

## Planning Committee Minutes - 15 March 2017

### Planning Committee – 17 May 2017

Report Author                                **Iain Livingstone, Planning Applications Manager**

Portfolio Holder                            **Cllr Lin Fairbrass, Community Services**

Status    **For Decision**

Classification:                                **Unrestricted**

Previously Considered by                **Planning Committee 19 April 2017**

#### **Executive Summary:**

This report concerns the minutes of the March Planning Committee, which were agreed by Planning Committee at the meeting on 19 April 2017. These minutes did not accurately reflect the decision of Planning Committee on the 15 March in relation to Planning Application F/TH/16/0924 – Land formerly used as Club union Convalescent Home, Reading Street. The decision of the Committee was to refuse the application on two grounds, and the minutes only state one ground. This agenda item is to agree the revised minutes to accurately reflect the decision of the Committee.

#### **Recommendation:**

Members approve the revised copy of the minutes for the meeting of 15 March 2017.

#### **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Financial and Value for Money</b>	No implications
<b>Legal</b>	<p>The reasons for any decision must be formally recorded in the minutes and a copy placed on file. It is imperative that the agreed minutes of any Planning Committee meeting reflect the discussion that occurred and the resolution and decision of the meeting.</p> <p>In this instance the application in question has been refused and that decision has been appealed by the applicant. It is therefore key that the Council's record of events that lead to the refusal of the application accurately reflects the actions taken by the Council.</p>
<b>Corporate</b>	The recording of minutes of previous meeting is enshrined within the Council's constitution and is a requirement of the Council.
<b>Equalities Act 2010 &amp; Public Sector Equality Duty</b>	Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people

	<p>who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.</p> <p>Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy &amp; maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage &amp; civil partnership.</p> <p>In the opinion of the author of this report the Public Sector equality duty is not engaged or affected by this decision.</p>
--	---

## 1.0 Matters for decision

1.1 At the Planning Committee meeting on 15 March 2017, the Committee refused the planning application at Land Formerly Used as Club Union Convalescent Home, Reading Street, Broadstairs for the erection of 30 dwellings together with associated access and landscaping following demolition of 30 Convent Road, under reference F/TH/16/0924, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the number, location and design of the residential units, would appear out of keeping with the surrounding pattern of development, and severely detrimental to the historic character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area, contrary to Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraphs 17, 58, 60 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The applicant has failed to enter into a legal agreement to secure 30% affordable housing, and the delivery of the necessary planning obligations required in order to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development on the local infrastructure and make the development acceptable in all other respects. The application is therefore contrary to Policies CF2, H14 and SR5 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.2 At the Planning Committee meeting on 19 April 2017, members agreed the minutes produced outlined the decisions made the previous month on the 15 March 2017. These minutes did not accurately reflect the decision of Planning Committee on the 15 March in relation to the application, as only the second reason for refusal was stated. Therefore it is requested that the Planning Committee reconfirm that planning application - F/TH/16/0924 – Land formerly used as Club union Convalescent Home, Reading Street was refused on the 15 March 2017 due to both the reasons outlined at paragraph 1.1.

## 2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The Planning Committee reconfirm that planning application - F/TH/16/0924 – Land formerly used as Club union Convalescent Home, Reading Street was refused on the 15 March 2017 due to both the reasons outlined at paragraph 1.1 of this report namely:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the number, location and design of the residential units, would appear out of keeping with the surrounding pattern of development, and severely detrimental to the historic character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area, contrary to Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraphs 17, 58, 60 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The applicant has failed to enter into a legal agreement to secure 30% affordable housing, and the delivery of the necessary planning obligations required in order

to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development on the local infrastructure and make the development acceptable in all other respects. The application is therefore contrary to Policies CF2, H14 and SR5 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer:	Iain Livingstone, Planning Applications Manager
Reporting to:	Helen Havercroft, Head of Growth and Development

### **Appendix List**

<i>Appendices</i>	<i>None</i>
-------------------	-------------

### **Corporate Consultation**

<b>Finance</b>	Matthew Sanham, 8 May 2017
<b>Legal</b>	Ciara Feeney, 8 May 2017