

Medway Council
Planning Committee – 29 July 2026
Supplementary Agenda Advice Sheet

Minute No. 710 Planning Committee 11 February 2026:

Planning application - MC/25/0241 Land At 320-346 High Street, Rochester, Medway ME1 1BT

Demolition of existing buildings and structures retaining 340 and 346 Rochester High Street and construction of 28 residential dwellings together with provision of vehicular access, cycle and pedestrian access, public open space, sustainable drainage systems, landscaping, infrastructure, earthworks and all other associated works.

Members resolved to approve the application subject to a S106, which, following a viability assessment (which was independently assessed) was to secure the following:

- (i) A contribution of £9,449.72. towards bird mitigation
- (ii) Amendments to the CPZ in relation to 3 parking spaces
- (iii) A Clawback clause in relation to viability

Following the resolution work has been on going to complete the S106 to allow the decision to be issued with the conditions as agreed. During this time, the applicants/agents have been doing some soft market testing, recognising that this site is one that the Council has been seeking to bring forward for some time, and that the viability of the scheme is marginal. With the recommended clawback clause there has been no interest in the site. The applicants are, therefore, requesting the removal of the clawback clause.

While the use of such clawback clauses is supported within the NPPF, this is a site that has been allocated for development in the 2003 Local Plan and the scheme which is resolved to be approved is a very sensitive and high quality scheme that will enhance the conservation area and area generally while providing much needed homes on a brownfield sustainable site.

If development is to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans, there are some very detailed conditions that need to be complied with, some prior to commencement, and then development needs to commence within 3 years for the permission to remain valid. It is highly unlikely that the viability of this site will fundamentally improve within this timescale and, therefore, in this instance, we are recommending removal of the clawback clause to give the

development of this site the best possible opportunity to commence and be taken forward.

Minute No. 117 Planning Committee 1 July 2026:

Planning application - MC/25/2538 Land to the south of Moor Street and east of Meresborough Road, Rainham

Following referral to the Secretary of State a response has been received that the Secretary of State has decided not to call in this application. He is content that it should be determined by the local planning authority.

A copy of the letter is attached to this agenda on pages 9-10.

Pages 20 – Planning Application MC/26/0549 101 Balmoral Road, Gillingham, Medway ME7 4QG

Appraisal

Additional map and figures produced identifying the surrounding land-uses along an approximately 200m stretch of Balmoral Road. The map is attached to this Agenda.

A breakdown of uses found through both a search of the planning history and from a walking survey is set out below. In terms of non C3 uses there were no care homes or hostels identified but 7 HMOs were identified. This accords with the information in the evidence paper for the designation of the Article 4 Direction. There are a number of flats in the area (set out below), however, these are within a C3 residential use and, therefore, are the same use class as all other dwellings.

Observation	HMOs	Flats
Public Access	89, 132, 157, 128, 129	85, 87, 92, 96, 106, 108
Site Visits	91, 114	146/148
Total Properties Surveyed	88	
Total HMOs	7	
Expressed as a %	7.9%	

Page 30 – Planning Application MC/26/0767 49 Priestfield Road, Gillingham, Medway, ME7 4RE

Recommendation

After the reasons for refusal on page 32 it states:

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

This should state:

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

Representations

A letter of objection has been received from the Member of Parliament for the area, Naushabah Khan, and the Applicant has also submitted a statement and a rebuttal to the Case Officers Report. All of these letters are attached to this agenda on pages 12-15.

Appraisal

A map has been produced from on site observations, professional judgement and a desktop study taking a circa 200m segment of the street, on the basis of how the street would likely be experienced by residents by doing a walkover, followed by desktop study cross referenced to show different non-family housing located on the application sites street. The map is attached to this Agenda.

Pages 40 – Planning Application MC/26/0358 15 Paget Street, Gillingham, Medway ME7 5ER

Appraisal

Additional map and figures produced identifying the surrounding land-uses along an approximately 150m stretch of Paget Street. The map is attached to this Agenda.

A breakdown of uses found through both a search of the planning history and from a walking survey is set out below. In terms of non C3 uses there were no care homes, hostels or HMOs identified. There is one property in use as a pub and two divided into flats in the area (set out below), however, these are within a C3 residential use and, therefore, are the same use class as all other dwellings.

Observation	HMOs	Flats	Other
Public Access	--	1/7 St Margarets Street	135 Britton Street (PH)
Site Visits	--	140 Britton Street	--
Total Properties Surveyed	23		
Total non-single family dwellings	3		
Expressed as a %	13.0%		
Total HMOs	--		
Expressed as a %	--		

Page 56 – Planning application MC/20/0347 Land south of Ham Lane (formerly Gibraltar Farm), Hempstead, Gillingham

Recommendation

Amend condition 1 – approved plans as follows:

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

Received 14 May 2026:

55-1 Barratt garage details
55-2 Redrow garage details

Received 19 June 2026:

13840_1100 Rev P6	Catchment plan
13840_1600 Rev P5	Drainage layout sheet 1
13840_1601 Rev P5	Drainage layout sheet 2
13840_1800 Rev P4	Levels and contours plan sheet 1
13840_1801 Rev P4	Levels and contours plan sheet 2
13840_1955 Rev P3	Visibility splays sheet 1
13840_1956 Rev P3	Visibility splays sheet 2
54-1	Wall and fence details
54-2	Wall and fence details
54-2 Rev A	Street scenes

Received 22 June 2026:

13840-1750_P1	Deep bore soakaway
---------------	--------------------

Received 30 June 2026:

13840_1951 Rev P5	Refuse vehicle tracking sheet 1
-------------------	---------------------------------

13840_1952 Rev P6	Refuse vehicle tracking sheet 2
13840_1953 Rev P6	Fire tender vehicle tracking sheet 1
13840_1954 Rev P5	Fire tender vehicle tracking sheet 2

Received 7 July 2026:

13840_1957 Rev P1	Removal van tracking sheet 1
13840_1958 Rev P6	Removal van tracking sheet 2

Received 8 July 2026:

104 Rev E	Materials and boundary treatment plan
Ht-KI	Floor plans and elevations (Kelling)
Ht-Ks	Floor plans and elevations (Kennisham)
Ht-Kw	Floor plans and elevations (Kew)
Ht-Kw-x3	Floor plans and elevations (Kew)
Ht-Kn	Floor plans and elevations (Knightswood)
Ht-La	Floor plans and elevations (Lavenham)
HT-Mr-Kw-x2	Floor plans and elevations (Martham and Kew)
HT-Mr	Floor plans and elevations (Martham)
HTMr-KIx3	Floor plans and elevations (Marwood and Kelling)
HT-Mw-KI	Floor plans and elevations (Marwood and Kelling)
HT-Mw-01 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Marwood)
HT-Mw-x3 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Marwood)
HT-Mr-Ma	Floor plans and elevations (Martham and Matlock)
HT-Ma-x2 Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Matlock)
HT-Ma-x3 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Matlock)
HT-Mt x4	Floor plans and elevations (Matlock)
HT-Ro Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Rowan)
HT-Rd	Floor plans and elevations (Redford)
HT-50-x3 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (YB50)
HT-50-x4-01 Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (YB50)
HT-50-x4-02	Floor plans and elevations (YB50)
HT-52 Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (YB52)
HT-52-x3 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (YB52)
HT-55-50x4-Eg-Mn-50x2-55-01 Rev A	House type elevations
HT-55-50x4-Eg-Mn-50x2-55-02 Rev A	House type floor plans
HT-YB55-YB52 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (YB55 and YB52)
HT-YB73 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (YB73)
FB-A	Floor plans and elevations (Flat block B)
HT-RICH	Floor plans and elevations (Richmond)
HT-OXFO Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Oxford)
HT-CAMB Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Cambridge)
HT-CHTR Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Chester)
HT-OVER Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Overton)
HT-HARR Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Harrogate)
HT-WINC Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Winchester)
HT-HENLP Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Henley)
HT-HAMP Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Hampstead)
HT-LETC Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Letchworth)

HT-STx4 Rev A	Floor plans and elevations (Stamford)
FB-B-02 Rev B	Floor plans and elevations (Flat block B)
GL_EDLA_ZZ-XX-DR-L-1001 Rev P04	GA Plan 1 of 6
GL_EDLA_ZZ-XX-DR-L-1002 Rev P04	GA Plan 2 of 6
GL_EDLA_ZZ-XX-DR-L-1003 Rev P04	GA Plan 3 of 6
GL_EDLA_ZZ-XX-DR-L-1005 Rev P04	GA Plan 5 of 6
GL_EDLA_ZZ-XX-DR-L-1005 Rev P04	GA Plan 6 of 6

Received 13 July 2026:

13840_1951 Rev P6	Refuse vehicle tracking sheet 1
13840_1952 Rev P7	Refuse vehicle tracking sheet 2
13840_1953 Rev P7	Fire tender vehicle tracking sheet 1
13840_1954 Rev P6	Fire tender vehicle tracking sheet 2
13840/1957 Rev P1	Removal van tracking sheet 1
13840_1958 Rev P1	Removal van tracking sheet 2

Received 14 July 2026:

55-3 Rev B	Bin and cycle details
55-4 Rev B	Cycle store details

Received 16 July 2026:

106 Rev E	Refuse and fire tender access plan
105 Rev E	Parking plan
101 Rev A	Site location plan
100-4 Rev F	Overall planning layout
100-1 Rev E	Planning layout sheet 1 of 3
100-2 Rev E	Planning layout sheet 2 of 3
100-3 Rev D	Planning layout sheet 3 of 3
GF -EDLA_ZZ_XX_DR_L_110 Rev P03	Sitewide masterplan
GL_EDLA_ZZ-XX-DR-L-1004 Rev P05	GA Plan 4 of 6

Received 17 July 2026:

FT-B-01 Rev D	Floor plans and elevations (Flat block B)
13840_1602 Rev P6	Drainage layout sheet 3
13840_1802 Rev P5	Levels and contours plan sheet 3

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

Add additional condition as follows:

- 11 Notwithstanding the submitted materials plan, no development above slab level within a construction phase shall take place until details of the materials to be used on all of the residential units within that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted should include the manufacturer and

name of the material sample. 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.

Appraisal

Page 78 Add new section on Air Quality after Flood and Drainage – Condition 27 (Drainage) as follows:

Air Quality – Condition 29

An air quality assessment by Accon UK has been submitted with the application.

The assessment concludes that during the operation phase, the modelling predicts that there would be no exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide or particulate matter objectives at the sensitive development receptors on the application site.

There are no existing sensitive locations which will exceed the AQAL, as a result of the proposed development. Accordingly, air quality impacts of the proposed development scheme are considered to be acceptable, and mitigation is not required.

In line with Medway Council's Air Quality Planning Guidance an air quality emissions mitigation assessment and damage cost assessment by Accon UK has been submitted. The statement identifies the most appropriate damage cost payment for the site, which can be offset through the implementation of mitigation measures which are shown within Table 3 of the assessment.

The cost of implementing the mitigation identified in Table 3 is greater than the Central Present Damage Cost and, therefore, the damage cost would be totally offset by the Air Quality mitigation measures.

The proposal is in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan.

Conclusions and Reasons for Approval

Page 81 Add new paragraph after details relating to the discharge of Condition 27 as follows:

Details relating to the discharge of Condition 29 of MC/18/0556 has also been submitted as part of this application. It is considered that the details for this condition are acceptable and, therefore, condition 29 of MC/18/0556 is discharged. In order to fully comply with the condition, the development shall be implemented and managed in accordance with the approved scheme. The

details submitted pursuant to this condition has been considered under the provisions of Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003, having regards to air quality.

Page 82 – Planning Application MC/26/0815 130 High Street, Gillingham, Medway, ME7 1AS

Recommendation

After the reasons for refusal on page 83 it states:

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

This should state:

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

Representations

A Statement from the agent on behalf of the applicant has been received and is attached to this agenda on pages 18-20.



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Nick Roberts
Principal Planner
Medway Council
nicholas.roberts@medway.gov.uk

Please ask for: Astrid Lawrance
Email: astrid.lawrance@communities.gov.uk
Your ref: MC/25/2538
Our ref: PCU/CONS/A2280/3378826
Date: 17 July 2026

Dear Nick Roberts

The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2026

Outline application (all matters reserved except access) by Bellway Homes for up to 150 dwellings, including public open space, landscaping and associated works at land to the South of Moor Street and East of Meresborough Road, Rainham, Kent (application no: MC/25/2538)

I refer to your email of 2 July referring to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government ("The Secretary of State") an application for planning permission for the above development.

The Secretary of State has carefully considered policy on calling in planning applications, as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 26 October 2012. The policy makes it clear that the power to call in a case will only be used very selectively. This policy also gives examples of the types of issues which may lead him to conclude, in his opinion that the application should be called in.

The Secretary of State has decided not to call in this application. He is content that it should be determined by the local planning authority.

In considering whether to exercise the discretion to call in this application, the Secretary of State has not considered the matter of whether this application is EIA Development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The local planning authority responsible for determining this application remains the relevant authority responsible for

Planning Casework Unit
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
23 Stephenson Street
Birmingham
B2 4BH

Tel: 0303 44 48050
pcu@communities.gov.uk

considering whether these Regulations apply to this proposed development and, if so, for ensuring that the requirements of the Regulations are complied with.

Yours sincerely

P Barber

Phil Barber (decision officer)
Head of Recovery and Referrals
Planning Casework Unit

This decision was made by officials on behalf of the Secretary of State, and signed on his behalf

Land Use Survey

101 Balmoral Road



HMO



Subdivided Flat



Application Site



Survey Area



Dave Harris
Planning Department
Medway Council
Gun Wharf
Dock Road
Chatham
ME4 4TR

20 July 2026

Dear Dave,

Re: Objection to MC/26/0767 – 49 Priestfield Road

I am writing to object to planning application MC/26/0767 for the change of use of 49 Priestfield Road Change to a six-bed house to six person HMO (C4), with a loft conversion with dormer with 1 rooflight to the rear and 3 roof light to the front.

Parking pressures

This proposal is likely to increase demand for on-street parking, with up to six unrelated residents living in the same property, potentially with their own vehicles in addition to their own guests and visitors.

Constituents living on and around Priestfield Road have previously raised parking issues with me, with a lack of parking spaces especially in the evenings and weekends. The increase of occupants at this property will only add to these pressures without sufficient parking available.

Inconsistencies in the planning application

Councillors and constituents have raised valid concerns over the consistency and accuracy of this application.

The developers claim that no works have been done to this property since its purchase in July 2025. However, whilst 49 Priestfield Road was previously a three-bedroom family home, it now has six bedrooms. It seems that works have been continuing on this property since the purchase whilst the property has been vacant, despite claims from the developer that the property has been occupied throughout this time period.

Furthermore, the proposal states that no trees or hedges will be removed, but the hedgerow between numbers 49 and 51 has already been removed by the developers.

These inconsistencies call into question the validity of this application and should be considered appropriately by the Planning Committee.

Article 4 direction

Priestfield Road lies within Watling Ward, which currently has Article 4 direction. Watling has been clearly identified as one of the most concentrated areas in Medway for HMOs.

It is important to maintain a mix of housing type and prevent one area being overconcentrated with HMOs and losing its character. Priestfield Road alone already has five registered HMOs, and residents are very vocal in their opposition to further HMOs in their community.

I hope that these objections will be considered by the Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Naushabah Khan', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Naushabah Khan MP

Member of Parliament for Gillingham and Rainham

APPLICANT'S STATEMENT TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE — 29

JULY 2026

Application MC/26/0767 — 49 Priestfield Road, Gillingham, ME7 4RE

Members, as Medway does not permit applicants to address the Committee, I ask that this statement be considered alongside the officer's report.

1. The facts of ownership. My family has owned 49 Priestfield Road since 11 July 2008 — eighteen years. Written objections, including from a councillor, state we purchased it in July 2025. The Land Registry title register proves that claim false.

2. We asked this Council first — and this Council said yes. We applied for a Lawful Development Certificate on 9 July 2025, before committing to the project. On 3 September 2025 the Council granted it (MC/25/1399), confirming the change of use and dormer were lawful. The Council's own decision notice records that "the application was lawful as submitted." The substantial works followed that certificate: structural steelwork from 11 September 2025, the dormer in mid-October. Building Control inspected throughout and issued an unconditional completion certificate. Your own case officer has confirmed the room standards are acceptable. We relied on this Council's formal decision, invested accordingly, and delivered high-quality, professionally managed accommodation with a full management plan covering waste, parking and neighbour relations.

3. The single reason for refusal does not withstand scrutiny. The recommendation rests on "clustering" under Policy T8 of the emerging Local Plan. Members should weigh three points. First, T8 is not adopted policy, and it defines no threshold, radius, percentage or methodology for a "cluster" — there is no test to fail. Second, the Local Plan's own examining Inspectors wrote to the Council on 27 March 2026 stating that the examination is at an early stage, that adoption is unlikely during 2026, and that they hold significant unresolved concerns; on the national policy test for emerging plans, T8 can carry only limited weight — as appeal decisions at Kingswood Road and Stopford Road have already confirmed. Third, the objectors' own figures put HMOs at 5.4% of this street, rising to 6.5% with this application — more than nineteen of every twenty properties are family homes, and neither adjoining property is an HMO.

4. The adopted plan and national policy support approval. Adopted Policy H7 supports HMOs in properties too large for a single family: this is a six-bedroom house within easy walking distance of the town centre, Gillingham station and everyday services. Medway can demonstrate only around 3.1 years of housing land supply against the five years national policy requires. This proposal houses six people where there were three — the low-cost, flexible housing the Council's own Article 4 evidence base recognises as vital.

5. What I ask of the Committee. I am not asking for sympathy; I am asking for consistency. We followed this Council's process, trusted its certificate, and built to the standard its own officers have verified. If a resident cannot rely on a formal decision of this Council, what can they rely on? The adopted plan supports approval. National policy supports approval. The facts support approval. I respectfully ask the Committee to grant planning permission.

Miguel Pereira, Applicant — 49 Priestfield Road, Gillingham, ME7 4RE

ADDENDUM TO APPLICANT'S STATEMENT — PLANNING COMMITTEE,

29 JULY 2026

Application MC/26/0767 — 49 Priestfield Road, Gillingham, ME7 4RE

Members, this addendum supplements my statement of 20 July 2026, following publication of the officer's report, which recommends refusal on two grounds. I ask that it be considered alongside that statement.

1. The second recommended reason for refusal (SAMMS bird mitigation) has been addressed. I have offered in writing, unconditionally, to pay the SAMMS contribution of £350.18 together with the associated legal and monitoring costs of £550 in full before the Committee meeting, and I have asked the Council to advise how payment should be made. This contribution was not previously requested of me; my agent was advised in June that it would be requested if the application were proceeding to approval. Payment resolves this reason entirely.


2. On the first reason (Policy T8 clustering), I ask Members to note the following from the Council's own papers. The officer's report records from the HMO register that five properties on Priestfield Road are HMOs — none of them adjoining No. 49. The report raises no objection on design, neighbouring amenity, occupant standards (all bedrooms meet or exceed national space standards), parking (a highly sustainable, car-free scheme), waste or biodiversity, and it sets out the conditions under which the use would operate, including a six-person occupancy cap. The report confirms the party wall matter raised in objections is a civil matter and not a planning consideration.

3. Consistency with item 5 on this agenda. Elsewhere on this same agenda, a six-bedroom HMO at 101 Balmoral Road (MC/26/0549) is recommended for approval on the basis that six existing HMOs on that street are “dispersed” and “would not represent a clustering or overconcentration”, and that a further single HMO “would not materially alter this position”. Priestfield Road has five. I respectfully ask the Committee to determine this application by the same standard, on the same evening, under the same policy.


4. My request is unchanged. The adopted plan supports approval, national policy supports approval, and the facts support approval. I respectfully ask the Committee to grant planning permission.

Miguel Pereira, Applicant — 49 Priestfield Road, Gillingham, ME7 4RE — 21 July 2026


Land Use Map – 49 Priestfield Road



Registered HMO's




Flats/Converted to flat(s)



Registered C2 care home




Vehicle Repairs




Hair and Beauty

Land Use Survey

15 Paget St

-  Public House
-  HMO
-  Subdivided Flat
-  Application Site
-  Survey Area



130 High Street Gillingham ME7 1AS MC/26/0815

Change of use from shop (Class E) to betting office (Sui Generis)

Supplementary Statement to Planning Committee

29 July 2026

Chair, Members of the planning committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide a supplementary statement in support of this application. My name is Altine Elias, and I am the agent for this proposal and I writing to ask you to grant planning permission for the development.

As you aware from your officer's report, Coral are seeking to relocate from their existing premises at 171-173 High Street to the application site at 130 High Street. The new premises will better meet the need of their proposed digital fit out which will cost in the region of £300,000 to complete should consent be granted. This is a significant investment and will provide a high quality shop front to the High Street. The application unit is smaller than the current unit, being 1,185 sq ft.

Your own policies in the Medway Local Plan, which dates to 2003, were written at a time when betting offices fell under Use Class A2. Policy R5 confirms that uses within Class A2 are acceptable within the town centre provided they support the vitality and viability of the centre as a whole. We have submitted evidence by way of a footfall survey to demonstrate that betting offices do indeed attract strong visitor numbers and this proposal will also enable a vacant unit, one of 19 in the town centre, to be reoccupied.

Policy R17 specifically relates to changes of use from retail to Class A2 and confirms these will be permitted except where the addition of the new use *"would cumulatively have a detrimental effect on the character and retail function of the centre"*

Your case officer has argued that betting offices should be taken as a group together with adult gaming centres in applying this policy. However adult gaming centres, or amusement arcades, have their own separate policy in your plan, being policy R15.

R15 does not include betting offices which should be assessed under policy R17. As such we believe, and a number of Planning Inspectors at Appeal have agreed with this, that betting offices should be considered as a separate sui generis use when looking at the cumulative impact of a proposal.

Our detailed street survey, undertaken prior to submission in March of this year confirmed that only three out of a total of 172 units in the town centre are in betting office use, being 1.74% of the total. A recent appeal decision, overturning a refusal of consent for an adult gaming centre in Chatham, has shown this to be an acceptable and proportionate level of provision for a town centre. The three existing betting offices are well spaced throughout the town centre, and this will continue to be the case should consent be granted for this proposal. The application will not therefore lead to any clustering of betting offices or dominance of the use within the town centre as the three betting offices will continue to be spread throughout the length of the High Street. In terms of the application site, other uses within the frontage between King Street and Sappers Walk fall within Class E. The retail character of the frontage will therefore remain unchanged, with shopping uses continuing to predominate.

Finally, the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF] needs to be taken into account. The NPPF, which dates to 2024 and therefore carries significant weight in assessing the proposal, supports the diversification of town centres through allowing a suitable mix of uses. This is likewise shown through the introduction of Class E since your own plan was adopted, facilitating a wider range of uses in centres.

This proposal will enable the relocation of a long-standing business within the town centre. No objections have been received from the police or your environmental health and public health officers, something which again would carry weight at an appeal. A number of concerns have been raised in respect of anti-social behaviour, and we have provided a copy of the company's Security and Safety Plan for the proposed new unit to your officers. Again, no objections to this have been received.

Should consent be granted, the applicant will implement a robust operational management plan and security measures to ensure that the premises, Coral's customers and the company's relationship with neighbours are all well managed, as is the case with the current unit. Staff are provided with a copy of the plan which is reviewed every 6 months. As with the current Coral betting office which has traded on the High Street since 2013, the sale of alcohol will be strictly prohibited and a Challenge 25 proof of age scheme will be operated at the premises where any person who appears to be under 25 years of age, and who has not previously provided satisfactory proof to the contrary, is challenged at the point of entry.

We therefore believe that the proposal is compliant with your policies and very much hope you will support the application by granting consent this evening.

Thank you for your time in reading this statement.