

**Medway Council  
Planning Committee  
Wednesday, 4 June 2025  
6.30pm to 9.28pm**

**Record of the meeting**

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

- Present:** Councillors: Stamp (Chairperson), Jones (Vice-Chairperson), Anang, Bowen, Etheridge, Field, Filmer, Gilbourne, Gulvin, Hamandishe, Hamilton, Myton, Pearce and Vye
- Substitutes:** Councillors: McDonald (Substitute for Peake)
- In Attendance:** Councillor Maple (for agenda item 5)  
Duncan Berntsen, Senior Urban Design Officer  
Julie Francis-Beard, Democratic Services Officer  
Hannah Gunner, Principal Planner  
Dave Harris, Chief Planning Officer  
Peter Hockney, DM Manager  
Madeline Mead, Principal Planner  
Arron Nicholls, Senior Planner  
Sam Pilbeam, Senior Planner  
Jonathon Simon, Planner  
Steven Ward, Highways Consultant

**29 Apologies for absence**

An apology of absence was received from Councillor Peake.

**30 Record of meeting**

The record of the meeting held on 7 May 2025 was agreed by the Committee and signed by the Chairperson as correct.

**31 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances**

There were none.

**32 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests**

Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

Other significant interests (OSIs)

There were none.

Other interests

Councillor Etheridge stated that he often attended meetings of Frindsbury and Cliffe Woods Parish Councils and explained that if any planning applications were ever discussed there, which were due to be considered by the Medway Council Planning Committee meeting, he would not take part in the discussion at the Parish Council meetings.

**33 Planning application - MC/24/2495 Go Outdoors, The Brook, Chatham, Medway ME4 4NZ**

**Discussion:**

The Service Manager - Development Management outlined the application in detail for a mixed-use redevelopment comprising of 319 apartments with shared communal facilities and up to 744 sq.m of flexible commercial floorspace (Class E and F) with associated landscaping and infrastructure provisions.

The Service Manager – Development Management brought Member's attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet which included additional representations.

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Maple addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and outlined the following points:

- This was a balanced and well thought out scheme and would benefit the local area.
- There was a housing crisis, not only in Medway but nationally.
- Concerns were raised with the lack of affordable housing, however, Councillor Maple acknowledged the amount of work that had been undertaken to make the scheme work. The Arches Neighbourhood Planning Group had suggested having a clawback, could that be considered?
- There was also a lack of genuine engagement from the developer with local groups, such as Arches Neighbourhood Planning Group regarding this application. That could have happened, however, it didn't.
- Could a working group made up of Ward Councillors, members from Chatham Town Centre Forum and members from the Arches Neighbourhood Planning Group be formed to consider where the S106 contributions were allocated to, within Chatham Town Centre.

The Committee discussed the planning application noting the points raised by the Ward Councillor and acknowledged that the advantages outweighed the negatives, the overall design was good, and it would be a great addition to

## **Planning Committee, 4 June 2025**

Chatham. Members considered the green spaces that were proposed would benefit the health and wellbeing of the residents.

Members clarified that 319 apartments, which would equate to approximately 500 bed spaces, would go a long way towards Medway's housing demand.

Concerns were raised regarding the height of the development. Members acknowledged that the original proposal was for a block of 13 storeys and following design review panels and the work that Officers had done to get the scheme amended but still viable, the height had reduced to a reasonable level.

Members supported the Leader's suggestion of a working group to be established to consider the allocation of S106 contributions.

The Service Manager - Development Management acknowledged Members' disappointment that no affordable housing was being provided by the developer for this site. The applicant had not provided their own viability assessment, therefore, it was a joint instruction that Medway's own consultant would undertake the viability assessment. The Service Manager - Development Management confirmed that 10% affordable housing would not be viable. The only way that could work was to provide 3% affordable housing with no S106 contributions, which would equate to 10 apartments out of 319 and no Registered Provider would commit to that.

Concerns were raised regarding only having 5 parking spaces for a development of 319 flats. The Service Manager - Development Management advised that the 5 parking spaces, secured through S106, would only be allocated to the largest of apartments. There was an intention that that multi-storey carpark located next to the development would be re-opened and would provide those 5 spaces as well as providing additional parking for shoppers using Chatham Town Centre. Prospective residents would also be able to rent a space.

Members requested that the S106 could include a requirement to help young people develop a trade, for example in the construction industry. The Chief Planning Officer confirmed this was a good idea and could be requested that the contractor have a certain number of apprentices on site during the construction.

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the suggestion of a working group to look at S106 allocations could be achieved. He went on to explain that some of the S106 contributions to open spaces would go towards finishing off the Town Hall Gardens

The Chief Planning Officer advised Members that the Arches Neighbourhood Plan carried full weight in the planning process and had huge public support when adopted. He explained that although the applicants had not fully engaged with the Arches Neighbourhood Group that did not mean that the plan had been ignored. His Officers had tried to get a scheme which was as close to the Arches Neighbourhood Plan as possible and still viable. The public

## Planning Committee, 4 June 2025

wanted to see things happen on the site and he considered this to be a good scheme. He was disappointed that the applicant had not interacted with local residents and members of the Arches Neighbourhood Planning Group.

The Chairperson clarified that this application had gone through three design review panels which had resulted in a reduction of the height of the development. Over the past 2 years, Planning Officers with over 100 years of experience, had worked on this application. It was an improved scheme, however, frustrations were raised regarding the lack of affordable housing but this Planning Committee knew building on brownfield sites was more costly.

### **Decision:**

#### **Approved** subject to:

- A. The applicant entering into a Section 106 agreement to secure the following:
- a) Financial contributions as follows.
    - i) £104,718.13 towards Designated Habitat Mitigation.
    - ii) £200,000 towards public realm and/or community facilities within Chatham Town Centre or within the vicinity of the site.
    - iii) £305,281.87 towards open space and play space improvements within Chatham Town Centre or within the vicinity of the site including but not limited to Town Hall Gardens, Chatham Waterfront and The Great Lines.
  - b) Non-financial obligation as follows.
    - i) To secure the provision of 5 car parking spaces within The Market Hall Car Park which are to be provided prior to first occupation.

With the following:

- Clawback agreement with a revised viability assessment to secure additional contributions that were requested in the event that the viability position improves.
  - Best endeavours to be used to secure apprenticeships and entry level opportunities during the construction.
- B. Conditions 1 to 26 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report with an additional requirement for a post S106 Working Group to be convened to consider the location of the S106 spend to include Ward Councillors, representatives of the Chatham Town Centre Forum,

## Planning Committee, 4 June 2025

representatives of the Members from the Arches Neighbourhood Planning Group and Officer representation.

### **34 Planning application - MC/25/0204 Former University College for the Creative Arts, Fort Pitt Hill, Chatham, Medway ME1 1DZ**

#### **Discussion:**

The Principal Planner outlined the application in detail for the conversion of an existing building (Use Class F1(a)) to deliver 102 residential units (Use Class C3), commercial, business and service accommodation (Class E) and retained education/community use accommodation (Use Class F1) with associated works in respect of car parking, landscaping, and external alterations including new windows and doors and the installation of solar panels.

The Principal Planner brought Member's attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet which amended Condition 24 and had comments from one of the representations regarding the Preliminary Roost Assessment (Bats) and Bat Dusk Emergence Survey.

The Committee discussed the application in detail and Members were pleased the site would be repurposed and was an efficient way of providing accommodation.

The Principal Planner confirmed that a condition was imposed for a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted to minimise the impact of construction with regards to Fort Pitt Grammar School for Girls, which was located next door. The applicant has had discussions with the school regarding minimising noise disruptions.

Although there were only 6 disabled parking spaces provided within the development, Chatham train station was only an 8 minute walk away where residents would have access to public transport.

#### **Decision:**

##### **Approved subject to:**

- A. The applicants entering into a Section 106 to secure the following:
  - i) £33,534.54 towards Designated Habitats Mitigation.
  - ii) The resurfacing/payment to resurface/or purchase and resurfacing of RRX20 all to an agreed specification and timescale.
  - iii) Offer of transfer of the housing to the Council or Nominated Provider prior to offer on the Open Market.

## Planning Committee, 4 June 2025

- iv) Provision of a car club facility to serve the development with incentives for residents.
- B. Conditions 1 to 29 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report with an amendment to Condition 24:

### **Amendment to Condition 24:**

Prior to the installation of any external lighting within each phase or sub-phase of the development, details of such lighting and a lighting plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include height, position, external appearance, any shielding, light intensity, colour, spillage (such as light contour or lux level plans showing the existing and proposed levels) and hours of use. The lighting plan shall also:

- a) Take into account measures as described in paragraph 11, Recommendations of the Bat Dusk Emergence Survey report.
- b) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly important for bats;
- c) Show how and where external lighting will be installed and takes account of the 'Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting' (Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals).

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the plan and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To limit the impact of the lighting on the wildlife and with regard to Policies BNE37 and BNE39 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### **35 Planning application - MC/24/2463 Land south of Berwick Way, east of Frindsbury Hill and north and west of Parsonage Lane (known as Manor Farm), Frindsbury, Rochester, Medway**

#### **Discussion:**

The Principal Planner outlined the application in detail for a proposed Deed of Variation to the S106 agreement signed as part of hybrid application MC/21/0302 (as amended by S73 application MC/22/2839) and reserved matters application relating to appearance, layout, scale, access to and landscaping pursuant to outline planning permission MC/22/2839 for construction of up to 181 market and affordable dwellings with associated access, roads, open space, drainage and other works together with the discharge of conditions 4 (LEMP) 75 (CEMP) 83 (SuDs) 87 (Ev Charging) 88 (Travel Plan) 92 (Landscape details) 93 (Trees) 94 (Parking Strategy) 101 (Climate Change) and 102 (BNG).

The Principal Planner suggested adding a condition to secure the installation of the retractable bollard.

## **Planning Committee, 4 June 2025**

The Committee discussed the application in detail and Members were pleased to see the delivery of more affordable homes and an additional 475 trees being planted.

In response to a question about the quarry infill, the Principal Planner confirmed that following a request for an extension for a further 18 months, which was agreed in September 2024, they were ahead of schedule and should be completed before the 18 months expired which would be December 2027.

The Chief Planning Officer explained that although the road in the development would be at a standard where the road could be adopted, it would be the developer's decision as to whether they would ask the Council to adopt the road or not.

The Principal Planner clarified that the affordable homes would be located in 3 of the character areas, they would be affordable rent and shared ownership homes. They would be completed in three phases, the first being the affordable rented homes.

### **Decision:**

**Approved** that the deed of variation be agreed to the S106 entered into as part of Planning Consent MC/21/0302 (relevant to the latter Section 73 application – MC/22/2839) to modify the S106 agreement to vary the following:

- Schedule 2, Part 7
- Schedule 2, Part 13
- Schedule 3, Part 1

**Approved** with Condition 1 as set out in the report for the reason stated with an additional condition.

### **Additional Condition 2**

Prior to the commencement of development above slab level, details of the timing and implementation of the agreed retractable bollard to be located on the spine road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented in accordance with those approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the road is not used as a through road, restricting access to refuse and emergency vehicles only, in accordance with Policy T2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and for reasons of road safety.

**36 Planning application - MC/24/1333 69 - 71 High Street, Rochester, Medway ME1 1LX**

**Discussion:**

The Senior Planner gave one presentation for this application and the Listed Building application MC/24/1334 69-71 High Street, Rochester.

The Senior Planner outlined the application in detail for the conversion of the first and second floors to residential use, forming the addition of 4 residential flats, change of use of the ground floor to dental surgery, demolition of part of the single storey rear extension and construction of a two storey rear extension to provide dental surgeries with two flats on the first floor, provision of cycle and bin storage and associated works. Felling of a Lime tree located in the rear garden which is subject to a TPO.

The Committee considered the application and Members requested that native trees be specified in the planting of additional trees. Following a discussion, it was agreed that the locations of the trees, would be decided in consultation with the Chairperson, Opposition Spokesperson and relevant Ward Councillors.

Members were pleased to see the historic panelling would be removed, restored and replaced back into the building, in a controlled environment for public viewing.

**Decision:**

**Approved subject to:**

- A. The applicants entering into a Section 106 to secure the following:
  - i) £3,608.42 for the planting of 2 trees within Intra area or within the vicinity of the site.
- B. Conditions 1 to 13 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report. The location of the trees to be agreed, in consultation with the Chairperson, Oppositions Spokespersons and Ward Councillors.

**37 Planning application - MC/24/1334 69 - 71 High Street, Rochester, Medway ME1 1LX**

**Discussion:**

The Senior Planner outlined the application in detail for a Listed Building application for the conversion of the first and second floors to residential use, forming the addition of 4 residential flats change of use of the ground floor to dental surgery, demolition of part of the single storey rear extension and construction of a two storey rear extension to provide dental surgeries with two



## **Planning Committee, 4 June 2025**

flats on the first floor, provision of cycle and bin storage and associated works. Felling of a Lime tree located in the rear garden which was subject to a TPO.

### **Decision:**

**Approved** with Conditions 1 to 13 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

### **38 Planning application - MC/25/0387 Land to the east of Eastern Road, Gillingham, Medway**

#### **Discussion:**

The Senior Planner outlined the application in detail for permission in principle for the construction of a minimum of five and a maximum of five residential units.

The Senior Planner explained that permission in principle was not the equivalent of an outline planning permission. It was an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led developments. On its own, permission in principle did not allow development of the land, planning permission was still required. Where permission in principle was granted for land, an applicant may obtain planning permission by applying for technical details consent (TDC), which would cover matters such as the design of buildings, development layout and landscaping schemes.

The Service Manager – Development Management acknowledged that Members required more information and would have liked to see a more detailed application or even an outline planning application. However, it was the applicant's decision as to how they wished to apply for planning permission. He stated that the planning application was for permission in principle for five dwellings, what Members did not know was whether they were for houses, bungalows or flats. The Service Manager – Development Management brought Members' attention to page 176 of the agenda which set out the site area / density. This showed that five units on this site represented a density of 20 dwellings per hectare.

The Chief Planning Officer stated that if Members were to approve this planning application, technical details, such as access, climate change and ecology would have to come back to this Planning Committee for consideration.

The Officer's recommendation was voted on and the planning application was refused. A second proposal, which was seconded, was that Members were not convinced that in principle 5 dwellings could be satisfactorily located within the site. This was voted on and agreed.

## Planning Committee, 4 June 2025

### Decision:

**REFUSED** due to the constrained nature, characteristics and shape of the site. Final wording to be agreed in consultation with the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Opposition Spokespersons.

### 39 Planning application - MC/24/1204 91 Rolvenden Road, Wainscott, Rochester, Medway ME2 4PF

#### Discussion:

The Principal Planner outlined in detail for the construction of a three-bedroom detached dwelling, demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of vehicle parking to front of existing and proposed dwelling with dropped kerb.

The Principal Planner brought Member's attention to the supplementary agenda advice sheet where there was an amendment to Condition 2.

The Committee discussed the application in detail and the Chief Planning Officer confirmed that a Construction Environmental Management Plan condition could be added to minimise the noise of construction work and control working hours to start no earlier than 8am until 5pm Monday to Friday, Saturday mornings only and no construction work on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Following a question regarding the dwelling being set back and was not in line with other properties and was not sympathetic to the area, the Chief Planning Officer explained that due to other developments in the immediate vicinity, he did not consider the development to be out of character or not sympathetic.

The Principal Planner clarified that the trees would remain in the back garden and a condition could be added to protect the trees during construction works.

### Decision:

#### Approved subject to:

- A. The applicant entering into a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the dwelling as a self-build.
- B. Conditions 1 to 12 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report with an amendment to Condition 2 and additional conditions to protect the tree against construction works and a working time programme.

#### Amendment to Condition 2:

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

## **Planning Committee, 4 June 2025**

Received 27 March 2025  
Block Plan Showing Drop Kerb and Stores

Received 7 April 2025  
Proposed Plans and Elevations  
Existing and Proposed Street Scene  
Existing and Proposed Parking Section

Received 3 May 2025  
Site Location Plan and Block Plans

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

### **40 Planning application - MC/25/0709 4 Cypress Road, Wainscott, Rochester, Medway ME2 4PS**

#### **Discussion:**

The Planner outlined the application in detail for the construction of a single storey rear extension and loft conversion to form habitable rooms.

The Committee considered the application, and the Chief Planning Officer confirmed that as the applicant was not proposing any hard standing, there was no requirement for grey water submissions.

#### **Decision:**

**Approved** with Conditions 1 to 3 as set out in the report for the reasons stated in the report.

### **Chairperson**

**Date:**

**Julie Francis-Beard, Democratic Services Officer**

Telephone: 01634 332012  
Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk