#### PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 November 2015

PART 5

Report of the Head of Planning

#### PART 5

Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

## Item 5.1 – 1 Stuppington Cottages, Norton Road, Norton

#### APPEAL DISMISSED

# **Observations**

Delegated refusal:

Full support for the Council's decision

# Item 5.2 – 10 Grovehurst Avenue, Kemsley

## **APPEAL ALLOWED**

# **Observations**

Delegated refusal:

A disappointing decision, where the Inspector has given little weight to the Council's concerns regarding the lack of adequate off street parking provision, finding on-street provision to be acceptable.

# • Item 5.3 – 27 Cumberland Drive, Lower Halstow

#### APPEAL DISMISSED

## **Observations**

Delegated refusal:

A technical decision, where the Council's interpretation of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 was held to be correct.

# Item 5.4 – 49 Parsonage Chase, Minster

#### APPEAL ALLOWED

# **Observations**

Delegated refusal:

A very disappointing decision – the Inspector has concluded that this backland scheme would not give rise to harm to visual or residential amenity, despite the dismissal of an appeal against a very similar proposal earlier this year..

# Item 5.5 – Medway Autos Ltd, London Road, Upchurch

#### **APPEAL DISMISSED**

# **Observations**

Delegated decision:

A good decision that supports the Council's policy of resisting large illuminated advertisements in the countryside.

# Item 5.6 – New Barns, Box Lane, Painters Forstal

## APPEAL PART DISMISSED/PART ALLOWED

# **Observations**

Delegated refusal:

Full support for the Council's decision to resist the substantial further enlargement of this rural bungalow. Officers had no objection to the proposed garage, but the Council does not have the option of partially approving an application.

# • Item 5.7 - Public Kiosk, Pavement nr Park entrance, High Street, Sheerness

#### **APPEAL DISMISSED**

# **Observations**

Delegated refusal:

Full support for the Council's decision for the refusal of permission for a stand alone cash machine which would have been located such that it would have been likely to give rise to crime or the fear of crime.