

16/508602/OUT – Land at Preston Fields, Salters Lane, Faversham

TABLED UPDATE FOR ITEM 2.4, **AMENDED VERSION CIRCULATED ON 2<sup>ND</sup> MARCH 2018**

1) Since the production of the report, ELEVEN additional letters have been received. Issues are as summarised at Paragraph 6.01 (on Page 26 and 27 of the agenda) and with new issues raised as follows:

- Various concerns about the level and comprehensivity of the information provided in the Technical Note (revised January 2018) in general and, in particular, in respect of the drawing showing the proposed access on to the A2;
- The proximity to the ambulance station and the KCC Depot are sited as factors that could affect road safety in the vicinity of the new junction;
- Given scale of this development, and Perry Court, both bus stops on the A2 near to the site need to be upgraded as they are likely to be in “*constant and frequent use*”;
- Concern expressed that waiting buses will disrupt traffic flow and cause potential road safety problem;
- Development is not well designed for pedestrian and cycle safety;
- The position of the access on to the A2 (which as shown may not be safe) should be moved so that it is directly opposite the entrance to Preston Park
- With regard to cycle safety, the design of the entrance on to the A2, may cause cyclists to break various Highway Code rules;
- Showing the junction of the A2/A251 as a roundabout is misleading – even if it is intended to be illustrative – as it is not known whether this is the form that the junction upgrade will ultimately take;
- Traffic lights – rather than a roundabout – should be provided at the A2/A251 junction;
- It is suggested that the contribution (of £87,000) to be made by this development to upgrading the A2/A251 junction may not be adequate;
- The applicant’s drawing showing the access on to the A2 has been annotated to illustrate 3<sup>rd</sup> party concerns;
- The local MP and the Transport Secretary have been informed of 3<sup>rd</sup> party concerns about the access arrangements for the junction with the A2;
- Concern is expressed that KCC Highways are not opposed to the development;
- It is requested that the “data and statistical analysis collected by KCC Highways to support their ‘no objection’ is published at least 24 hours before Planning Committee;

## Planning Committee 5 March 2018

- The highway layout for the development should be planned in a way that recognises plans for "...a 20 mph zone across the town";
- The proposed road layout would set a bad precedent for subsequent development south of the A2;
- The development will cause noise pollution and "smells";
- "The Planning Committee appears to be ill-led and badly advised";
- The development would detract from visual amenity; and
- Increased footfall on routes into the Town Centre will reduce security for people living along those routes.

2) The Town Council have submitted comments objecting to the application, which read as follows [my responses are in red]:

*"Reasons:*

*(A) Application is premature as plans regarding A2/A251 junction have yet to be decided.*

This does not constitute a reason to refuse or even defer the application, as with other housing schemes recently approved in the Faversham area (for example Perry Court Farm (15/504264/OUT) and Oare Gravel Works (SW/14/0257), the development will be subject to a financial contribution (of £87,900) towards the cost of the upgrade to the A2/A251 junction. It is also worth noting that KCC Highways and Transportation raise no objection to this planning application (see Paragraph 7.20 of the Committee report).

*(B) Highway – details on highways in the report are not convincing. The plans do not show the roundabout/lights proposed at junction of A251 and A2.*

The Highway Technical Note (Revised January 2018) is, as set out in the Committee report, acceptable to both KCC Highways and Transportation and Highways England. It is noted that the relevant drawing, namely F16038/02 Revision D, shows the roundabout option, rather than making clear that it is also possible that a traffic-signal controlled junction might ultimately be delivered instead. However, the key point here is that these works are separate from the planning application and the ultimate solution does not have a bearing upon the determination of the planning application.

*(C) Air Quality – this development would have a negative impact on Ospringe.*

Members will note the comments of the Environmental Protection Team Leader (see Paragraph 7.09 of the Committee report) who raises no objection, the relevant paragraphs in the 'appraisal', including Paragraph 9.60 and condition (35), which will be used to secure the mitigation. This issue does not amount to a reason for refusal.

*(D) Access – the concerns over access have not been addressed. This is a busy area, with ambulance, fire station and building supplier in the vicinity. Information on existing access to these sites is insufficient.*

As set out above, it is pertinent that both highway authorities raise no objection to the development, including the proposed access arrangements.

*(E) Insufficient information and detail relating the east and west bound bus stops serving the proposed development*

Information about the number of buses that use these stops is held by KCC, and KCC Highways and Transportation will have considered the implications for bus services as part of their overall assessment of the implications of the development.

*(F) Inadequate pedestrian crossing points on A2 and A251.*

This issue will have been considered by KCC Highways and Transportation, as well as by this Council and the proposed arrangements are considered to be acceptable. Among other things, the proposed upgrade to the A2/A251 junction will provide an opportunity to ensure suitable pedestrian crossing facilities are in place at that point. The pavement to be provided between the development access onto the A2 and the vehicular access to the Abbey School (see condition 36 in the Committee report and 3<sup>rd</sup> last bullet point on Page 51) will significantly improve accessibility for pedestrians and lessen the demand to cross the A2 in the vicinity of the proposed development.

*(G) No drawing to show the requested footpath link from the south side of the A2 from the A251 to the Abbey School or a crossing point over the A251*

Although a drawing has not been provided at this time, as noted above, if planning permission is granted the permission will include measures to ensure that it is provided.

*(H) No layby for bus on Canterbury bound side of A2.*

On the one hand, this is not a requirement of Policy A16 in the Local Plan (set out in full on Pages 24 and 25 of the Agenda – see also the plan on Page 36). It is also, as stated above not required by KCC Highways and Transportation or justified by the level of bus traffic along the A2.

*Comment:*

*(I) A carpark should be included at the northern end of the site for cars presently parked on the A2. Yellow lines should be painted to facilitate traffic flow on the A2.*

This is not a requirement of Policy A16 in the Local Plan, and it is considered that the proposed provision of landscaped open space at the northern end of the site is more appropriate. In any case, it would not be reasonable to require the prospective developer to provide this car park to address a pre-existing situation, unrelated to the proposed housing.

## Planning Committee 5 March 2018

(J) *The Town Council requests a master plan of the area showing connectivity.*"

It is considered that the potential connectivity for all modes of transport between the proposed development and other areas of the site can be understood without the need for the proposed masterplan.

- (3) The applicant has confirmed - in response to a query from KCC Highways and Transportation - that the pavement from the site access to the bus stop just to the east will be widened to two metres in width (and this is shown on drawing F16038/O2 Revision D).
- (4) The applicants advises that while their surveyors, when reviewing the site, noted young Japanese knotweed plants in the bottom field (adjacent to the M2), this is not within the application site red edge. In any case, I do not consider this to be an issue upon which the application could be determined.
- (5) Further to the summary of the contributions requested by KCC Development Contributions Team, at Paragraph 7.17 on Page 31 of the agenda, the revised amount (assuming 250 houses are ultimately developed) is incorrect; rather than £1,770,951.60, the actually amount payable would be £1,181,002.50.
- (6) Further to the discussion of affordable housing in the report (see Paragraph 9.64), with regard to the tenure split, the applicant has now provided a detailed response setting out their case for a different split, with a lower proportion of rented tenure, being agreed.
- (7) Delegated authority is sought to agree the ultimate tenure split and to agree the number of wheelchair-adapted dwellings to be provided. With regard to the latter point, the number being sought is four, not three as stated in the 14<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Paragraph 9.64.
- (8) Contrary to Paragraph 10.03, on page 53 of the Agenda, the archaeology condition is no.14, not no.13. Similarly, the reference at Paragraph 10.07, on Page 54, should be to Paragraph 9.60, not 9.54 to 9.59. And at Paragraph 10.10, the reference – in respect of infrastructure - should be to 9.64, not 9.61.
- (9) In conclusion, officers consider that Members have all the information needed in order to determine the application, and remain firmly of the view that the development as proposed is acceptable subject to conditions as set out in the report (on Pages 55 to 63) and to the signing of a suitably-worded Section 106 agreement. Delegated authority is therefore sought to approve the application subject to the signing of a suitably-worded Section 106 agreement to cover the matters set out in the report at Paragraph 9.64 and with authority to agree the tenure split (between rented and intermediate tenure) for the affordable housing and the number of wheelchair-adapted affordable

## **Planning Committee 5 March 2018**

dwellings, and to the inclusion of the conditions listed in the report. Delegated authority is also sought to make such amendments to the wording of the Section 106 agreement and the conditions as may reasonably be necessary.

JRW – 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2018