

**APPENDIX 3**



## Technical Note

To: **Swale Borough Council**  
From: **Iceni Projects Ltd**  
Date: **8<sup>th</sup> November 2021**  
Title: **Parcel G, Land at Harps Farm, Minster-on-sea, Kent**

### a. Introduction

---

1. Iceni Projects Ltd (IPL) have been appointed by Swale Borough Council (SBC) ("the Client"), to undertake a further highways review of additional information provided by the developer relative to the proposed development at Parcel G, Land at Harps Farm, Minster-on-sea in Kent ("the Site").
2. The Site lies within the local jurisdiction of SBC, whilst Kent County Council (KCC) is the designated highways authority for the reserved matters application. Given the focus of the local concerns relate to highway issues, which KCC highways have given detailed highway advice in relation to, SBC felt it was important to obtain independent highway advice before they present their report to planning committee.
3. This is the second Transport Note (TN) provided by IPL on this development and follows on from the previous TN submitted on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 to SBC, which dealt with a number of technical matters relating to the reserved matters application that needed to be resolved.

### Technical Review

---

4. SBC have again reached out to IPL and requested that we provide a further independent highways review of the technical responses relative to the work submitted by the developer before SBC report their recommendation to planning committee. This review will focus on two matters that still required further updates, which include the following:
  - Reassessing the quantum and layout of parking;
  - Assessing vehicle tracking / swept path analysis.
5. These further iterations must also be considered in the context of the outline planning permission, which has already been granted and adopted policies/standards.
6. This TN has been produced to review the additional work undertaken by the developer to address the afore-mentioned matters raised by IPL in our previous TN and to ensure that a thorough assessment is undertaken and reviewed to the satisfaction of SBC.

**APPENDIX 3****b. Parking Requirement**

---

7. IPL previously recommended that although not referenced within the Design Access Statement (DAS), SBC Parking Standards (June 2020), state that where parking spaces abut a footway or carriageway, a 0.5m setback should be provided. It went on further to say that a parking space in front of a garage, car port or car barn should provide for the full length of the vehicle plus an allowance for opening of the garage door. A 1.0m clearance should normally be provided in front of garages. As such, it was requested that an additional 0.5m setback is therefore required to meet standards throughout the development and that further design considerations are required with regards to the layout (parking) for this to be acceptable.
8. The developer has undertaken a review of the layout with the aim of achieving a 6.0m length where spaces abut a footway or carriageway, noting instances where the spaces provided the 5.5m bay length but not the additional 0.5m sought by the latest parking standards. The layout has therefore been reviewed and updated to achieve the 6.0m length, where possible.
9. The most recent layout review by IPL verified that this update applied to spaces associated with a number of plots throughout the development and those additional updates were provided for plots 31, 33-45, 54-57, 60-70, 108-113, 126-129, 135, 137, 141, 145-152, 153-158, and the LAP area. IPLs review of the layout concurs with the additional information provided by the developer and that most of the spaces now provide that additional 0.5m. It is noted and confirmed following our analysis that it is more difficult to achieve this separation at plots 31-40 due to the back-to-back privacy separation distances that have to be maintained. As we understand it, the developer has had previous discussions with the officers which are considered to override the additional 0.5m required for these plots. We would agree with the developer that the additional 0.5m is guidance only and concur that the bay dimension requirement is still met and given the scheme design originally pre-dates the latest standards. We do also recognise that the scheme was drawn up and submitted prior to the parking standards being adopted but this would be weighted against these standards being provided in draft with a material weight and being given due consideration in the planning process.
10. It should also be noted that the majority of the shared surfaces are actually wider than required in order to achieve a 6.0m aisle width for cars to manoeuvre in / out of the spaces and in the unlikely event that a 0.5m overhang into the shared surface occurs, this would not affect the shared surface space. The majority of the parking spaces in front of garages/car ports complied already, although the parking boxes were shown to abut the front of each garage, with space behind the boxes and are not being marked out.
11. In summary, following further design consideration by the developer, such as parking spaces in front of garages and spaces that abut a footway or carriageway has been undertaken and that the work provided indicates that the additional 0.5m has been applied to parking spaces where appropriate taking account of privacy separation distances. Therefore, based on the additional information submitted, IPL believe this to be acceptable in terms of a design alteration.

**c. General Tracking Comments – Servicing**

---

12. For completeness, the developer has now issued the general tracking drawing for the whole Site, which IPL did not have sight of when setting out comments in the September 2021 Note. That said, whilst the general tracking drawing for the whole Site has now been provided, IPL would reiterate its previous position that this layout could have been cleaned up in terms of presentation.

## APPENDIX 3

13. Firstly, the refuse vehicle tracks overrun a proposed visitor parking bay to the south-east of the Site, which could have been rectified by providing clearer tracks through this section of the layout. Secondly, there are multiple areas where the refuse tracking follows the centre of the carriageway, rather than the kerb line. Most noticeably, the central spine road of the Site where the width of the road is 7.1m and adequate for a refuse vehicle and car to pass to pass one another, but they've shown the refuse vehicle in the centre of the road, so it looks like two-way working is not possible, when clearly it is. Again, this could have been presented in a more clear and concise way.
14. Lastly, there's a 2.0m offset dashed line around the carriageway to the north-west of the Site, which the developer has tracked to, where this is most noticeable. IPL have added a note on the attached *Drawing No. 21 – T091\_01A*, although it is not absolutely clear what the dashed line is representing.
15. It is worth acknowledging that two-way working is not achievable through the bends of the Site layout, although given the refuse vehicle is an ad-hoc vehicle movement over-engineered roads may encourage higher speeds throughout the Site. Based on the refuse vehicle tracking provided within the updated drawings, it would again suggest that two-way working is not achievable on the straights either, although clearly if the tracking had been presented in a more concise way, then this would have been shown to be achievable.
16. IPL previously acknowledged that whilst vehicle tracking had been provided, only selected sections have been analysed. For completeness it was requested that the whole development should be tracked to demonstrate that the refuse freighter can negotiate its way through it.
17. It is important to recognise that whilst this is a matter of presentation, this is not considered an impediment given that KCC highways raised no objection to the tracking presented by the developer and therefore have accepted it from a highways perspective. On this basis, IPL believe this to be acceptable.

**d. Conclusion**

---

18. This TN has reviewed the further work undertaken by the developer and has provided a number of comments on the revised Site layout. The Site is acceptable in highways terms with the additional commentary being picked up within the updated layout, which are itemised below:
  - i) Further design consideration has been undertaken with regards to the layout (parking) and this has now been deemed to be acceptable;
  - ii) Additional vehicle tracking has now been provided, whereas previously only selected sections have been analysed. For completeness, the whole development has been shown to be tracked that demonstrates that the refuse freighter can negotiate its way through it. IPL was not aware of the full tracking analysis previously provided to KCC and have noted that again the tracking could have been cleaned up in terms of presentation.
19. On this basis the highway safety and amenity of these routes providing access to the Site are deemed acceptable and in accordance with relevant policies and standards.

APPENDIX 3

