

APPENDIX B

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 16/508602/OUT		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL		
Outline application for erection of up to 250 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access		
ADDRESS Land At Preston Fields Salters Lane Faversham Kent ME13 8YD		
WARD Watling	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Preston Field Land Trustees AGENT HOW Planning

The Major Projects Officer drew Members' attention to the tabled update which included officer responses to issues raised by Faversham Town Council. He reported that four further letters had been received, which included issues already noted in the report, plus comments which included: there should be space for a car park (for cars that currently park on the A2); there should be a 20mph speed limit through Faversham; housing schemes were dealt with on a case-by-case basis, however this should be on a cumulative basis; the proposals were unrealistic; the design of the road junction between the scheme and the A251 was questioned; and emergency services would be delayed by the proposed road layout at the A2/A251 junction.

The Major Projects Officer reminded Members that this site was allocated for housing in the Local Plan. He referred Members to paragraph (5) of the tabled update which outlined the corrected amount being sought by the KCC Developer Contribution Team as a developer contribution (£1,181,002.50).

Eve Martin, an objector, spoke against the application.

James Berggren, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded.

The Chairman read out a tabled statement from Councillor David Simmons, one of the Ward Members as he was unable to attend the meeting:

'You will be considering the above outline application at tonight's planning committee meeting. It is noted that this is an allocated housing site and that the development would be in accordance with the current Local Plan. I can therefore see little grounds for you to vote for refusal.

However, I would request that you consider carefully matters relating to air quality. You will be aware that Swale Borough Council is working on an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP), which will include various actions along the length of the A2 to improve air quality.

This application provides the opportunity to provide a car park at the northern end of the site next to the A2. The aim would be to provide car parking spaces for the

APPENDIX B

properties along Canterbury Road (A2) between the site and Salters Lane, Faversham. We could then introduce no parking outside these houses. (I note that there is one disabled bay). It is well known that air quality can be improved where traffic flows are steady and stop/starts are avoided. This is a particularly narrow section of the A2 where, because of parked cars, two large vehicles cannot pass each other.

If you think this idea has merit you could perhaps defer a decision to allow officers to work with the applicant to achieve this improvement to air quality.'

In response to a question, the Kent County Council (KCC) Senior Development Planner (Highways) explained that in terms of safe access, it was down to the design and also driver behaviour. He explained that the proposed accesses onto the A2 and A251 from the site both had met the highway design standards in relation to sight lines and geometry.

Members raised points which included: there would be an average of 14,000 car movements per week; mitigation was needed to address air quality issues; 35% affordable housing was a real benefit and officers should ensure that the 90:10 tenure split (in favour of rented housing) is secured; the application was not ready for approval at this stage; there were inaccuracies in the report; the KCC depot entrance was on the A2, not Salters Lane; there was a lack of information on existing accesses onto the A2; the bus stop on the south side of the A2 needed a lay-by; concerned with the private road (which served a number of existing houses) next to the entrance to the site on the A251 from a highway safety point of view; would like to see an agreement on how the land outlined in blue would be protected in perpetuity for the residents living there; clarification was needed on the availability of minerals (brickearth) on the site; concept of a small parking area, to meet existing residential demand, was a good idea, and should not move forward until this was resolved; insufficient developer highway contributions; and needed to defer to deal with the outstanding issues.

In response, the KCC Senior Development Planner (Highways) reported that the proximity and nature of existing accesses close to the site had been considered and he explained that officers would be assessing them through local knowledge, and the access points were indicated on later versions of the site plans. He advised that developer contributions were based on a vehicle movements formula and the figure in the report was part of the full amount; and other major housing developments in the area would also contribute to the A2/A251 junction improvements. The figures needed to be a fair representation, reflecting anticipated impacts on traffic flow.

Further Member comments included: developers needed to comply and stick with the contribution amount; needed to be clear of what we were agreeing on this outline application; and issues with the layout.

In response, the Major Projects Officer referred to page 21 of the report which outlined the proposal for the erection of up to 250 dwellings. The application also included the two access points onto the A2 and A251, for which approval was sought. All other details, the scale, appearance, layout and landscaping would be subject to reserved matters. He also explained that a written agreement had confirmed that 35% affordable housing would be included.

APPENDIX B

Further Member comments included: this (A2) was the most dangerous road in Faversham; the access onto the A251 was not wide enough; cars parked on the pavements of the A2; the area near Salters Lane on the A2 was very congested with parked cars, and it was an accident black spot; off-street parking facility was vital; a traffic island was essential for pedestrians to walk safely; a bus layby on the A2 was vital; and the junction of the A2/A251 was not fit for purpose and needed to be improved before the development went ahead.

The Major Projects Officer stated that condition (36), plus the Section 106 Agreement, addressed the need for a footpath along the southern side of the A2 to the entrance of the Abbey School. He explained that the layby/car park facility was not a requirement of the application, but could be delegated to officers to ensure that it was provided as part of the planning permission. The land edged in blue (to the south of the site) was outside of the application site and there would be a legal agreement to ensure the management of the site as accessible, natural open space.

Further Member comments included: originally in Local Plan, 217 dwellings were allocated for this site; disappointed with the developer contributions outlined in paragraph 7.17 (which set out the request made by KCC) of the report; needed to ensure that the ratio (tenure split) of affordable housing as noted in paragraph 7.07 remained.

The Major Projects Officer explained that the affordable housing tenure split had not yet been agreed.

Further Member comments included: did not need to defer the application; more clarification was needed in terms of the minerals (brick earth) on the site; and the road improvements needed to be completed and implemented at the right time.

In response to a question, the Senior Lawyer referred to the Section 106 Agreement outlined on page 51 of the report and explained that matters concerned with the layby/car park would be delegated to officers, but a decision was needed on the other aspects of the Agreement as part of the current application, not at the reserved matters stage.

In response to a question, the Major Projects Officer advised that the wording referring to the protection of the land outlined in blue could be amended to include the words 'in perpetuity', plus the addition of a management plan. With reference to the minerals on the site, outlined in paragraph 10.06 of the report, he stated that this had been weighed in the planning balance, however the priority was the delivery of the housing as the site was allocated for housing in the Local Plan.

Members agreed that the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the Ward Members and the Planning Committee Chairman being included in the process of drafting the Section 106 Agreement.

Resolved: That application 16/508602/OUT be delegated to officers to approve subject to the Ward Members and the Planning Committee Chairman being

APPENDIX B

included in the process of drafting the Section 106 Agreement. Authority was also delegated to fine-tune/amend the wording of conditions as required.