

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 JANUARY 2014

Present: Councillor Collins (Chairman), and
Councillors Ash, Black, Cox, English, Harwood, Hogg,
Moriarty, Nelson-Gracie, Paterson, Mrs Robertson and
J.A. Wilson

Also Present: Councillors Newton, Pickett and Ross

232. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

It was noted that an apology for absence had been received from Councillor Chittenden.

233. **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

It was noted that Councillor English was substituting for Councillor Chittenden.

234. **NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS**

Councillors Pickett and Ross indicated their wish to speak on the reports of the Head of Planning and Development relating to applications MA/13/0297 and MA/13/0298.

235. **ITEMS WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA**

There were none.

236. **URGENT ITEMS**

The Chairman stated that, in his opinion, the update report of the Head of Planning and Development should be taken as an urgent item because it contained further information relating to the applications to be considered at the meeting.

237. **DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

238. **DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING**

All Members stated that they had been lobbied in relation to applications MA/13/0297 and MA/13/0298.

239. EXEMPT ITEMS

RESOLVED: That the items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

240. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 DECEMBER 2013

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2013 be approved as a correct record and signed.

241. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS (IF ANY)

The petition in relation to application MA/13/0297 was presented during consideration of this application.

242. MA 13 0297 - BALTIC WHARF, ST PETERS STREET, MAIDSTONE, KENT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Development regarding this application and application MA/13/0298.

Mr Jeffery, petitioner and objector, Mr Rees, for the Applicant, Councillors Pickett and Ross (Visiting Members) addressed the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Planning Inspectorate be advised that, had there not been an appeal for non-determination, the Committee would have refused planning permission for the reasons set out below:-

1. The proposed development does not comply with the Council's strategy for future retail development in Maidstone as set out within the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan (2000), or within the emerging Maidstone Local Plan (which are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework), which designate other sites for new retail development and do not designate this site for such a use.
2. The proposed development does not comply with the sequential approach set out in paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and within Policy R2 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan (2000) as it is out-of-centre in retail terms; and there are more sequentially preferable sites available which could accommodate the proposed development with due flexibility on the part of the developer.
3. The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on planned investment in Maidstone town centre, which would put at risk the Council's strategy to secure new retail development on the Maidstone East site and elsewhere within the town centre set out in the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan (2000), and in the emerging Maidstone Local Plan, and is therefore contrary to paragraph 26 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed development, due in particular to the loss of the stairwell and north wing, would result in substantial harm to the

Grade II Listed Building, which is not considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. The proposal therefore conflicts with the advice given in the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 131, 132 and 133.

5. The proposed development would result in the loss of a tree that is protected by a Preservation Order (2 of 2013). The loss of this tree would have a significantly detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the locality, and would therefore fail to comply with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Voting: 11 – For 0 – Against 1 – Abstention

243. MA 13 0298 - BALTIC WHARF, ST PETERS STREET, MAIDSTONE, KENT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Development regarding this application and application MA/13/0297.

Mr Rees, for the Applicant, Councillors Pickett and Ross (Visiting Members) addressed the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Planning Inspectorate be advised that, had there not been an appeal for non-determination, the Committee would have refused listed building consent for the reason set out below:-

The proposed development, due in particular to the loss of the stairwell and north wing, would result in substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Building, which is not considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. The proposal therefore conflicts with the advice given in the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 131, 132 and 133.

Voting: 11 – For 0 – Against 1 – Abstention

244. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that the site visit to see solar farms had taken place the day before and that they had an opportunity to speak to one of the landowners which was very helpful. The Planning Officer had sent a letter of thanks to the landowner and the Chairman stated that he would also send a letter of thanks from Members.

245. DURATION OF MEETING

6.05 p.m. to 7.15 p.m.