

19/501564/EIFUL – land at Perry Court, Faversham – TABLED UPDATE FOR ITEM 2.4

Further to the report at Pages 58 to 78 of the Agenda, and – in particular, the comments of KCC Highways and Transportation, at Paragraphs 6.03 to 6.07, an update has now been received from KCC Highways and Transportation, which reads as follows:

“I have contacted our Roadworks Coordination team to obtain an update on the works programme. They have confirmed as follows:

- *A permit has been granted to Walkers (BDW’s new civils contractor for the S278 highway works) for 3-way traffic signals on the A2/Brogdale Road junction from 6th January to 8th February. During this time, the junction widening works will take place.*
- *This will then be followed by 2-way traffic signals on Brogdale Road until 25th March, in order to carry out the road and footway widening along the remainder of its length.*
- *At some point after that, a road closure is anticipated so that Brogdale Road can be planed out and resurfaced. This is expected to take 3 days, but the Roadworks Coordination team are looking into the possibility of requesting that this is done during overnight closures later in the year, when road temperatures are unlikely to fall below the critical zero for laying asphalt.*

In effect, the S278 highway works will be operationally complete by the end of March. The resurfacing wasn’t specified in the planning obligation, or shown on any of the listed drawings, so whilst it is required to be included in the S278 as a consequence of the physical disturbance the widening works will cause to the longevity of the existing highway, it wouldn’t necessarily be covered by the planning trigger point. The point to note, is that the footway and carriageway would have been widened as required, so that they will be suitable widths to take the additional movement.”

Members will note that the highway works required pursuant to the planning permission will not now require the closure of Brogdale Road. It is also worth noting that this should mean that these works are complete by 25th March.

I have also received an update from the applicant, which confirms that number of dwellings occupied is seven, rather than nine as set out at Paragraph 8.03 of the report.

In conclusion, officers remain of the view that while it is obviously not ideal that the development is in breach of condition (37) of the outline planning permission, it is appropriate to allow the variation of the condition as proposed by this application.