

Deferred Item 1 Reference Number 17/500727/OUT

Tabled Update for Manor Farm, Key Street, Sittingbourne

1. Two further emails of objection have been received from local residents. One refers to air quality issues which have already been raised, but the second introduces new information. The objector refers to a response from the Leader of the Council responding to the following question: *'What plans do the Council have to expand the AQMAs, as there are major concerns expressed with the air quality at Key Street and Grovehurst, so should these not be with AQMAs to ensure accurate measurements are taken? This is both to prove the current situation and also to monitor the council's statement in its air quality strategy that air pollution will naturally decrease with technology. There are currently applications in with planning for 2,500 plus houses all within touching distance of the A249 and hence through/under Key Street roundabout. This excludes the Crown Quay and Easthall areas.'*

The objector's email is quoted in full below:

'Firstly paragraph 3.11 [on Page 4 of the agenda] states that the AQMAs at St Pauls Street is almost a mile away when it is in fact 1.25 miles and the East Street AQMA is 1.25 miles when it is 1.9 miles. Not significant but the report should be accurate for such an important decision.

My main complaint concerns the quotes in paragraph 3.12 "The Council does not have data in respect of levels of air pollution at the site or in the vicinity of it" and "We do not have any current evidence of an exceedance of AQ guidelines here and hence are fairly relaxed from an AQ perspective..." Yet, the response I received below (from the Leader, as noted above) states "We have monitored NO₂ at Key Street and Sonora Fields over a number of years and last year the monitoring identified that levels of this pollutant are just above the annual mean (40.6 µg/m³) at Key Street" and as a result Cllr Bowles says "To this end and because the Key Street data indicate there may be a problem we have increased the NO₂ tube monitoring at seven locations around the Key Street roundabout and Chestnut Street from 1 July. This monitoring will continue for a minimum of a year to identify any trends and provide a more detailed picture of NO₂ in the area."

I am therefore concerned that the planning team are not using the same data that Cllr Bowles has access to and that the recommendation of this application should therefore be refused or on hold until such time that the pollutant levels are understood.

To advise granting permission when there is evidence that air pollutants are excessive in close proximity to the site would be wrong at this time and I urge you to either reconsider the reports recommendation or advise the planning committee to refuse this application.'

The Environmental Protection Team Leader has responded as follows: *'The distances are only approximate and are as the crow flies – apologies for any inaccuracies. The reference to these distances was to show that at such distances the effect of the pollution on and from these two existing AQMAs on this site is negligible.*

There are periodic exceedances of the annual mean for Nitrogen Dioxide at Key Street, but there are few receptors, which is another important factor to consider when deciding whether

or not to declare an AQMA in this vicinity. The figures at Sonora Fields are typical for an urban background site – well below the annual mean values for NO2 and particulates

We do not have air pollution measurements for everywhere in the Borough – we already monitor at more locations than anywhere else in Kent. We have just begun to collect data at seven new diffusion tube sites in the vicinity of Wises Lane/Chestnut Street. When we have 12 months data we will be in a better position be able to comment on air pollution levels in this part of the Borough.

There is only one set of data collected and monitored by the Council – these are the figures being quoted.'

As such, Officers are satisfied that there will likely be no significant adverse impact on air quality arising from the development and that the development would not result in any exceedances on the Air Quality Objectives in any of the AQMAs within the Borough.

2. As the matter has not been re-iterated in the Contributions section of the update report, it should be noted that the amount of affordable housing for this site is that required for sites within the Sittingbourne area – 10%.

3. In conclusion, officers remain of the view that the proposed development is in accordance with the allocation in the adopted Local Plan and that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions (as set out on Pages 8 to 15 of the agenda) and the signing of a suitably-worded Section 106 Agreement.

AJS – 14 August 2018