

HERNE & BROOMFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Office, Herne Centre, Herne, Herne Bay, Kent CT6 7AP

Tel: 01227 742700

Minutes of the meeting of Herne & Broomfield Parish Council Planning & Highways Committee to be held at Herne Centre on Thursday 6th December 2018 at 7.30pm for the purpose of transacting the following business.

Present: Cllr Blatherwick, Cllr Moore, Cllr Mitchell, and Cllr Taylor

- 1) Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Harvey and Sargent.
- 2) To receive declarations of interest on items on the agenda. Cllr Moore, personal interest 18/02295
- 3) The minutes of the planning meeting held on 15th November 2018, were agreed as a correct and accurate record.
- 4) Matters arising. None

Public Adjournment 3 members of the public attended .

18/02299	Golf Course	4 x two storey dwellings	21/12/18
Members had concerns regarding this application. It is thought, acknowledging the highways officers concern regarding below standard parking whether this area should be considered for that purpose. The scheme proposes 4 houses which sit uncomfortably with the geometry of the site. Gardens are below standard and offer very little opportunity to enjoy these areas as meaningful amenity space underscored by the omission of any meaningful connection between the house and the garden save the utility room door. It would appear that the proposal looks to impose a standard traditional house type on an up standard site. This is clearly demonstrated by the proposal for double door access from the dining room onto the neighbours parking bay not the garden. The application fails to recognise the opportunities of an unconventional site and to treat it with boldness and invention preferring to stamp the site with traditional houses which fail to deliver recognise the attributes of the site and as a consequence deliver quality of life essential and embedded in the Councils Local Plan.			
18/02290	Golf Course	93 residential dwellings, office floorspace of 1,179sqm and 372 sqm of retail	02/01/19
Members raised some issues on this application. There are a number of concerns with the strategy adopted for the commercial areas. It is felt illogical to not place the public house and offices adjacent to the Market square. Both of these uses would benefit from feed out onto a public space where a conflict of uses proposed could result in the market space becoming confused as it is bounded by private property who seek a degree of privacy. The public house fails to meet the aspirations proclaimed in the D&A for local character. The design of the public house is general and non-specific failing to benefit from its prominent location and failing to contribute to the wider demands of setting. The application offers places that suggest value and quality. The market square and urban square/linear park are all potentially wonderful opportunities to create a real sense of place. When one looks at the design of these spaces in detail you become aware that they are names added to space left over between buildings and are not spaces with character, quality or value. They neither contribute to the wider public enjoyment or help to tie the scheme together in any coherent way. The linear park is a prime example bound between two residential properties neither of whom would welcome a public space outside of their living room or bedrooms and as a consequence the use of the space will be confused and not mature into an important public amenity. A similar concern is raised by the green square to site 2 (block H). A large car free open space would be of great value a place to sit and meet but with a road laid to its side and cars coming and going the character of the space changes and an opportunity missed. In essence this is the concern with the scheme. It looks on the surface that it has all the ingredients of a lovely place to be, but the ideas lay undeveloped and as a consequence the			

scheme is flawed. It is the parish council view that the applicant should be asked to review the scheme to address very fundamental design conflicts and the failure to do so will result in a scheme that delivers numbers but little value.			
18/02369	Golf Course	Phase 5, 109 dwellings, access appearance and landscaping, layout and scale. VAR to 16/00378	04/01/19
Members approved this application. They thought the alterations that had been made were an improvement.			
18/02187	31 Margate Rd	Roof ext to side increase roof height two dormer windows to rear, 1 dormer and two rooflights to front	14/12/18
Members had concerns about the impact of this application on the streetscene also issues with regard to overlooking nearby properties.			
18/02295	The Manor Park Place	Single storey side ext with dormers to front and rear, single storey rear ext with detached single storey ancillary accommodation	14/12/18
Members felt an extension in principle is acceptable but there is a feeling that the application fails to present a balance contribution to either the house or the approach into the village. The extension is a collision of building scales. The existing house reflects a visual balance of roof and wall and sits calmly at the entrance into the village. The extension disregards the architectural vocabulary of the existing house and sits as an inarticulate block, uncomfortably proportioned and failing to address its context. Visually it appears larger than the existing house due to its lack of detail and finesse. The proposed extension, visually becomes the dominant element in the composition, extending the building in a way that overpowers the existing house and fails to add anything positive to the overall composition. Instead it detracts from the presence and setting of the house and approach to the village, failing to acknowledge this is one of the first houses one sees on the approach into the village. Historically there was a graduation of building form and scale stepping from larger building in open land through to tight-knit terraced properties within the village centre. This traditional approach is lost in this scheme, replaced by a utilitarian out-building located in a prominent location and paying no respect to setting or neighbours. Therefore members are objecting to the application in its current form.			
18/02327	The Plough, Margate Road	Detached two storey building with retail unit at ground floor 5 flats at first floor.	21/12/18
The clerk reported that over 40 objections had been logged on line. Members objected to this application. Members supported the comments made by UK Power Networks and CCC Environmental Health. Members did not think the hours of opening should be longer than that of the newly opened Sainsbury store. The Design & Access Statement fails to mention there are other retail outlets within close proximity of The Plough, the parade of shops in Hawe Farm Way, which is a 5 minute walk and Broomfield Post Office which is a couple of minutes up the road, there is also the well-stocked Post Office in Herne Street which is a 5 minute drive, as well as the newly opened Sainsbury store which is also a 5 minute walk. Members consider the massing and scale of the proposed building is too much for the plot especially as there is currently a good open outlook from Hunters Forstal Road and Margate Road. Members consider that having the building so close to the pavement on both of these roads will result in poor visibility, from the roundabout. This proposal will have an overbearing impact on the existing dwellings, there are a good number of bungalows in the vicinity, this would also result in overlooking issues with the subsequent loss of privacy. It is considered that it is visually incongruous and would be harmful to the character of the area. There is no provision of any amenity space within the development. Questions were raised as to whether some of the bedrooms met government space standards, as the roof slopes, no area calculations have been provided. Confirmation that there is a compliant floor area with headroom of 1.5m in compliance with Government			

direction ie 1 bedroom is 50m² and 2 bedroom at 61m², is required.

The proposed parking and associated noise and disturbance for such long periods will have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions for the nearby dwellings. The parking adjacent to the back of pavement isn't a natural relationship and the view into the parking area at the northern end is a poor contribution to the village character.

Members believe it will be very difficult to access from the south and the scheme should show this manoeuvre as lorries will come from both directions.

With the Sainsbury store now having opened the volume of traffic using Margate Road has increased. The requirement of the delivery vehicle needing to oversail the footway when leaving the site is not acceptable.

Moving onto the parking provision 6 spaces for the 5 dwellings will result in a loss of parking for customers which in turn will result in vehicles being parked on the highway which will again cause issues with visibility. The proposed delivery strategy is fraught with danger, the internal manoeuvring will be problematic. If you follow the tracking when the lorry gets to the mid position, wanting to exit it may have to stunt backwards and forwards 2 possible 3 times. This will concentrate engine noise close to the gardens of the neighbouring houses. It will also cause vehicles trying to enter the car park to reverse out onto Margate Road as they will not be able to see the delivery vehicle until they have turned into the entrance.

The view from the N and SW onto the flank of the building will reveal the long flat roof which will be out of keeping with the area with the flanks contributing very little to the streetscene. Trees and general landscape are not shown on the application drawing which means, that they are not part of the application as the CGIs are indicative.

This proposal may well lead to Broomfield Post Office and the general store in Hawe Farm Way having to close, these provide valued facilities and services and would be contrary to Policy QL3 of LP.

There is likely to be air con units and fridges which will cause disturbance to nearby neighbours, as well as the pollution from having a large number of vehicles continually using the car park. Members consider there will be a significant increase in vehicle movements compared to the public house as well as the opening times proposed being much longer, it will be intolerable for those in the immediate vicinity.

There is also the issue of lighting on the new building both from the residential dwellings and the retail outlet, which will no doubt have bright neon signage. This will be really intrusive in the area. Members consider the visual impact of this proposal is totally out of keeping with the area and contrary to NPPF Policy DBE3 and the adopted LP.

18/02384	42 Herne Street	Single storey rear ext and demolition of conservatory	04/01/19
Members approved this application.			
18/02287	St Martins Church	Replace two missing stone crosses	11/01/19
Members approved this application.			

Appeals **None**

Correspondence received. None

Applications Approved by CCC: 18/01950 19 Hillbrow Ave 1.8mtr fence to front

18/01994 15 Hunters Forstal Road Single storey rear ext, two storey side ext, first floor ext to rear and porch to front.

18/01974 1 Halford Close Extensions front, side and rear

18/02027 19 Mill Lane First floor ext.

CCC planning applications refused 18/01451 Land rear 103 Margate Road Detached single storey ext with accommodation in roof space.

Applications Withdrawn **None**

To discuss any Highways Issues. **None**

Meeting closed 9.15pm

