

# **AYLESFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

## **Tuesday 7 FEBRUARY 2017**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES**

\* \* \* \* \*

**Present:** Cllrs Wright (Chairman), Balcombe, Base, Ms Dorrington, Elvy, Mrs Gadd, Gledhill, Jones, Mrs Phibbs, Rillie, Shelley, Smith, Walker, Winnett

**In attendance:** Mr Harris, Clerk    Mrs Collier, Deputy Clerk

**Apologies:** Cllrs Mrs Brooks, Hammond, Homewood

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **1. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations additional to those contained in the Register of Members Interests.

#### **2. Apologies**

Apologies as follows were noted and reasons given accepted:

Cllrs Mrs Brooks (care of elderly relative); Hammond (working), Homewood (KCC meeting).

#### **3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

##### **1.TM/10/00328 Hermitage Quarry, Hermitage Lane, Aylesford South**

Section 73 to vary conditions 9 and 10 in order to increase vehicle movements and to allow preloaded HGVs to leave the site from 0630 hours.

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

##### **2. TM/10/02029 Hermitage Quarry, Hermitage Lane, Aylesford South**

Relocate transport workshop and HGV parking from Little Preston to existing quarry; relocation of existing offices and weighbridge facilities to quarry working area; masonry workshop building; manufactured aggregate recycling facility and revised restoration/phasing in western extension area to allow for relocated water storage lagoon

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

### **3. TM/14/03594 Rochester Airport**

Amended description: Erection of two hangers, erection of fencing and gates, formation of associated car parking areas, fuel tank enclosure and a memorial garden. Site plan has been amended to reflect land that sits entirely within Medway Council.

*Parish Council Comments: No objection (Responded in order to meet deadline)*

### **4. TM/16/03025 Aylesford Newsprint, Bellingham Way, Larkfield, Aylesford South**

Outline application for mixed use development.

*The Clerk reported on his review of this application based on the comments already made to TMBC on the Local Plan, the recent meeting with TMBC Officers and the response received to a number of questions raised on the application. The Clerk's written report was distributed to all Members and attached at Appendix A to the bound copy of these minutes.*

*Based on this report Members agreed to make an initial response to TMBC on the current application but to reserve the right to submit a further formal response on the significant amendments expected on the basis detailed in the report.*

*Parish Council Comments: See Appendix B attached.*

### **5. TM/16/03048 – 89 Cork Street, Eccles**

Retrospective application for retention of balcony area

*Parish Council Comments: Original PC comment was no objection. However having now been made aware of neighbour concerns, Local Members and the Chair of Planning have agreed that comment should be amended to 'Objection as balcony allows persons to be able to look at window at the rear of 91 Cork Street and also overlooks the gardens of the neighbouring properties which with people being on the balcony is very intrusive to the neighbours trying to enjoy the amenities of their garden'. Already sent in order to meet deadline.*

### **6. TM/16/03167 5 Sheraton Court, Walderslade**

Single storey rear extension and alteration to windows on side and front elevation.

Amended drawing received showing gutter/drainage details

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

### **7. TM/16/03527 215 Robin Hood Lane, Blue Bell Hill – 2 applications**

Proposed two storey front annexe extension

Amended location and site plan

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

### **8. TM/16/03554 Bunyards Farm, London Road, Allington, Aylesford South**

Final remediation verification report submitted to pursuant to condition 15 C and D of TM/11/00617 – 43 residential units and open space

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

### **9. TM/16/03603 Unit 1, South Aylesford Retail Park (Homebase)**

Installation of weather protection canopy with lighting attached beneath the canopy.

Additional information – Ceiling plan indicating details of lighting beneath the proposed canopy.

Further information – Lighting detail

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**10 TM/16/03624 59 Woodbury Road, Walderslade**

Single storey rear extension

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**11. TM/16/03683 Nil Desparandum, Maidstone Road, BBH**

Free standing totem sign advertising Big Motoring World

*For information only*

**12. TM/16/03775 47 Walsham Road, Walderslade**

Two storey side extension to property adding two extra bedrooms to 1<sup>st</sup> floor and increasing living space on ground floor to the lounge and kitchen/diner

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**13. TM/16/03779 467 Maidstone Road, Blue Bell Hill**

Demolish existing bungalow and replace with two new bungalows

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**14. TM/17/00026 Kent Frozen Foods, Kent House, Priory Park, Quarry Wood Ind Est, Aylesford South**

Details submitted pursuant to condition 17 (noise assessment) TM/16/00021 (New cold store and ancillary office link to existing building)

*Parish Council Comments: No objection in principle provided note is taken of any resident concerns.*

**15. TM/17/00058 268 Rochester Road, Aylesford North**

Two storey side and rear extension

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**16. TM/17/00081 The Little Gem, 19 High Street, Aylesford North**

Replace first floor and second floor front window

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**17. TM/17/00105 3 Mercer Court, Walderslade**

To remove oak tree in back garden

*Parish Council Comments: Objection. The tree not near the house and there is no diagnostic report to suggest that it is anything but healthy*

**18. TM/17/00116 5 Holtwood Avenue, Aylesford South**

Reduce height and cut back overhanging branches to 4 x cypress trees

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**19. TM/17/00129 31 Oakleigh Close, Walderslade**

T1 hornbeam – crown raise to 6m above ground level, T2 oak – crown thin by no more than 20% and T3 oak – to remove deadwood

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**20. TM/17/00178 Land West of Hermitage Lane and East of Units 4A, 4B and 4C Mills Road, Quarry Wood Industrial Estate, Aylesford South**

Cut back overhanging branches and boughs of chestnut trees to the rear of the industrial units

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**21. TM/17/00206 Unit 5A (Smyths), South Aylesford Retail Park Quarry Wood Ind Estate, Aylesford South**

Removal of condition 1 (trading hours) and 3 (approval period) to allow store to trade for an extra hour to 2300 between 1 November and Christmas Day

*Parish Council Commnets: No objection*

**22. TM/17/00246 Former Bridgewood Service Station, 459 Maidstone Road, BBH**

Section 73 application to vary condition 17 to insert rooflights

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

**23. TM/17/00279 48 Holtwood Avenue, Aylesford South**

Demolition of existing utility and single storey extension to form kitchen/breakfast

*Parish Council Comments: No objection*

#### **4. DETERMINATIONS DIFFERING FROM PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS**

**1. TM/16/03184 – 17 Gorse Crescent, Aylesford South**

Creation of a first floor. APC objection – out of keeping. TMBC decision – Refused

**2. TM/16/02985 – 219 Robin Hood Lane, Blue Bell Hill**

Coppice area to allow regrowth. APC objection. TMBC decision – Agreed.

**3. TM/16/03241 – Land behind 35 and 36 Oaks Dene, Walderslade**

Tree felling. APC objection – valued woodland. TMBC decision – Agreed.

*Cllr Elvy queried whether this land is now in the care of Boxley Parish Council. The Clerk advised that he believed it had not been handed over to them yet. Cllr Elvy queried however whether the work could be done without consultation with Boxley PC. In fact some work has already started and the area left in an untidy condition. This may be acceptable in the wooded area but on the grass verges it is unacceptable. If work is to proceed he asked that TMBC be asked to instruct their contractors to clear up as part of the felling project. Clerk will discuss with TMBC and Boxley Parish Council. Cllr Shelley suggested that the Walderslade Woodlands Group also be consulted and gave a contact of Mr Ron Burrows.*

*Clerk*

**4. TM/16/03374 – Land at Roman Close, Blue Bell Hill**

Tree felling. APC objection – no reasons stated. TMBC decision - Agreed

## **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS/CORRESPONDENCE**

5.1 – **Allington Incinerator** – Scoping Report. Clerk reported that this was an initial consultation on the proposal to confirm permanent status to the Incinerator site. Cllr Walker reported that he attended regular meetings at the Incinerator and was satisfied at the way it was run and managed. He mentioned two recent charity donations made by the company to local projects. It was **agreed** that the Aylesford Parish Council had no comments to make at this stage.

5.2 – **Aylesford Business Centre** - Enforcement investigation relating to the culvert being undertaken by TMBC. Noted.

There being no further business, meeting closed at 8.22pm.

**AYLESFORD PARISH COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**7 FEBRUARY 2017**

**TM/16/3025 – Outline Application for a mixed use development comprising up to 120,500 sqm of B1, B2 and B8 employment space (GEA) and 79000 sqm of residential land capable of accommodating up to 450 residential dwellings, including affordable housing and a dedicated community facility, with appearance and landscaping reserved for future consideration**

The council has been consulted on this application the details of which are in the office. However the application title describes the proposal very succinctly other than for one other significant element of the proposal which is that Bellingham Way would be opened though only for general traffic and buses, the industrial use traffic would use New Hythe Lane. Access to the eastern part of the residential development near to the river would be accessed by a new access road through Mill Hall. There would also be a community hub provided which could include a primary school.

The Council commented in general terms on the Aylesford Newsprint site in its response to the TMBC Local Plan and the Council's comment is set out below:-

*The Council is also firmly of the view that the economic hub at New Hythe Lane including the Aylesford Newsprint site should remain an economic hub only and should not include housing as this would then require additional industrial capacity to be found elsewhere which could require the identification of additional economic hubs.*

In this comment the Council is expressing its general view that there should be no housing on this site because it would not wish to see the loss of economic land because of the potential impact on the other economic hubs such as the Quarry Wood Industrial Estate.

Previously the Council agreed that before determining its response to this application it would ask a number of questions of TMBC Planning. A copy of the questions and the response received from TMBC is attached to the report including a copy of the holding objection from the KCC on the highways issues for this proposal.

Additionally the Chairman and I recently met with Officers from TMBC and the KCC to discuss the A20 and as part of this discussion the Aylesford Newsprint application was considered. The clear point coming from this brief discussion was that the application was to be changed quite significantly arising from issues raised by TMBC and KCC such as KCC's request for further information on the impact of this proposal on the highway network. The revised application would also see the removal of the school and the possible resiting of some of the housing. The main thrust of this is that the Council would be consulted on all of these changes once they have all been received. It was also indicated that this would delay consideration of this application by TMBC.

Due to all these changes the Council does not have to reply immediately but a view on the proposal so far would be welcomed. I, therefore recommend that the Council put in a number of initial comments to TMBC on the basis that the Council's official response to the application would come after it has received and had a chance to consider the significant amendments to the scheme arising from comments already received.

The Council's comments are as follows

1. The Council is still of the view that this site should remain an economic hub only and should not include housing as this could lead to the position that further industrial capacity would need to be found elsewhere which could require the identification of additional economic

hubs or the expansion of already full capacity sites such as the Quarry Wood Industrial Estate.

2. If there is to be housing on this site the Council would wish to see a significant decrease in the numbers proposed and the removal of any residential units to the east of the railway line.
3. The Council is very concerned about the inclusion of any residential units on this site due to the site being in a high risk flood area and their inclusion being contrary to the TMBC policy of seeking to use low risk of flooding sites for residential units. These comments are particularly relevant to the housing to be included to the east of the railway line though could be relevant to the whole site.
4. The Council would oppose the provision of residential units to the east of the site as any access through Mill Hall would be completely unsatisfactory and would encourage all residents in this area to make their access to and from this site via Station Road and the A20 which would be a completely unsatisfactory situation putting additional traffic on to roads which were already over capacity.
5. The Council would also oppose the opening of Bellingham Way as the release of any traffic to this part of the highway network would be to make the position worse on an already over capacity road network particularly at the junctions with the A20.
6. The Council's position would be that if it was agreed to open Bellingham Way to traffic that it be limited to the proposed residential units of the site only and that no traffic from any of the industrial units including staff travel should be via this access point. Additionally as proposed by the KCC any opening of this road must have an effective access control to Station Road as well as an improvement scheme for the Hall Road/Station Road junction which takes into the account the problems caused by the railway level crossing. There would also have to be measures taken to improve both the junctions to the A20 from Station Road and Hall Road caused by the significant increase in traffic from the development on these already over capacity junctions as well as the knock on effects from this traffic on the A20/Hermitage Lane and M20 junctions.

## **RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS RAISED ON 9 DECEMBER 2017 BY AYLESFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

1. What is the exact loss of Employment land as a result of this planning application and what are the implications of this going forward into the current Local Plan process? Would this put more pressure for growth on economic hubs such as Quarry Wood?

*TMBC – The site was included in the Economic Land Review 2014 as forming part of the existing stock of employment land, therefore any reduction in site area would, in theory result in a net loss of allocated employment land within the Borough. However it could be argued that the site was sparsely developed and that a redevelopment that provided a more concentrated use would, in reality be likely to result in an overall increase employment use. This may be an argument put forward by the applicant. However, this will need to be assessed and balanced as part of the determination of the planning application as a whole.*

2. I am not sure if this development is contrary to the Council's flood risk policies and whether this changes with more constraints in place in the new Local Plan?

*TMBC – Local plan policy CP10 (TMBCS) states that within the floodplain development should first seek to make use of areas at no or low risk to flooding before areas at higher risk. However should development in such areas be exceptionally justified it must be subject to a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA); include a safe means of escape above anticipated flood levels and be designed and controlled to mitigate the effects of flooding on the site and potential impact elsewhere.*

*Local plan policy CC3 (MDE DPD) seeks to prevent development which would have an unacceptable effect on the quality and quantity of surface water, ground water and river corridors. Development proposals must include appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and features such as rainwater harvesting and/or green roofs.*

*In addition the site has been identified in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2016 under reference SHAA 431 for employment use only. The outcome of this assessment is as follows;*

*"In terms of access to services, this site is in a sustainable location within the confines of the Medway Gap urban area. A significant proportion of the site lies within an area at high risk of flooding which makes these parts of the site unsuitable for more vulnerable uses including residential. Existing access is sufficient for employment uses, given the extant use of the site, which generated significant employee and HGV movements. The site is well located to access the wider highway network via the M20 Junction 4. The proximity of the site to the railway line, the M20, industrial areas and the sewage works means that noise, odours and air pollution are likely to be significant issues. The long industrial history means that contamination could be an issue. A Minerals Assessment would be needed and surface water flooding issues would need to be addressed. Water resources would need to be protected. This assessment concludes that this site is suitable for employment."*

*The above refers to a 'desk top' assessment of the site and not to a determination of any potential planning application. However you will note that the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore it will be up to the applicant to demonstrate that any flooding issues can be overcome without increasing flood risk elsewhere in accordance with local planning policy and paragraphs 100 – 104 of the NPPF.*

3. The Developers seem to indicate that the current access to the eastern portion of the site on the other side of the railway line precludes industrial use though in the transport assessment they talk of having access both to the north via New Hythe Lane and to the south via Mill Hall. Are these contrary statements or are they indicating that these accesses are not sufficient for HGV's and therefore it is just a matter of cost rather than can't?

*TMBC - I am aware that the access to the eastern portion of the site, from within the existing site, is via a single carriageway bridge beneath the railway. This restricts access and I understand improvements to this arrangement would be extremely costly. The proposal includes a proposed access to the north via New Hythe Lane and a possible access to the south east via Mill Hall. However both accesses onto the public highway are not included within the site outline and therefore it is not clear as to whether either is achievable. Again the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate feasibility.*

4. Is the new development going to include a new link road through the development connecting Leybourne Way, and the A228, via Bellingham Way to Station Road? If this is being proposed do they intend making any road improvements or is it just opening up the access to Station Road possibly with traffic lights at the Station Road/Bellingham Way junction?

*TMBC - The application comprises the creation of a new link road between the existing access at Station Road in the east and the existing roundabout at the end of Bellingham Way which forms the current entrance to the site in the west. I understand the road as currently proposed is to be 6.5m in width with a 7.5 tonne weight limit except for buses. However KCC has offered specific comment on this aspect of the proposal.*

5. The Transport Assessment mentions mitigation measures such as the signalisation of the Station Road/Hall Road junction. Will these measures be implemented?

*TMBC - The application currently proposes a number of junction improvements. However KCC has a number of concerns which will require the submission of additional details. You may wish to view the KCC comments in full via the Council's website, listed as KCC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT received 2 Dec 16. In principle however should highway improvements be necessary in order to mitigate the impact of any development their implementation will need to be secured by legal agreement which includes agreement with KCC as the Highways Authority.*

6. Are there any other mitigation measure proposed for the Aylesford Parish area beyond the above such as the level crossing or at the junctions of Hall Road/A20/Quarry Wood industrial estate and A20/Hermitage Lane particularly as these 2 junctions have been highlighted in the recent KCC/Amey survey as over-capacity and the worst junctions on this part of the A20?

*TMBC – You will be aware that the submitted Transport Assessment Report recommends improvements to Leybourne Way and its junctions with Castle Way, Bellingham Way/New Hythe Lane, with alterations to the proposed link road/Station Road junctions and Station Road/Hall Road junction. However you may wish to view the KCC comments (referenced above) as concern is raised on a number of issues and recommends that the applicant considers additional mitigation measures regarding the A20.*

7. If this new link road is provided then is it to be assumed that it will be open to all traffic using it as a cut through from the A228 to the A20? If this is the case the assumption must also be that all traffic including HGV's, both from the site and using it as a cut through, will be able to use this link road and thereafter the road network through Aylesford Parish?

*TMBC - Please see response to question 4.*

8. In terms of a new M20 junction what are the reasons why this option is not being pursued?

*TMBC – As I understand from informal correspondence with Highways England a new junction on the M20 would not be supported for the following reasons.*

*The proposed development is not of a level which would warrant a new motorway junction. The distance between junctions 4 and 5 is not sufficient in highway safety terms to accommodate a new junction.*

*Under the Roads Investment Strategy 2014 a Smart Motorway is due to be created between M20 J3 – J5 in 2018 which would create additional running lanes in each direction.*

*The primary purpose of the Strategic Road Network (SRN,) of which the M20 is part, is the long-distance movement of goods and people. It would not therefore accord with national highway policy to introduce works to the SNR designed specifically for local use.*

9. In the papers submitted by the applicant a statement is made that if the area remained as wholly industrial it would create more traffic than if there was a mix of industrial and residential. On what basis is this statement made and can it be supported?

*TMBC – As you will be aware it is necessary for an applicant to predict the expected levels of traffic generation resulting from a major development proposal. The applicant is likely to carry out specific traffic surveys and use any existing traffic survey data already carried out in the area. This is in combination with a modelling system such as TRICS which enables users to establish potential levels of trip generation for a wide range of developments. TRICS is the national standard system of*

*trip generation and analysis in the UK and is used as an integral and essential part of developing Transport Assessments. By using the TRICS database the applicant has been able to calculate the proposed traffic levels.*

*It is generally accepted that many industrial uses are likely to generate a greater number of traffic movements than residential use. By way of explanation it may be useful to compare office (B1a) use with residential use. The traffic movements associated with an office use is likely to be greater than that of residential use owing to the density of occupation. An office is likely to provide a greater density of the occupiers than residential dwellings and therefore a greater number of associated traffic movements. This can be similar for many manufacturing and warehouse uses.*

Neil Harris  
Clerk to the Council

February 2017