

Report of the Head of Planning and Development Planning Committee

Wednesday 20th May 2020 at 5.00pm



(a) 19/00025/AS – Land between railway line and Willesborough Road, Kennington, Kent - Hybrid planning application seeking:

(i) Outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for points of access) for up to 437 dwellings; formal and informal open space incorporating SuDS; and associated services, infrastructure and groundworks; and

(ii) Full planning permission for the erection of 288 dwellings; the creation of serviced plot of land to facilitate the delivery by Kent County Council of a two-form entry primary school with associated outdoor space and vehicle parking; a new Bowls Centre including a clubhouse of 292 sq.m, ancillary building and a bowling green; a local centre to provide 280 sq.m of A1 (retail), 180 sq.m of A1 (retail food store), 100 sq.m A3 (café), 75 sq.m A5 (takeaway), 190 sq.m D2 (gym/fitness studio space) open space incorporating SuDS; vehicle parking; and associated services, structural landscaping, infrastructure and groundworks.

Subject to Environmental Impact Assessment

Introduction

1. Consideration of this application was adjourned by the Planning Committee at the meeting on 18th March 2020 due to technical failure of the online streaming equipment. For consistency, the report being considered on that date is attached, without amendment, as **Annex 1** to this short covering report.
2. Since the publication of that report on 10th March 2020, a number of additional representations have been received. These are summarised below. In addition, minor changes to a total of 5 of the Heads of Terms for Section 106 Agreement set out in Table 1 of the report need to be reported and these are also explained below.

Additional letters of representation received

3. There have been a further 17 letters of objections and 1 letter of support received since the publication of the report. The following is a summary of issues raised as objections to the application that have not been previously raised in representations alongside an officer response to the issue:
 - The application goes against the Ashford Green Corridor scheme with it destroying the green belt.

[SPM comment; the site is neither located in the Ashford Green Corridor nor designated Green Belt land]

- impact on Wye village in terms of car parking for those choosing to travel from Wye train station.

[SPM comment: there is no evidence that there will be any material impact upon Wye station parking]

- Should not be building on the floodplain

[SPM comment: Flood mitigation is being provided so that no built development is proposed within Flood Zones 2 and 3.]

- Insufficient rail capacity on HS1

[SPM comment: Any rail capacity issue is a wider strategic issue being addressed by the infrastructure provider and not a material consideration for this application]

- 5 years housing land supply and housing delivery test is calculated unfairly to the detriment of local authorities who are not in control of the situation and bears all the adverse consequences while developers receive no government penalty.
- We are experiencing a much changed world and environment since this planning application was submitted. We are in recession, local and national infrastructure is collapsing and the future is uncertain. At such times a precautionary approach is needed and the council should consider declining this application or deferring until the future is more clear.

[SPM comment: The site contributes around 200 dwellings to the latest assessment of the Council's 5 year housing land supply (2019-24). A decision to refuse planning permission or defer a decision on the application would have a consequential effect on the Council's ability to rely on this amount of new development when housing land supply is next re-calculated.]

4. Within these additional representations, the following issues were raised but are addressed in the main report at Annex 1.

- Impact of a construction site on residential amenity.
- do not need a new Bowls Centre.
- overlooking into existing residential properties.
- no community spirit/provision.
- The need to provide infrastructure first as set out in the government's manifesto has not been addressed sufficiently by the applicant.

5. The letter of support refers to the current Covid-19 outbreak and the need for the development to help support the UK economy as we come out of lockdown.
6. Wye with Hinxhill Parish Council has submitted an objection to the application for the following reasons:-
 - KCC have objected regarding traffic.
 - Over-development of the site – evidenced by tandem parking arrangements, narrow roads challenging access for refuse and large vehicles, refuse vehicles required to reverse.
 - Landscape impact and impact upon AONB, buffering for residents.
 - Basic building standards will not help ABC meet carbon neutral status.
 - Location of primary school – noise from trains, overlooking from bridge, danger for children crossing unmanned level crossing, school not where it needs to be.
 - SuDS inadequate.
 - Location of affordable housing.
 - Lack of meaningful green space/play space.
 - Necessity for flood risk assessment to be undertaken.
 - Impact on infrastructure.
 - Power supplies.
 - Is there enough space for electric charging points to be installed.
 - No provision for self-build units.

[SPM comment: All of the issues raised above have been previously raised and addressed in the report. KCC Highways and Transportation do not raise any objections following the submission of additional information and amendments to the scheme.]

Amendments to Table 1

7. In Table 1 of the report, under the column setting out the Regulation 122 Assessment, there should not be reference to policy IMP2 of the Ashford Local Plan 2030 as the applicant has not made a case to waive or defer any necessary developer contributions through the submission of viability evidence, hence references to policy IMP2 are erroneous in this instance. This applies to Head 7 (Community Learning), Head 8 (Health Care), Head 13 (Secondary schools) and Head 14 (Strategic Parks).
8. Under Head 23 (KCC Travel Plan Monitoring Fee), the amount should read £1000 per annum for a period of 10 years (not £100 p.a.).

Recommendation

9. For clarity, subject to the above amendments to Table 1, the Recommendation remains the same as printed in the report at Annex 1.