

Regulatory Board (Planning)

Wednesday, 8 January 2020

7.00 pm

Present:

Cllr Lauren Sullivan (Chair)
Cllr Harold Craske (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Conrad Broadley
John Burden
Brian Francis
Gary Harding
Jordan Meade
Lee Croxton
Aaron Elliott

Note: Councillors: Gurdip Ram Bungar, Dakota Dibben, Sarah Gow, Bob Lane, Diane Marsh, Shane Mochrie-Cox, Emma Morley and Christina Rolles were also in attendance.

Laura Caiels	Lawyer (Place) Medway Council
Wendy Lane	Assistant Director (Planning)
Richard McEllistrum	Planning Manager (Development Management)
Richard Hart	Principal Planner (Major Sites)
Peter Price	Principal Planner
Andy Rayfield	Communications Manager
Lauren Wallis	Committee Services Officer (Minutes)

86. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bob Lane and Cllr Brian Sangha. Cllr Aaron Elliott and Cllr Lee Croxton respectively attended as their substitutes.

87. To sign the minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 2 October 2019 were signed by the Chair.

88. Declarations of Interest

Cllr John Burden made an other significant interest in respect of application 20190169 – Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend DA12 5UE as a s106 legal agreement might potentially benefit the Gr@nd. Cllr Burden was a Director on the Board of The Gr@nd and as such would leave the Council Chamber during discussion and voting on this application.

Cllr Lauren Sullivan made an other significant interest in respect of application 20171245 – site of the former Battle of Britain Public House, Coldhardbour Road, Northfleet DA11 8NT

as her aunt lived on New House Lane within sight of the site and advised she would leave the Council Chamber during discussion and voting on this application.

Cllr Lee Croxton made a voluntary announcement of another interest in respect of application 20140550 – Former Guru Nanak Darbar Gurdwara, Clarence Place, Gravesend DA12 1LD because he lived close to, but not in sight of, the application site.

Cllr Jordan Meade made a voluntary announcement of another interest in respect of application 20140550 – Former Guru Nanak Darbar Gurdwara, Clarence Place, Gravesend DA12 1LD and the Windmill Hill Conservation Area and he knew the registered public speakers, speaking against the application but not in a social capacity. Cllr Meade advised that this would not affect his decision making.

Cllr Jordan Meade made another voluntary announcement of another interest in respect of application 20190169 – Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend DA12 5UE and he knew the registered public speakers, speaking against the application in his capacity as a former governor on the school board for the Thamesview Secondary School. Cllr Meade advised that this would not affect his decision making.

Cllr Gary Harding made voluntary announcement of another interest in respect of application 20190169 – Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend DA12 5UE as he lived 10 minutes walk away from the site. Cllr Harding advised that this would not affect his decision making.

Following a question on declaring an interest from Cllr Conrad Broadley, the Board was advised that if Members of the Board knew anyone who had registered to speak on an application, then they had to make a voluntary announcement of another interest if they felt it would affect their decision making.

89. Planning applications for determination by the Board

89.1 20140550 - Former Guru Nanak Darbar Gurdwara, Clarence Place, Gravesend DA12 1LD

Further to a meetings of the Board held on 12 April 2017 and 6 February 2019, the Board considered an application reference 20140550 in relation to the former Guru Nanak Darbar Gurdwara, Clarence Place, Gravesend DA12 1LD for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a four/five storey building to accommodate 16 two bedroom and 2 one bedroom self-contained flats with 19 parking spaces, cycle storage provision and bin stores at basement level. At the meeting on 6 February 2019, the Board had recommended, with the supplementary report, to be approved, subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 agreement. The Board resolved further resolved that the decision be delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Management) subject to “Further consideration of late representations received prior to the resolution of the Regulatory Board (Planning) and whether those representations raise any new issues with legal advice to be sought where appropriate” as well as the proposed conditions and s106 agreement.

The Principal Planner (Major Sites) introduced the application drew Members’ attention to paragraphs 4.8 to 4.23 of the report and advised the, following the February 2019 Regulatory Board (Planning) resolution, further intensive analysis of the late representations received had taken place and he summarised the key findings of the analysis. The Principal Planner (Major Sites) also explained the disparities between the valuation undertaken by

Caxtons (£500k) and that of Historic England (£300k) (paragraph 4.15 of the report). It was therefore concluded, in the absence of appropriate information, there was no clear and convincing justification for the loss of the existing building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Windmill Hill Conservation Area.

The Officer advised that it could no longer be concluded that the marketing exercises had demonstrated that all reasonable reuses of the existing building had been fully explored by the applicant which was a requirement of paragraph 194 of the NPPF (2019) and demolition of the building at this point in time could not be considered acceptable. Based on the information accompanying this application it was therefore concluded that refusal be recommended as the proposal was contrary to local and national planning policy.

The application was before the Board at the discretion of Planning Manager (Development Management) who had taken into account the scale of Councillor and local interest in the site (as was the case for the 2017 and 2019 Board reports).

The Board heard the views of the public speakers who answered a number of Member questions.

The following points were made during discussion on this application:

- Cllr Burden asked for clarification on the difference between the reasons for referral and the recommendation. The Principal Planner (Major Sites) confirmed that the reasons for referral outlined why the application was before the Board and the recommendation set out the officer's recommendation to the Regulatory Board (Planning).
- The Council had discussed the appropriate time period to market the site with the applicants after seeking advice from Historic England as to what was an adequate timeframe. Historic England had advised 12 months and the applicant had requested 6 months which had been agreed as the Council were looking to progress the application.
- It was noted that residents supported the idea of the building being re-used as a religious building or for community use.
- The possibility of keeping the façade of the former Gurdwara intact and erecting another building behind it. However, it was noted that the Board could only consider the application before them.
- The Board received legal advice that whilst it would not be illegal for the Board to approve this application, the decision could be subject of a challenge and this should be taken into account.
- It was noted that the Historic England conclusion separates harm into substantial harm and less than substantial harm. However, this does not mean that the harm was insignificant and this consideration needed to be balanced with making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.
- The Board was advised that the Council carried out an assessment of the Conservation Area 10 years ago and this building was mentioned a number of times and it was noted at that time that it need looking after. Other churches in the wider area had been successfully converted to residential use.
- An opinion was aired that there was no value in keeping the building as it was in a state of disrepair which was exacerbated by vandalism. It had empty for 10 years and a decision needed to be made. A decision to permit or refuse could be challenged but a solution needed to be found as the uncertainty should not be allowed to continue.

- Other opinions included the need to protect a historical asset for the Windmill Hill Conservation Area by finding the right solution for the future of the building. It was noted that the applicant had failed to prove that all reasonable re-uses had been explored.
- The density of the proposal was considered unacceptable, was also out of character with the locality and the site was prominent in the Conservation Area.
- Concern about the abandoned building was raised with its vulnerability to being misused and becoming an eyesore.

Resolved that application 20140550 be REFUSED on the following ground - The proposed application is accompanied by insufficient information to demonstrate that a sufficiently robust exercise regarding the use or re-use of the existing building has been undertaken. In the absence of such information there is not clear and convincing justification for the loss of the existing building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Windmill Hill Conservation Area. As such, the development would result in an excessive and inadequately justified harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to a level which is not sufficiently mitigated by the benefits of the proposed development, and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, saved Policy TC3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994) and paragraph 11(d) and section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

(Cllr Jordan Meade requested that his vote in support of the recommendation be recorded)

- Note:
- (a) Mr Jeff Haskins (Agent)(a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (b) Mr Neege Allen Navarria (an objector) addressed the Board.
 - (c) Mrs Melanie Parr (an objector) addressed the Board.
 - (d) Mr David Moesli (an objector) addressed the Board.
 - (e) Cllr Emma Morley spoke with the leave of the Chair.

(There was a 10 minute recess to allow the changeover of members of the public attending for consideration of this application and the next.)

89.2 20190169 - Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend DA12 5UE

Cllr John Burden left the Council Chamber during discussion and voting on this application.

Further to a meeting of the Board held on 12 June 2019, the Board considered an application reference 20190169 in relation to Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive, Gravesend DA12 5UE for the demolition of the existing house and the erection of a part 4 storey and part 3 storey building for Build to Rent residential units (Use Class C3), comprising 20 one bedroom, 41 two bedroom and 3 three bedroom apartments with associated car parking.

The Principal Planner (Major Sites) advised of a procedural issues in that 180 letters had been sent out notifying third parties of the Board meeting. It was noted that 37 had been returned by the Royal Mail as "persons not known at this address". In addition, residents had reported that they had received letters from the Planning Service that had not been addressed to the actual occupants. However, the Council still has to pay attention to the material planning considerations raised in correspondence. The Board was advised a total of 29 objections had been received by the Council together with a petition of 880 signatures.

At the meeting of the Board in June 2019 a decision on the application had been deferred to enable negotiations with the applicant and/or the applicant's agent to address the Board's concerns in regard to all five grounds of refusal. The application proposals had been amended to address these concerns with the green walls and roofing extended to disguise the bulk and mass of the building; car parking had been reduced to expand the amenity space; louvered balconies and adjusted sight lines for windows would assist in protecting the privacy of neighbouring properties;

The Board was further advised that whilst a significant amount of objections have been received to the revised plans, it was considered that the amended plans had adequately dealt with the issues relating to the previously suggested grounds of refusal 2,3,4 and 5 as set out in the 12 June 2019 officer's report to the Regulatory Board (Planning). However, notwithstanding the amendments made following the June meeting, the physical siting, size, bulk, massing have not changed and whilst elements of the external finishes of development have been amended the proposal would still create an overly dominant development that would not relate well to the character of the street scene and would not integrate well with the surrounding local area. As such the proposal was considered to remain contrary to the objectives of Policies CS15 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and section 11 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). It was therefore considered that the advantages provided by the application were outweighed by the disadvantages.

The application was before the Board as it was a major development proposal which had been deferred from the meeting of the Regulatory Board (Planning) held on 12 June 2019.

The Board heard the views of the public speakers who answered questions from Members.

The following points were made during discussion on this application:

- Members expressed concern with regard to the correspondence issue and were assured that the software used was being investigated to see if safeguards could be introduced.
- Concern was expressed about the green walls and roof in that it had been introduced simply to cover up a bulky building. There was also concern about the future maintenance of the green wall and roof and who this would be carried out. The Board was advised that the roof and walls were two separate green solutions. The green roofs would look after themselves as the plating was done on an "egg box" system which slowed down water release. The wall would be covered with fabric curtain with pockets in them that would be filled with soil and planted with a careful selection of flora. There would be an irrigation system with built in sensors which would seep controlled amounts of water and plant food according to the conditions. Surface water would be stored to feed this system which would also reduce water discharged off-site. The system would be subject to a monthly visual inspection and a bi-annual close-up inspection using a Cherry Picker and replacement and new planting would be done as a result of this inspection. It was also noted that it was usual to have a condition included in a planning permission which would require a 5 to 7 year maintenance plan from the applicant which would be enforced by the Council.
- The proximity of the site to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing was raised, together with additional traffic as a result of the application and the likelihood of an increase in the levels of air pollution. Members were informed that the vegetation in the green walls and roofs and the landscaping around the building would filter air pollution by catching the particulates of their leaves which the rain would then wash

off. This would not be enough and other systems had been included to address this issue including air heating and cooling filtration vent systems in the dwellings which would heat and cool the apartments and booster systems would provide fresh filtered air. Therefore occupants need not open their windows. This would also mitigate any noise pollution.

- The meeting was informed that the overlooking issues had been mitigated by the re-design of the dwelling windows, which had been slanted away from neighbouring properties and the balconies which had been louvered. The slanted windows had been assessed to ensure that maximum light entered the dwellings.
- Concern was expressed in relation to the mass and bulk of the proposal which included 64 apartments, was not in character with the area or with neighbouring properties and was an intensification in the area. It was noted that the site was within the urban area of Gravesham and was bounded by the M2 Motorway but it was considered by many Councillors that, whilst it might be a well designed scheme, this was not the right brownfield site for this proposal. There was also the Government's housing targets for the area to take into account.
- A question was raised in relation to the effect of the proposal on the amenities of the area and whether the development was sustainable.
- The Principal Planner (Major Sites) explained that Natural England had been consulted in relation to the impact on the SPA/Ramsar sites and ancient woodland and had not raised any objections to the proposal subject to a SAMMS payment per dwelling.
- Disappointment was expressed in the lack of alterations to the application submitted in June 2019 and it continued to constitute an overdevelopment of the site that was out of character with the area. The minor changes to the scheme did not address the potential impact.

The Planning Manager (Development Management) concluded that the report submitted to the Board at its meeting in June 2019 had included five reasons for refusal and the absence of the s106 legal agreement had been recorded; the absence of the Ramsar contribution had been addressed; there had been an improvement in the amenity space on the site; and whilst was subjective as to whether the proposal constituted an unneighbourly development, mitigation had been designed into the scheme. The Council was aware of the housing need in Gravesham and whilst the NPPF (2019) requires this to be given weight, it does not override material planning considerations.

Resolved that application 20190169 be refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposal by virtue of its siting, size, bulk, massing and design would create an overly dominant development that would not relate well to the character of the street scene and would not integrate well with the surrounding local area. As such the proposed development would, if permitted, would fail to maintain the prevailing character of the area contrary to the objectives of Policies CS15 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and section 11 and 12 of the NPPF of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);

2. The proposed development, if permitted, would result in inadequate and unsatisfactory communal amenity space for future occupiers and would provide a poor layout which would be car dominated putting pedestrians into conflict with vehicles. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Section 12 of The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policy CS19 of the

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and saved policy LT6 of Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994) which sought to ensure that proposed developments provided a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, as well as maintaining the amenity of surrounding properties; and

3. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, size, bulk, massing and design would create an overly dominant addition and unneighbourly form of development that would adversely affect the outlook and the private amenity space of numerous surrounding dwellings. As such, it would be contrary to Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014), which amongst other criteria requires new development safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties and to integrate well with the surrounding area.

(Cllr Jordan Meade requested that his vote in support of the recommendation be recorded)

- Note:
- (a) Mr Darren Bland (Agent)(a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (b) Mr Oliver Jefferson (Agent)(a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (c) Mr Harman Sond (Agent)(a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (d) Mr David Gingell (an objector) addressed the Board.
 - (e) Mrs Tina Brooker (an objector) addressed the Board.
 - (f) Mr Robin Theobald (an objector) addressed the Board.
 - (g) Cllr Sarah Gow spoke with the leave of the Chair.
 - (g) Cllr Bob Lane spoke with the leave of the Chair.
 - (g) Cllr Diane Marsh spoke with the leave of the Chair.

(There was a 10 minute recess to allow the changeover of members of the public attending for consideration of this application and the next.)

(Cllr John Burden returned to the Council Chamber.)

89.3 20171245 - Site of Battle of Britain, Coldharbour Road, Northfleet DA11 8NT

Cllr Lauren Sullivan, the Chair left the Council Chamber during discussion and voting on this application. Cllr Harold Craske took the Chair.

The Board considered an application reference 20171245 in relation the site of the former Battle of Britain public house, Coldharbour Road, Northfleet DA11 8NT for the construction of 20 residential units comprising 6 three bedroom houses, 9 two bedroom flats and 5 one bedroom flats, laying out of the access road, provision of 32 parking spaces, refuse and cycle storage, private and communal gardens and construction of vehicular access onto New House Lane. The supplementary report contained further revised drawings of the hard and soft landscaping proposals for the site.

The Principal Planner introduced the application which had undergone a significant period of assessment and scrutiny and gave a detailed description of the site and advised that the former public house had been demolished before the Council had given demolition approval. However, it was noted that the Council would have given this permission given the time to do so. The site was now an overgrown area protected by hoardings. The Board was shown

diagrams of the proposals and the elevations and noted that the design of the dwellings had gone from traditional to contemporary and back to a more traditional appearance. Local residents had wanted a community use of the site but these uses had not been tested and therefore this application should be considered on its planning merits. The application was served by local transport routes, had local amenities such as shops nearby and accorded with the Core Strategy and the NPPF. The density of the scheme at 44 dwellings accorded with the Core Strategy and integrated well with the Coldharbour Road area. The meeting was informed that the scheme had been amended to move it further from the residences in St Clement's Close. This scheme was supported by the New Homes Strategy Development Manager and the Leisure Manager had requested a contribution to off-site leisure access. Access to the site complied with Highways rules and all other impacts could be dealt with by planning conditions as set out in the supplementary report. However, the officer recommended an additional condition requiring the submission to the Council of full details of the sustainability measures on site before the construction commenced and the applicant had agreed to this.

The application was before the Board at the request of Cllr Shane Mochrie-Cox and it was a major development.

The Board heard the views of the public speaker who answered questions from Members.

The following points were made during discussion on this application:

- Following a question on whether the Council should require the former Public House to be rebuilt so that it could be legally demolished, the Principal Planner reiterated that whilst the demolition required prior approval, the method of demolition and proposed restoration of the site had been appropriate although the building had been demolished before the Council had made that decision. However, it was noted that approval of this application might set a precedent for early, unapproved demolition.
- The Board was advised that the officer had negotiated with the applicant with regard to off-site sports provision, education and healthcare and the application met the legal tests of being necessary, related to the development and reasonable. The applicant had also agreed to provide a piece of public art which related to the previous use of the site and the inclusion of a public footway and pedestrian crossing on New House Lane.
- The maintenance of the public art and associated landscaping would be dealt with via a legal agreement. Members were advised that it was expected that the community would be involved in choosing the design of the public art together with a preference for a local designer using a subject specific to the site - A Spitfire was suggested.
- The proposed condition was welcomed to deal with contamination on the site
- The use of wood cladding in the design of the dwellings and the inclusion of three storeys in some of the dwellings was mentioned as not in keeping with the character of the area. The scheme would also overlook a neighbouring school.
- The Board was also advised that difficulties had been experienced in accessing the planning portal to register objections to this application.
- The Board was informed that the former Battle of Britain Public House had been a local landmark and that residents would like to see the site allocated a community use. Residents also considered that 32 parking spaces, less than the national standard for 20 units, would not be enough and would cause congestion and parking issues in the locale.

- The highway junction of New House Lane and Coldharbour Road was not flat and was a busy junction
- It was noted that if permission continued to be refused on schemes such as this then the Council would not be able to deliver on its Government housing numbers and would have planning control removed by the Planning Inspectorate who would then release Green Belt sites not agreed by the Council. The application site and the scheme were NPPF and Local Plan compliant and should not therefore be refused.

Resolved that application 20171245 be DEFERRED to a future meeting of the Regulatory Board (Planning) to enable officers to liaise with the applicant to gain clarity of the s106 legal agreement in respect of the affordable housing offer, further details relating to the content, delivery and maintenance of the public art proposal on the site, to reduce the potential overlooking of the adjoining primary school and to address the Board's concerns regarding the use of suggested external facing materials such as wood cladding.

Note: (a) Mr James Sturgess (Agent) (a supporter) addressed the Board.
(b) Cllr Shane Mochrie-Cox spoke with the leave of the Chair.
(c) Cllr Christina Rolles spoke with the leave of the Chair.

(Cllr Lauren Sullivan returned to the Council Chamber and took the Chair.)

89.4 20181271 - Land South of Coldharbour Road, Northfleet DA11 8AB

The Board considered an application reference 20181271 in relation to land south of Coldharbour Road, Northfleet DA11 8AB of Britain, Coldharbour Road, Northfleet DA11 8NT for the erection of a Foodstore (Use Class A1 - Retail) and business units providing employment floorspace (to be used flexibly within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 - light industrial, general industrial and storage and distribution including the provision for ancillary retail sales to facilitate specialist, trade counter operations); creation of new infrastructure including a pedestrian footway / cycleway and 'toucan' crossing on Coldharbour Road, access, car parking and servicing; hard and soft landscaping and associated retaining structures and ground works. The Principal Planner introduced the application and gave a description of the site and advised that it was currently an uncultivated field with an access already built into the hammerhead roundabout serving Morrisons as the application site had been previously earmarked for development and Lidl, who was the intended occupier of the food retail unit, would be trading as a limited discount trader.

The Board was advised that there had been three previous planning permissions, the first in 2007 which had been renewed in 2010 and the last in 2018 which had included a recommended legal agreement for £50k to be spent on transport measures. Members' attention was drawn to paragraph 4.8.14 of the report and that this was a sustainable location which fulfilled the requirements of the Local Plan but was contrary to the Development Plan. The report had sought to include specialist advice on retail policies and viability of the out of centre retail site and also any possible effect on town centre viability and there was evidence to support additional retail space in the Borough. Visual improvements to the design had been made on the request of a Ward Councillor.

The Principal Planner set out the improvements to the transport and parking impacts and the highways mitigations that had been offered by the applicant as set out in the report. Traffic modelling predictions had noted that the traffic impact could be worse without the

development and its transport mitigations which included a footway and cycleway on the south side of Coldharbour Road; a footpath around the Morrison's dumbbell access road; a toucan crossing linking the site with the residential development on the north side of Coldharbour Road ; junction widening at the Wrotham Road roundabout ; the relocation of the poorly positioned bus layby in the underpass; and the approach to the A2 slip road to be split into two lanes with the inclusion of a pedestrian and cycle crossing. It was also the intention to prioritise the vehicles leaving from Morrisons on the hammerhead access roundabout. It was therefore considered that no harm would be caused to local amenity by the application.

In conclusion, the Board's attention was drawn to the letter from the applicant which had been circulated to Members which contained an additional condition proposed instead of that put forward by officers, which as explained by officers would require that the foodstore should not be built and occupied before the construction of the other employment floorspace. The applicant's letter instead sought to require practical completion of the employment buildings no later than 18 months following the opening of the foodstore.

The application was before the Board at the request of Cllr Shane Mochrie-Cox and it constituted a major development.

The Board heard the views of the public speakers who answered questions from Members.

The following points were made during discussion on this application:

- Following concern about possible congestion, the Board was advised that an industry standard modelling procedure had been undertaken and that the highway mitigation being offered by the applicant was substantial and should reduce the queuing traffic. The modelling had been reviewed by Kent Highways and Highways England and a Road Safety Audit undertaken.
- It was noted that a formal assessment of the retail offering in the Borough had concluded that there was a need for additional convenience retail space and this application fulfilled that need.
- The retail evidence in support of the application had been vigorously tested independently and the allocation in the Local Plan was no longer viable
- Concern was expressed about the Morrisons site and its environs and the problems with fly-tipping and litter and the possibility of designing in an interface between the fence and the footpath together with a requirement to keep the site clean and tidy. The Board was advised that the officer would consult with the applicant with a view to the possible inclusion of this suggestion in the service development management plan.
- Members were advised that there was not sufficient space to allow for the introduction of an additional lane on the road approaching the Wrotham Road roundabout from the site.
- Objections to all out of town retail developments were expressed because of the damage to the commercial viability of the town centre.
- Following a question on deliveries to the proposed store, the officer explained that an area had been set aside at the side of the building to enable lorry deliveries to manoeuvre within the site without impacting the car parking arrangements and this had been accepted by Kent Highways. In addition, a planning condition had been included to address this subject. It was intended that there would be 2 to 3 deliveries per day from the distribution centre which was less than a mile from the site. In

addition, all waste would be returned to the distribution centre after each delivery so no waste would need to be stored on site.

- It was explained that the interface between the two parts of the application site would be concluded before Lidl took possession of the retail store. Whilst it may not be possible to conclude construction on both parts of the site at the same time as a number of issues may crop up, the inclusion of 18 months grace would highlight this intention.
- The Board was advised that the employment floorspace (to be used flexibly within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8) had not yet been widely marketed. However, the applicant had been approached by a number of local and national businesses expressing their interest.
- It was intended that the construction of the buildings would take place on site and would, if permitted, commence after a 12 week archaeological assessment and would hopefully be completed in 2021.
- Following a question about customer numbers, Members were advised that the Lidl carpark was likely to be mainly full at peak times. A twenty minute shopping time was the average with a turnover of 300 customers per hour.
- It was intended that a payment scheme for trollies to encourage their return to store be implemented. The applicant also intended to liaise with Morrisons on this issue.
- The Board was advised that there would be 7 parking spaces for disabled persons and 6 electric vehicle charging bays installed.
- A request was made by a Ward Councillor that the Right of Way across the site currently fenced off be unblocked.
- A suggestion was made that the site could be made more sustainable with the use of solar panels on the site and the applicant's agent confirmed that he would be happy to receive a detailed condition should the application be permitted.

Resolved that, subject to referral to the Secretary of State as a departure from the development plan, application 20181271 be PERMITTED subject to the planning conditions as set out in the supplementary report, subject to minor modification regarding condition 7 (subdivision to exclude independent concessionary stores), the sustainability measures set out in condition 39 (sustainability) to include solar panels, and to a condition to the effect summarised in condition no.45 to ensure delivery of both elements of the development as set out in the decision notice issued by the Planning Department and made available on the following link:

<https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/planning-search>.

- Note:
- (a) Mr Tim Price (Agent) (a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (b) Mr Darren Cheeseman (a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (c) Mr Conor Lavery (a supporter) addressed the Board.
 - (d) Cllr Shane Mochrie-Cox spoke with the leave of the Chair.

89.5 20191047 - Longreach, 27 The Russets, Meopham, Gravesend DA13 0HH

The Board considered application reference 20191047 which proposed the demolition of a first floor extension above the ground floor integral garage and utility room to provide a replacement master bedroom, en-suite and hobby room. The Principal Planner (Major Sites) deemed the design of the extension acceptable and that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding properties or the adjacent heritage assets. In addition there was no conflict with local or national planning policy. There would be no

adverse impact on the surrounding highway network and no consultee or neighbour objections had been received

The application was before the Board because the application was a Gravesham Borough Councillor.

Resolved that application 20191047 be PERMITTED subject to the planning conditions to be set out in the decision notice issued by the Planning department and made available on the following link:
<https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/planning-search>.

89.6 20191027 - 12B Lennox Road, Gravesend DA11 0EP

The Board considered application reference 20191027 which proposed the demolition of an existing conservatory and two outbuildings, and the erection of a single storey rear extension and detached outbuilding. The Principal Planner (Major Sites) deemed the design of both the rear extension and outbuilding acceptable and that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding properties as the extension and outbuilding would be single storey and of a modest size. In addition there was no conflict with local or national planning policy. There would be no adverse impact on the surrounding highway network and no consultee or neighbour objections had been received

The application was before the Board because the application was a Gravesham Borough Councillor.

Resolved that application 20181027 be PERMITTED subject to the planning conditions to be set out in the decision notice issued by the Planning department and made available on the following link:
<https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/planning-search>.

90. Planning applications determined under delegated powers by the Director (Planning & Development)

A schedule showing applications determined by the determined by the Director (Planning & Development) under delegated powers had been published on the Council's website.

Close of meeting

The meeting ended at 11.35 pm