Discussion:**

The Head of Planning outlined this part retrospective application and informed the Committee that ordinarily, this application would have been dealt with under delegated authority but he considered that it should be referred to the Committee for consideration due to the nature of the proposal with new tourist facilities in designated ecological sites.

He suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, the proposed conditions be amended as set out on the supplementary agenda advice sheet.

The Committee discussed the application and noted the popularity of the facility and that the natural habitat had increased at the site since the introduction of the facilities.

**Decision:**

Approved with conditions 4 - 14 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and conditions 1 – 3 as set out below:

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

Received 23 April 2021:

BUC/1/2021 Main Location Plan (Proposed)  
BUC/3/2021 Main Car Park Changes and Location of areas 1, 2, 3 and 4  
BUC/6/2021 Glamping Cabin Type 1  
BUC/7/2021 Glamping Cabin Type 2  
BUC/8/2021 Glamping Cabin Type 3  
BUC/9/2021 Glamping Cabin Type 4  
BUC/10/2021 Original and New Wellness centre plans and views  
BUC/11/2021 Proposed Wellness Centre  
Received 4 May 2021:

BUC/5/2021A Proposed plan and external elevations of cafe and outside serving area  
BUC/12/2021A Gym/function room and arts and crafts

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

- 2 No development of the glamping caravans shall take place until details of all materials to be used externally have been submitted to and

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and without prejudice to conditions of visual amenity in the locality, in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

- 3 All external materials used in the extensions to the café and alterations to the other structures on site shall match the existing buildings/structures to which they relate.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and without prejudice to conditions of visual amenity in the locality in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### **372 Planning application - MC/21/1703 - Land adjacent to Balancing Pond, St Andrews Park, Halling**

#### **Discussion:**

In the absence of the Chairman and Vice Chairman, it was agreed that Councillor Hackwell chair the meeting for this item.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that this application related to a variation of condition 12 (affordable provision) on planning permission MC/19/0994 to allow for a change in the percentage of affordable housing units to be provided on site from 50 units (56%) to 22 units (25%).

He explained that this reduction in affordable housing units fell within the Council's policy requirements of 25% affordable housing provision.

The Committee discussed the application and although it was accepted that this variation would still permit 25% affordable housing provision within this development, there was concern that if this had been the level stipulated in the original planning application, then the outcome of that application may have been different as this had been a balanced application. Some Members expressed concern as to whether the applicant had originally included a high level of affordable housing provision to make the application appear attractive, particularly as no reason for the request to reduce the affordable housing provision had been supplied to support the reduction from 56% to 25%.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that if it was minded to refuse the application to vary condition 12, it would be necessary for the Committee to identify grounds for refusal and he reminded the Committee that the applicant still proposed provision of 25% affordable housing which met the Council's agreed policy for a development of this size.

It was suggested that consideration of the application be deferred to obtain the reasons why it is no longer possible to provide 56% affordable housing at this

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

site and that this be reported to a future committee along with a summary as to the reasons why this had been a balanced application when originally submitted for consideration.

### **Decision:**

Consideration of this application be deferred to obtain the reasons why it is no longer possible to provide 56% affordable housing at this site and that this be reported to a future committee along with a summary as to the reasons why this had been a balanced application when originally submitted for consideration.

### **373 Planning application - MC/21/2643 - 42 New Road, Chatham ME4 4QR**

#### **Discussion:**

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application in detail.

With the agreement of the Committee Councillor Adeoye addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor on this application and outlined the following summarised concerns:

- This property is located in a Conservation Area.
- This application has already been the subject of a refusal in July 2019
- If approved, there will be additional pressure on on-street parking in the area.
- If approved, there should be an additional condition requiring facilities management.

The Committee discussed the application noting the reason for refusal when considered in July 2021. The Committee noted that the applicant had attempted to overcome the refusal reasons by incorporating an en-suite bathroom into the proposed 7<sup>th</sup> bedroom in the loft space of the existing property but it was considered that this provided a poor amenity for the occupier of the 7<sup>th</sup> bedroom by virtue of the reduced space available.

Some concern was also expressed that this additional bedroom would create additional noise levels and have an adverse impact on on-street parking.

#### **Decision:**

a) Refused on the following ground:

The provision of an en-suite bathroom in the loft space will provide an inadequate level of amenity for the occupier of the 7<sup>th</sup> bedroom by virtue of the reduction in living accommodation.

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

**374 Planning application - MC/21/2223 - 104A, B And C Poplar Road, Strood, Rochester**

**Discussion:**

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail and clarified that although the application site address covered three properties, the planning permission approved at MC/19/2692 related to the provision of 4 units. She explained that the current application was solely to allow for a minor material amendment to allow for the introduction of small studios in all four units.

The Planning Manager drew attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet and suggested that if approved, proposed condition 3 be amended.

Some Members expressed concern that if approved, the additional room may be advertised as another bedroom. In response, the Planning Manager informed the Committee that originally there had been an error in the number of bedrooms in marketing of these properties but that this had now been corrected on the company's website.

**Decision:**

Approved with conditions 1 – 2 and 4 – 8 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report and condition 3 amended as follows:

3. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the external materials approved under reference MC/21/1302.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and without prejudice to conditions of visual amenity in the locality, in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

**375 Planning application - MC/20/2884 - Port Werburgh, Vicarage Road, Hoo, Rochester**

**Discussion:**

The Head of Planning outlined this retrospective planning application and in particular the planning history for this site.

The Committee discussed the application noting the suggested grounds for refusal.

**Decision:**

Refused on grounds 1 – 4 as set out in the report.

**376 Planning application - MC/21/1551 - 107 Station Road, Rainham, Gillingham**

**Discussion:**

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application which sought to change the use of an existing vacant retail unit to provide residential accommodation.

The Committee discussed the application and whilst welcoming the use of a vacant property, some concern was expressed as to the proposal, in particular the location of and proposal to obscure glaze kitchen windows, overlooking from balconies, the amenity of the future occupiers of the units, provision of a bin store and lack of provision of parking on site.

The Principal Transport Manager advised that the occupiers of the premises would not qualify for a residents parking permit and, as the application site was located in an urban area with good links to sustainable transport, the development qualified for consideration under the reduced parking provision eligibility.

Overall, the Committee considered that a reduction in the number of proposed units or a change of layout could overcome some of the concerns expressed.

**Decision:**

Consideration of the application was deferred to enable officers to have further discussions with the applicant concerning the possible reduction in the number of units at this site or a revision to the proposed internal layout.

**377 Planning application - MC/21/1564 - Hazelbank, 189 Princes Avenue, Walderslade, Chatham**

**Discussion:**

The Senior Planner outlined the planning application in detail referring to the level of objections received and a petition containing 41 signatures.

He informed the Committee that if approved, the children's home would provide placements for 5 young people aged 5 – 17 with 1:1 support during the day, supervised at all times. At night, the children would be supervised by 2 waking nightshift staff and a total of 20 staff would work on a shift basis to care for the children. The home would be operated by Prime Calibre Care (PCC) and would provide a home for children with physical disabilities, learning disabilities and sensory impairment. The service would be controlled under Ofsted regulations.

The Committee discussed the application and whilst it was suggested that priority be given to placements from Medway, it was noted that as Medway and Kent County Council had a shared service, this may not be possible.

## Planning Committee, 13 October 2021

In considering the level of objections submitted, whilst there was a level of understanding about the community's concern, it was considered that there was a lack of understanding about the children that would receive placements in the home and it was unfair to assume that children with physical and learning disabilities or sensory impairment would create anti-social behaviour or lead to an increase in crime in the area. Furthermore, the integration of disabled children into the community in a family environment as opposed to a large institution was considered essential if they were to go on to live in the community as they got older.

### **Decision:**

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

### **378 Planning application - MC/21/2134 - 16 The Everglades, Hempstead, Gillingham**

### **Decision:**

This application was withdrawn from consideration at this meeting.

### **379 Planning application - MC/21/1239 - St Thomas More RC Primary School, Bleakwood Road, Walderslade, Chatham**

### **Discussion:**

The Planning Manager outlined the planning application in detail.

### **Decision:**

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

### **380 Section 215 Enforcement**

### **Discussion:**

The Committee received a report setting out information on Section 215 enforcement for Quarter 4 2020/21 and Quarter 1 2021/22.

### **Decision:**

The Committee noted the report.

**381 Exclusion of the press and public**

**Decision:**

The Committee agreed to exclude the press and public from the meeting during consideration of agenda item 19 (Enforcement Proceedings: 1 January 2021 – 30 June 2021 and item 20 (Derelict Buildings Report: July 2020 – May 2021) because consideration of these matters in public would disclose information falling within paragraphs 6a and 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as specified in agenda item 18 (Exclusion of Press and Public) and, in all the circumstances of the case, the Committee considered that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

**382 Enforcement Proceedings: 1 January - 30 June 2021**

**Discussion:**

The Committee received a report setting out enforcement proceedings for the period 1 January – 30 June 2021.

The Head of Planning confirmed that he was happy to take any questions and respond direct outside of the meeting.

**Decision:**

The Committee noted the report.

**383 Derelict Buildings: 1 July 2020 - 31 May 2021**

**Discussion:**

The Committee received a report setting out action undertaken on derelict buildings for the period 1 July 2020 – 31 May 2021.

The Committee noted that derelict buildings were usually investigated once they were brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority.

It was also confirmed that whilst there was an Empty Loan Scheme, the level of funding available was limited.

**Decision:**

The Committee noted the report and expressed its appreciation to officers for the work undertaken in ensuring that works were undertaken on derelict buildings.



**Planning Committee, 13 October 2021**

**Chairman**

**Date:**

**Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer**

Telephone: 01634 332012

Email: [democratic.services@medway.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@medway.gov.uk)