

Reference number: 16/507471

### Additional Urgent Update Report

#### Air Quality

As a consequence of additional liaison with Environmental Health and further negotiation with the developers, and further to the suggested removal of condition 28 in the previous Urgent Update, a new condition 28 is suggested as follows:

28. Prior to occupation two active Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be provided. Two additional passive Electric Vehicle Charging points will be made available for connection/operation if demand requires.

Reason: in the interests of air quality and sustainable transport.

#### Parking

The Parking Manager has provided the following comments:

*The question is how the CPZ will be managed and enforced. If the land is privately owned, the landowner would make their own arrangements, however if adopted highway (designated highway) KCC would normally place restrictions and draft a traffic regulation order to control access, maintain junction sightlines and manage the free flow of traffic etc. I understand that some yellow lines have been placed in this area by KCC from the roundabout but these are not backed up by a traffic regulation order and so remain unenforceable by our enforcement team.*

*With regard to resident parking permits, I can confirm this area is outside the current resident zones (these are mainly in the town centre) and so residents will not be eligible for a permit under the current scheme.*

5.02 Replace “proposal considered acceptable” with ‘No objection’.

Replace paragraph 5.02.04 with the following

The applicant has proposed that 187 parking spaces will be provided to support the new development. It is understood that 90 of the spaces will be allocated to the 90 private apartments and the remaining 97 spaces will be unallocated for use by residents and visitors of the build to rent apartments.

In accordance with Interim Guidance Note 3 (IGN3), resident parking should ordinarily be provided at a maximum rate of one space per unit. IGN3 also states that provision at edge of centre locations can be reduced for rented properties, subject to effective tenancy controls. Visitor parking, which is usually required at a rate of 0.2 spaces per unit, can be reduced in instances where there are flats and/or the main provision is unallocated.

On this basis, the maximum parking provision of 372 spaces permissible through reference to IGN3 is unlikely to be warranted. The issue is therefore whether the proposed 187 spaces are sufficient to support the development without there being problems of parking overspill, either within the development site or across the surrounding area.

KCC Highways regard the principles of the applied approach to provide a suitable basis for gauging the level of provision that may be appropriate. The proposals do not however, include any contingency allowance to reflect the fluctuating nature of parking demand and provide sufficient confidence that adequate parking will be available in the event that the forecast demand level is exceeded.

As highlighted in the Transport Assessment, the surrounding roads in the immediate vicinity of the site are subject to parking restrictions. Any displacement of parking demand could therefore affect a wider area or result in indiscriminate parking behaviour.

It is recommended that the applicant is requested to re-evaluate the proposed parking with a view to providing a greater degree of certainty that any demand over and above the forecast level can be accommodated within the site.

It is noted that 310 cycle parking spaces are proposed in accordance with minimum standards

Reason: to more accurately reflect KCC highways comments.

## **Arbiculture**

The Heritage Landscape and Design Team Leader has provided the following additional comments:

*Whilst further arboricultural information has now been supplied, the specific details are proposed to be provided through the provision of an Arboricultural Method Statement. At this stage there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the principles for retention and protection of existing trees can actually be achieved. I therefore continue to have concerns and cannot support the application on arboricultural grounds.*

*If, however, you are minded to grant permission I would want to see detailed conditions attached as follows:*

*Replace Condition 30 with the following:*

### **30. Arboricultural Method Statement**

Prior to commencement of development an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) in accordance with the current edition of BS 5837 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The AMS should detail implementation of any aspect of the development that has the potential to result in the loss of or damage to trees, including their roots, and take account of site access, demolition and construction activities, foundations, service runs and level changes. It should also detail any tree works necessary to implement the approved scheme and include a tree protection plan. Specific details should include the piled foundations for the access road and irrigation methods, proposed soil amelioration and mulching and the elevational treatment of the building to minimise heat and solar glare on the existing trees.

### **New Condition 33: Soft landscape scheme**

Prior to commencement of development a landscape scheme designed in accordance with the principles of the Council's landscape character guidance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall show all existing trees, hedges and blocks of landscaping on, and immediately adjacent to, the site and indicate whether they are to be retained or removed. It shall detail measures for protection of species to be retained, provide details of on site replacement planting to mitigate any loss of amenity and biodiversity value together with the location of any habitat piles and include a planting specification, a programme of implementation and a long term management plan.

Reason: In the interest of tree protection.

Correction:

7.10.7 replace the words 'minimal and' with the word 'likely to be substantial but'

**Recommendation remains unchanged.**