

19/504910

Correction/Clarification

Paragraph 6.51 states that,

"In more frequent lower impact flood events, the FRA demonstrates that the development would have a positive impact on flood risk in the area when compared to waste consent levels mainly due to the flood conveyance channel through the site and voids beneath buildings which allow better flows than the previous development."

This incorrectly refers to a comparison with the 'previous development' and thus buildings that were at the site, which cannot be made. To be clear, the buildings previously at the site have not been used to assess predicated flood depths on and around site but were used for the modelling of predicated flows of water through the site. 'Flow modelling' has not been carried out without the previous buildings so it cannot categorically be stated that the proposals will provide betterment in the local area by improving water flow across the site. However, the development does not have to provide betterment and need only demonstrate it will be safe from flooding without increasing flood risk elsewhere, which it does.

Condition 34

This condition is amended to reflect the floorspaces assessed under the most recent Transport Assessment which are set out in the table below. The total floorspace remains the same.

B1(c) or B2 Use (or a combination of both)	Up to 19,943m ²
B8 Use	Up to 26,504m ²
Total	46,447m ²

34. *The details submitted pursuant to condition 1 shall not exceed the following floorspace limits:*

*B1(c)/Class E(g)(iii) or B2 – no more than ~~21,655m²~~ 19,943m² combined
B8 uses – ~~24,792m²~~ 26,504m²*

Reason: To comply with the floorspace amounts assessed under the application.

Further Representations

Tom Tugendhat MP: Raises the following (summarised) points:

- Residents in Wateringbury are concerned money is being secured to the crossroads despite a scheme being rejected in late 2019, as it was considered it would not improve the quality of life for residents in the village.
- Question why MBC is seeking money towards an already rejected scheme particularly when no alternative solutions have been identified.
- Whilst the issues need to be resolved there is significant concern that the approach by MBC will revitalise a proposal that was widely opposed just a couple of years ago.

Wateringbury Primary School: Raise serious concerns and the following (summarised) points:

- Concerns over traffic levels in the villages of Wateringbury, Teston and Nettlestead and the knock-on effect of this on the health, safety and wellbeing of our pupils, their families, our staff and the wider community.
- Concern over greater risk of road traffic accidents and higher levels of pollution.
- Part of the village is an Air Quality Management Area and should not be exacerbated.
- Air pollution impacts widely on children's health and their future.
- Concerned that there has been no consultation with the school.

T&MBC Councillor Hudson: States that the Wateringbury crossroads scheme has not been fully costed or agreed by the Joint Transport Board and so KCC Highways comments are flawed.

Local Residents: 2 representations received raising the following (summarised) points:

- Concerns over the levels of traffic.
- Hampstead Lane is narrow.
- Increased traffic, noise, disruption and pollution.
- Flood risk.
- Should be turned over to a nature reserve or something similar.
- Will increase traffic a Wateringbury crossroads which is already a health hazard due to air quality.
- There is a primary school on route to Yalding.

Officer Comment

In terms of the crossroads, KCC Highways are seeking money towards the improvement scheme and as stated in the first 'urgent update', the responsibility for securing full funding, public consultation, and implementation lies with KCC.

As outlined in the committee report at paragraph 6.28, the traffic impact at the junction from the development is not considered to be unsafe or 'severe'. Neither are any highway safety issues raised by KCC Highways at the crossroads or in Wateringbury.

As outlined in the committee report at paragraph 6.74, the impact upon air quality at the crossroads would be negligible and no objections have been raised by Environmental Health.

All other issues relate to matters that have already been raised and are fully considered in the committee report.