

MA/09/1514:

I attach for Members' assistance a larger scale site plan indicating more clearly the position of the oasthouse to be converted, Ledian Farmhouse and the boundary of the Upper Street Conservation Area.

I wish to clarify the statement in paragraph 5.5 of the report. The oast to be converted lies in the northwest corner of the proposed residential area of the site. The oast is not a listed building and neither is it situated within the Conservation Area.

Access and parking issues

I note the comments of the Conservation Officer in paragraph 2.12.3 requesting consideration is given to retaining the site access in its current position. The proposed new site access is located where the required visibility splays and appropriate kerb radii can be achieved in both directions. This is not the case with the existing access.

I would also remind Members that proposed condition 5 (page 75) requires in part:-

"i) The retention of the existing hedgerow and ragstone wall to the Upper Street frontage of the site and where removed to provide the site access road the provision of a replacement hedgerow and ragstone wall returning into the site along either side of the site access road to the front of plots 1, 2 and 12,

ii) The provision of a ragstone wall and hedgerow to the Upper Street frontage of Plot 9,"

I consider that this addresses the concerns of the Conservation Officer.

As indicated at paragraph 10.3, concerns have been expressed by the Parish Council and residents regarding car-parking provision on the site.

In respect of the residential development Kent Highway Services have raised no objections to the level of parking provision although they state that the provision does not comply with the KCC Interim guidance Note no.3 as garage spaces are counted as parking spaces within the scheme. They have however confirmed that the roadways are of sufficient width to allow for some on-street parking still allow cars to pass if necessary.

In respect of the residential development I would remind Members that the Council does not have parking standards adopted at a local level. I would also draw Members' attention to PPG13 which states as follows in paragraph 51

"2. not require developers to provide more spaces than they themselves wish, other than in exceptional circumstances which might include for example where there are significant implications for road safety which cannot be resolved through the introduction or enforcement of on-street parking controls;"

In respect of the residential care home the current KCC standards would require the provision of 1 space per 2 staff and 1 space per 6 beds. A total of 64 staff are indicated as likely to be employed in the care home giving rise to a 32 space

requirement. The ratio of parking spaces to beds gives rise to a further requirement of 10 spaces, a total requirement of 42 spaces on the site if the KCC standard is to be met.

As indicated in paragraph 10.3 of the report, 32 spaces plus an overflow of 6 staff car parking spaces are indicatively shown. This results in an apparent shortfall of 4 spaces. However, the development will be subject to the provisions of a travel plan including the provision of a mini-bus for the site which will reduce demand for on-site parking.

The advice in PPS4 is also relevant and states under Policy EC8: Car Parking for non-residential development

"EC8.1 Local planning authorities should, through their local development frameworks, set maximum parking standards for non-residential development in their area, ensuring alignment with the policies in the relevant local transport plan and, where relevant, the regional strategy. Local planning authorities should not set minimum parking standards for development, other than for parking for disabled people."

The advice in paragraph 51 of PPG13 set out earlier also remains relevant to the residential care home element of the proposed development.

Kent Highway Services have confirmed that there have been no accidents within the last three years in the vicinity of the site and share my view that parking on Upper Street is unlikely to occur as a result of the development due to its width and alignment at this point.

Ecology

I wish to add an informative relating to the provision of bat roosts/swift bricks within the development.

Amendments to recommendation

Add additional informative

The provision of 'swift bricks' on the external faces of the buildings and bat roosts should be employed in the interest of nature conservation and biodiversity enhancement.