

MA/10/0167

A further petition of objection has been received with over 150 signatures.

Further letters of objection have been received from the Tovil Scout Group and CPRE Kent. Three further letters of objection have been received from local residents and a letter of objection from a planning consultancy on behalf of P Burke (the owner of the adjacent land). These new representations essentially raise matters already reported with the following additional points:

- a) The new use gives rise to safety concerns.
- b) Vermin would be a problem.
- c) There would be an adverse impact on the water supply of local users.
- d) This is an unsustainable location for the proposed use.
- e) The proposals would be incompatible with the permitted housing on the adjacent land in terms of land use and would be in conflict with the emerging spatial strategy for the area. The scheme fails to recognise the potential to redevelop an obsolete industrial site for housing.
- f) The use would compromise the marketability of the proposed housing. This would prejudice the reclamation of the housing site and the implementation of the residential scheme.

I have now received the views of Kent Highway Services who state:

“I refer to the above planning application and in order that I may fully assess the highway implications I shall require further information in respect of:-

The proposal, if permitted would generate additional HGV movements over and above that generated by the existing use of the site. I am concerned that Straw Mill Hill is adequate in terms of width to accommodate these additional vehicles and require evidence to indicate that there is sufficient width along Straw Mill Hill between the proposed site access and its junction with the B1010 to allow two HGV's to pass.

An hourly profile of the trips generated by the development is required, indicating the numbers of vehicles generated at both the highway peak hours and the development peak times. Evidence is also required to indicate that there is sufficient space for parking/loading/unloading/turning within the site during the busiest times.

Confirmation is required that the routing arrangements in respect of HGV's, for both the development traffic and construction traffic, will be made via Straw Mill Hill and the B1010.

Signing is required both within the site and along Straw Mill Hill to advise of cyclists.

I shall also be grateful if you will allow an extension of time to the normal consultation period in order that the highway implications of this proposal can be properly assessed. I will let you have my comments as soon as possible.”

OFFICER COMMENT: These comments have been made by the Highways Officer direct to KCC Planning so clearly this request for further information needs to be addressed by KCC as the determining authority. It seems to me that, whilst the officer is not objecting at this stage, concern is expressed as to the adequacy of the local highway network and I see no reason to change my recommendation to object on the highways issue. On the issue of sustainability the site is within the defined urban area and close to basic services and I do not consider that an objection could be sustained on that issue. The safety and security of the site would need to be addressed by the operators as part of their health and safety responsibilities, whilst I am not satisfied that potential incidence of vermin and problems with water supply are significant planning issues as they can be addressed by other legislation or other bodies. The issue of the impact of this proposal on the proposed housing site adjacent is dealt with in my original report.

Re paragraph 5.3.1 of my original report, I attach a copy of Policy W17 of The South East Plan hereto as it is missing from the committee papers.

MY RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED

POLICY W17: LOCATION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

Waste development documents will, in identifying locations for waste management facilities, give priority to safeguarding and expanding suitable sites with an existing waste management use and good transport connections. The suitability of existing sites and potential new sites should be assessed on the basis of the following characteristics:

- i. good accessibility from existing urban areas or major new or planned development
- ii. good transport connections including, where possible, rail or water
- iii. compatible land uses, namely:
 - active mineral working sites
 - previous or existing industrial land use
 - contaminated or derelict land
 - land adjoining sewage treatment works
 - redundant farm buildings and their curtilages
- iv. be capable of meeting a range of locally based environmental and amenity criteria.

Waste management facilities should not be precluded from the Green Belt. Small-scale waste management facilities for local needs should not be precluded from Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks where the development would not compromise the objectives of the designation.

- 10.54 Policy W7 identifies the urgent need for a wide range of new waste management facilities which, with the emphasis on recycling and recovery rather than landfill, will increasingly need to be situated in permanent locations. If new facilities are to be developed in time for meeting the challenging targets in this Plan, it is essential that waste and local development documents are site-specific wherever possible, but also specify locational criteria to provide the basis for considering other proposals.
- 10.55 Many facilities will need to be developed close to the source of waste and will therefore generally be close to urban areas. Development in the countryside, particularly the urban fringe and where there are rural waste management needs, will also be required and may represent the most appropriate location for certain activities, such as composting.
- 10.56 Waste management facilities should not be precluded from designated areas such as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) or National Parks, if the objectives of more environmentally sustainable forms of waste management are to be met. This is particularly important in the South East because of the proportion of land covered by such designations and the pattern of high-density development. It is essential that waste facilities proposed in such areas are assessed in the light of local circumstances and national/regional policy, and are subject to good design and landscape character appraisal. Within Green Belts major developed sites may provide suitable locations (PPG2, Annex C).
- 10.57 The types of facility that might be considered cannot be specified and will depend on local circumstances. It is also important not to stifle technological innovation and advance by referring to lists of types of facility that may be treated as exclusive. However the types of facility likely to be justified in Green Belts, where the lack of suitable alternative sites, and proximity to urban areas and the source of waste may be important factors, are likely to be different to those likely to be justified in AONBs and National Parks where facilities will probably be smaller in scale and associated with rural communities.
- 10.58 The co-location of waste management facilities, for example in recovery parks on sites offering good transport links, can provide significant environmental benefits and enable economies of scale by allowing flexible, integrated facilities to be developed. Co-location can also assist the separation of waste for different types of recovery on one site. Waste