

HERNE & BROOMFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Office, Herne Mill, Mill Lane, Herne, Herne Bay, Kent CT6 7DR

Tel: 01227 742700

Minutes of the meeting of Herne & Broomfield Parish Council Planning & Highways Committee held at Herne Mill, Wootton Room, on Thursday 28th January 2016 at 7.30pm for the purpose of transacting the following business.

Present: Cllr Blatherwick, Cllr Harvey, Cllr Mitchell, Cllr Sargent, Cllr O'Donnell, Cllr Moore and Cllr Taylor.

- 1) Apologies for absence. None.
- 2) To receive declarations of interest on items on the agenda. Cllr O'Donnell, Mountview Road, Cllr Sargent, Strode Farm, Cllr Moore, Hunters Chase.
- 3) The planning meeting held on 3rd December 2015, were agreed as a correct and accurate record.
- 4) Matters arising. None.

Public Adjournment. Residents wishing to speak need to confirm they are registered electors in this parish, by giving their name and addresses.

2 residents attended and spoke.

Planning Applications discussed

CA/15/02708	91 Mill Lane	Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of two new dwellings	29/01/16
Members objected to this application. It is over development of the site the massing is incongruous to the street scene. There are concerns with regard to the access onto Mill Lane, there is no room to turn vehicles on site which will result in them reversing into Mill Lane. The proximity with the junction of School Lane/ Broomfield Road make this access dangerous, especially as it is on the bus route. Previous reasons for refusal still apply. If granted these dwellings will be very overbearing on the site.			
CA/15/02753	Land at Chapel Row	Erection of dwelling	29/01/16
Members objected to this application. They are very concerned about how construction will be carried out and the limited parking in Herne Street to accommodate construction vehicles. The property is considered too large and it is intensification of an area which is mainly cottages. It will increase the number of vehicles using Chapel Row, which has a very narrow access and is used predominantly by pedestrians and is a main route to the schools. If this development is to be considered it should have a Construction Management Plan.			
CA/16/00037	9 Bramley Gardens	Proposed 2 storey double garage with home office	05/02/16
Members approved this application.			
CA/16/00036	Land rear 61 Broomfield Road	Erection of new dwelling	05/02/16
Parish Council Planning Committee objects to this development. They consider it an undesirable form of back land development, which will have an impact on 59 Broomfield Road, and other properties in the immediate vicinity. It will spoil the character of the area and set a precedent. There doesn't appear to be a Design and Access Statement with this application or any details of the conservatory to be demolished on the existing property.			

There are concerns over access for additional vehicles on this narrow stretch of road. Sightlines cannot be guaranteed with regard to no 59.

This application is contrary to CCC Guidelines Residential Intensification as it is tandem development, which will introduce light and noise to an area where there is currently none. This will cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties. There will be overlooking for both property in front and behind this proposed development.

The footprint is larger than that of the existing dwelling and members considered the height should be reduced.

If planning is minded to approve this application, we request that there is a condition stating no extensions or loft conversions.

It is not clear what trees are to be removed to allow for this development.

CA/15/02678	2 Selwood Cottages Hoopers Lane	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear and 2 storey side ext	12/02/16
-------------	------------------------------------	--	----------

Members objected to this application. They felt this was too large, doubling the size of the ground floor. This property is within the conservation area and totally changes the appearance of this cottage and is considered to be detrimental. With the consent for building on the plot next to this property it will be over development in this area and detrimental to the streetscene. It will change the character of the area and is not a sympathetic design. The 2 storey side extension may also cause privacy and overlooking issues.

CA/16/00086	32 Hunters Chase	Demolition of existing porch and conservatory and proposed single storey ext with associated alterations	12/02/16
-------------	------------------	--	----------

Members approved this application.

CA/16/00065	12 Mount View Rd	Demolish existing detached garage and proposed new lean-to roof side extension creating path access to rear garden.	12/02/16
-------------	------------------	---	----------

Members approved this application.

CA/16/00108	Land 73 Albion Lane	Erection of Dwelling	19/01/16
-------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------

Members objected to this application.

It is tandem development which is contrary to CCC Guidelines to Residential Intensification. It is too large, the massing will be overbearing for the bungalow at 73 and other neighbouring properties. The access will have poor sightlines on what is a narrow stretch of road, which is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass. There is a long narrow driveway to the proposed dwelling which would not be suitable for two vehicles to pass. It will cause loss of amenity to neighbouring properties by the introduction of vehicle and other noise and lighting. The access to the parking for 73 Albion Lane is difficult and although it shows two vehicles parked on the drawing would be possible if you pick them up and place them there space is very limited to park two vehicles and in reality this is not possible.

The development quoted, at 18 Albion Lane, in the Design & Access Statement, is on a wider section of road and was given permission prior to CCC producing the Residential Intensification document. This development is also much smaller than the proposed, with better sightlines for access.

CA/15/02782	Strode Farm Lower Herne Road	Hybrid application	12/02/16
-------------	------------------------------	--------------------	----------

Members objected to the application stating the previous reasons for refusal applied. Also

KCC Highways had responded to the application, with many concerns and had stated that they could not support it in its current form.

There are issues regarding deliverability of the Highways work that is required by KCC and also the intention of Hollamby Estates not to complete the spine road until the last phase of the development.

It was the view of the Committee that the Applicant needs to be held to account and must deliver meaningful, precise drawings which demonstrate the impact of a new roadway on the existing vegetation and to provide more detail; in particular road widths, whether or not there will be a pavement, how the banks will be dealt with, the character of street lighting etc all of which will have a significant impact on the surrounding area and could potentially change the character of this road forever. They need to confirm that they will comply with the requirements listed by KCC.

With regard to the installation of traffic lights at the junction with A291, these will urbanise the area. When the roundabout was installed space was left for a 7.3mtr wide road, off the roundabout, which should be adequate to take the additional traffic. The HGV traffic etc is very unlikely to use the estate road through the development, unless it is built as a strategic road and will continue to travel through Herne Village. The parish council concurs with KCC Highways that the installation of a traffic lights will not be suitable and will also have an impact on the A lane, which it will shorten to 5 mtrs, as well as backing traffic up in other areas. Access should be from an arm off the roundabout.

Bullockstone Road.

If the drawings are read correctly, part of the proposal reflects a significant alteration to the existing hedgerow together with the potential loss of a number of trees which are indicated on URB001-02A under the heading of “retained where possible” suggesting that excavation can happen underneath the tree roots “to be managed on site.” In addition, there is the planting of new hedgerow.

Has CCC consulted with Natural England regarding ‘new developments to protect the conservation area against pollution generated by cars and development, as we understand they are required to do?

The proposed drawings raise a number of issues. The first is, that this part of Bullockstone Road has clear characteristics of a rural lane, in stark contrast to the more open character of Bullockstone Road to the north where it adjoins the Thanet Way and where the road character has been scarred by alterations to the highway.

This character is formed in part by the existing bank, hedgerow and tree canopies all of which give it a very particular feel which is an important component of rural infrastructure, of which this road is clearly part. It is also good for wildlife.

The proposal seeks to significantly alter this sense of containment and rural feel. One has to seriously question whether the term “trees to be retained where possible. Excavation around tree roots to be managed on site” is a statement that holds any meaningful significance when one considers that under normal circumstances construction is avoided within root protection areas. In a number of cases the trees sit on a rising bank all of which suggests that the trees to the west of Bullockstone Road are potentially vulnerable and could easily be lost, which will dramatically change the character of this lane as with the loss of the trees will come the open aspect to the west with the view eventually contained by a new hedgerow, which in the early stages will be feathered and unsubstantial, the conclusion being that the character of this road will not be enhanced or fortified in any way but will actually be lost forever.

There are also issues as to the ownership of some of the land in the proposals, which the parish council has been given to understand is not within the control of the applicant.

This will have a significant impact on cost, if a pavement is to be installed and a roundabout at the junction of Bullockstone Road and A291 is to be put in place as requested by KCC Highways, compulsory purchase can be a long and expensive process.

The impact of the new road construction will have a detrimental effect on the trees and in turn the sense of rural character. Any build-up of construction either under or over root areas will potentially suffocate the trees unbalancing them on one side, the result of which is that a mature tree avenue will be lost and I believe the terminology on the drawings "retained where possible" clearly acknowledges this point through a somewhat half-hearted and non-committal statement.

In addition to this the oaks scheduled for removal currently have TPO's on them, this is not mentioned in the application.

It is our belief that the proposal is once again sadly lacking in detail. This IS a full application for the Highways side and it will have a significant impact on the local character; the applicant must be pressed to deliver detail? It is simply not acceptable for an applicant to suggest that the trees may be lost.

One must be concerned with regard to the impact of the road adjacent to a Grade II listed building and a locally listed building. Granted the relationship of the road will not alter in principle but the traffic generation will increase significantly, which will bring with it noise, pollution, vibration and the potential for long term structural damage. The Applicant has been silent on these points but from experience the Council clearly acknowledges these potential problems and if it was to transpire that the Council did not hold the Applicant to account for the impact of their work then the Council, by dint of ignoring their responsibility, will, one imagines, be exposed to future claims, which one would suspect is a dangerous position for the Council to enter into.

A Joint Position Statement produced by KCC & CCC stated 'This would also mean that other developments dependant on the link road would not be permitted to build out until the link road is completed. If the Sturry link road does not proceed then other dependant sites - Herne Bay and Hersden - cannot be commenced due to the issues of capacity addressed at the start of this note. This still applies.

The issues of flooding on the Strode Farm site itself are of great concern and from the drawings provided it will be necessary for lagoons to be placed all over the site, leaving virtually no open space for recreation such as play areas and kick about areas of a reasonable size. Southern Water has stated that the drainage system in the area is inadequate. These plans also directly oppose the Environment Agency advice. Is the inadequacy of the foul sewer at the pumping station or the sewage treatment works? The change of use of the lagoon to allotments will increase the flooding issues and mean that the area will only be suitable to grow rice!

We know from past experience that lack of space for children to play in, on a site of this size, causes real issues with anti-social behavior. It is no good installing additional equipment in Cherry Orchard as the equipment needs to be on the development site itself.

With regard to the demolition of the existing properties, the location of which is not shown on the drawings, the parish council strongly objects to the bungalow within the conservation area being demolished, they do not consider, looking at the plans that this is necessary and it could be retained.

The parish council consider that the density of this development should be reduced to allow for more open space for recreational use.

It is also considered that the proposed height of the new dwellings is excessive, 2.5 & 3 storey dwellings proposed behind the existing bungalows, is just not acceptable.

There should be school provision for Senior School children not just Junior.

There are no community facilities on this site and the parish council considers CCC

should seek S106 funding for this.

There are concerns about the number of access points from the new estate onto Lower Herne Road and the increase in traffic using what is an extremely narrow section of road, and the effect on Home Farm, who have a large number of horses on the premises.

In conclusion, it is the committees view that the proposal provides very little additional information to mitigate the impact of the scheme and seeks to soften the blow of development through a nicely rendered drawing, preferring instead to disguise the true impact through the absence of meaningful, tangible detailed information. Bearing in mind these road alignments will be based on traffic studies, the absence of such detail is unacceptable in our view and is clearly being concealed. Geometric details for the road design need to be shown.

Consequently, the committee would like to raise their objection to this proposal and would like the opportunity to review the position once a more comprehensive and detailed application has been submitted, on which a meaningful response can be prepared.

The parish council would also request a condition to state that a new phase cannot be started until the previous one has been completed, as we know from past experience where certain conditions have to be met by a certain stage in the development, that stage can be delayed by the developer. We also request that the spine road should be completed early in the development to protect Herne residents from all the additional traffic created by the development from going through the village and be fit for purpose to take strategic traffic.

There are concerns that at certain stages the developer intends to revisit the S106 and affordable housing; it is not considered satisfactory for this to happen, the amount of affordable housing is very low and should not be reduced during the development stages and the S106 should not be amended. It is very easy for a developer to plead poverty and say they cannot afford to pay their contribution etc.

We also (following feedback from residents) object to the name Lower Herne Village and wish to see the name of Strode Farm retained and therefore suggest Strode Farm Meadows/ Strode Meadows. This area is not a village and never will be and the name will be misleading to potential purchasers.

Correspondence received. Notification of appeal 36 Broomfield Road, for the erection of 9 dwellings.

Applications Approved by CCC: CA/15/02173 52 School Lane Demolish existing garage with flat roof, and replace with new double garage with pitched roof.

CA/15/02176 23 Strode Park Road Replace rear lounge windows with doors and construction of balcony.

CA/15/02498 3 Bramblefields Close Front ext to existing garage

CA/15/02193/TPO 6 Ridgeway Walk Works to Poplar trees to pollard and reduction in height of oak TPO 5 1989

CA/15/02466 Demolition of building at Strode Farm

CA/15/02539 Side extension incorporating a loft conversion and dormer windows to front and rear of property along with associated alterations.

CCC planning applications refused: CA/15/02254 14 Dove Close Replacement windows and doors.

CA/15/02221 8 Barley Close Erection of fencing

To discuss any Highways Issues. Streetlight outside 223 Canterbury Road is out, clerk will report.

Meeting closed at 10.15pm