

TABLED UPDATE for Item 2.10 (16/507298/FULL) – Land at Rushenden Road, Queenborough

Further to the report on pages 119 to 137 of the agenda.

- (1) Further to paragraphs 9.24 and 9.25 (on page 129), the section 106 contributions will need to be revised to account for the loss of ONE unit as a result of the amended layout.
- (2) With regard to the KCC requirements, and based now upon 101 units (instead of 102) being: 95 applicable houses and 6 applicable flats, they advise as follows:
 - Primary build: £386,000
 - Primary Land – contribution no longer required because the HCA have now advised that they will provide KCC with the land for the school.
 - Community Learning £6103.43
 - Youth Service £3795.58
 - Libraries £4849.60
 - Social Care - £6159.99, plus one Wheelchair Adaptable Home as part of the on site affordable homes delivery
 - An Informative relating to the provision of broadband infrastructure to serve the development is also requested.
- (3) Further to paragraphs 9.15 to 9.18 (on pages 127 and 128), the provision of 30 Starter Homes will now be included in the S106 agreement.
- (4) The Environment Agency continue to note that the Flood Risk Assessment is not up to date, but are happy for a condition to be attached requiring minimum Finished Floor Levels of 5.52m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).
- (5) Further to paragraph 7.04 (on page 124), the Lower Medway Internal Drainage Board objection in regards any development within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the adjoining watercourse in order to safeguard maintenance access has now been satisfactorily addressed; an amended plan (and sections through the maintenance strip and watercourse) have now been provided showing an eight-metre maintenance strip on the southern side of the watercourse. And the LMIDB now advise as follows: "*should the Board receive a Consent application and the application referred to drawing no. 5666-GA-102 [the amended plan showing the sections] I will happily recommend to the Board that Consent be granted. In this form the Board would very happy.*"
- (6) Delegated authority is sought to impose an additional condition requiring the provision of the retaining wall and maintenance strip before the 1st occupation of any of the dwellings facing the LMIDB watercourse.
- (7) The agent has requested that a number of pre-commencement conditions be worded to allow preparatory works to begin ahead of details being submitted to comply with the conditions in question. I have no objection to this request and ask for delegation to amend the conditions as necessary.

- (8) I have asked the agent to provide brick walls at key locations and discussions are on-going about which locations are appropriate for this boundary treatment, rather the fences or hedging. This matter can be dealt with under conditions (16)[landscaping] and (28)[boundary walls], though the latter will require amendment to reflect the locations where boundary walls are agreed to.
- (9) Condition (30) bin stores, needs to be amended to add "before the 1st dwelling is occupied" to the first sentence.
- (10) The comments of the Greenspaces Manager are awaited.
- (11) KCC Highways and Transportation agree with the conclusions of the submitted Transport Assessment, and do not anticipate unacceptable impacts on the local road network, including Rushenden Road and Thompsett Way. However, with regard to the layout of roads proposed, they make a number of relatively minor points, which need to be addressed in order for planning permission to be granted. KCC Highways and Transportation have indicated to me that it should be possible for the layout to be amended to satisfactorily address the points. These are as follows:

"First Avenue is restricted to single lane working due to the uninterrupted on-street parking that occurs along its southern side, serving the existing terraced properties and also associated with the Childrens Centre on the junction with Rushenden Road. The additional traffic generated by the proposed houses on First Avenue will increase the risk of conflict along this section of highway, and it is likely that vehicles will overrun the new footway or encourage the existing parking to straddle the southern footway. The carriageway should be widened along the site frontage to accommodate two-way vehicle flows, so that pedestrians are not exposed to risk.

2. The condition of First Avenue has deteriorated following the demolition and clearance works alongside it. Replacement and disturbance to the current kerbline and the construction of development proposals along its frontage, together with additional burden from construction traffic and ultimately increased usage due to the new development, would warrant improvements to the current road surface.

3. The new junction layout onto Rushenden Road is unclear on drawing 50623_SP(90)001 Rev25, as the colouring appears to indicate a wide bellmouth carriageway and narrow footpath on the southern side.

4. The drawings should clearly indicate that the existing site access is to be permanently stopped-up and the footway established across it. The submitted drawing is ambiguous, with kerb alignments not tied into the OS basemap.

5. Tandem visitor spaces are shown in the parking courtyard by plot 7, which cannot be used independently. These should be independently accessible, as currently the second visitor would block the first vehicle in.

6. The internal road layout should be laid out to a 20mph design speed. The current spine road through the site does not contain sufficient speed restraint features to encourage the low speed. Kent Design Guide would seek a maximum distance of 60m between features, but the distance between the ramps outside plots 69 and 77 is 65m. Additionally, the bend in the road near the crossroads by plot 18 would have to have a centre line radius of 20m to count as a speed restraint feature. In this location, I would suggest that the crossroads be formed as a raised table.

7. The footway outside plot 28 ends abruptly, either depositing pedestrians onto a grass verge or the ramp of the traffic calming feature, which is not considered suitable for foot traffic. The footway should lead pedestrians onto the level shared surface.

8. Similarly, the footway to the side of plot 68 leads pedestrians to the rear boundary fence of that plot, rather than onto the shared surface. This also results in no pedestrian visibility between pedestrians and vehicles emerging from the shared surfaced stub.

9. Again, the footway in front of plot 82 terminates onto grass verge, so the desire line for pedestrians accessing plots 78 to 81 will send them along the carriageway.

10. No visibility is provided at the parking space for plot 67, as the vehicle will emerge directly from behind the fence around the rear garden of plot 68. This parking space should also be 2.7m wide to mitigate against being positioned against the boundary fence.

11. Visibility may also be obscured for the rear parking space of plot 43, as the fence around the garden will limit sightlines for emerging vehicles. Again this parking space should also be 2.7m wide due to the physical obstruction of the fence restricting the ability to open vehicle doors.

12. The footway around plot 98 should extend beyond the ramp to connect to the shared surface.

13. It is assumed that the parking schedule is incorrectly labelled for plots 94 to 101, as the layout appears to suggest that parking is associated for plots 95 to 102."

- (12) The applicant has provided a further amended layout and explanatory note in response to these comments. KCC Highways and Transportation are now considering this information. I therefore seek delegated authority to deal with these points, and to seek further amendments if required.
- (13) I therefore seek delegated authority to approve the application subject to:
- (i) The comments of the Greenspaces Manager, and to the imposition of any developer contributions required by him;
 - (ii) The imposition of the additional condition as requested by the Environment Agency, a further condition in respect of the LMIDB maintenance strip, and the amendment of conditions (30)(bin stores);
 - (iii) Fine-tuning the wording of the pre-commencement conditions, condition (2)(approved plans) and condition (28)(boundary treatment);
 - (iv) The amendment of the layout to satisfactorily address the comments of KCC Highways and Transportation; and
 - (v) Completion of the S106 agreement (including refinement of the payments to reflect the reduction in dwelling numbers to 101);

JRW – 2/2/2017