

**PLANNING APPLICATION : 19/500163/FULL**

Environmental Protection Team Comments 28<sup>th</sup> February 2020

Environmental Health raise no objection in principle, making the following comments:

*Air Quality*

*The additional parking will increase the number of staff vehicles able to park on the site and may help to reduce the number of vehicles that drive around the site to find an available parking space or who park in non designated parking areas on the site. It may also help to reduce the number of staff vehicles that park on neighbouring residential roads. Installing 12 Electric Vehicle charging points will help to offset the development and attract staff electric vehicles to the site.....*

*Noise*

*The conclusions of the [acoustic] report have calculated that there will be minimal increase in the impact of noise once the car park is built and in use. The proposed car park will be for staff use and therefore cars will be parked for the length of the shift resulting in a slower turn over of vehicles when compared to visitor areas who would park for a comparatively shorter term.*

*The additional level may increase the potential noise experienced by residents, but the design has incorporated barriers and metal screening to provide a barrier.*

*Construction noise*

*Noise during the construction phase will increase due to the type of activities carried out on the site. However, the applicant has assumed that work would be starting from 07:00 hours until 18:30 hours. As the construction is stated as being carried out under the Considerate Constructors Scheme I strongly recommend that the construction phase also adheres to our Development Code of Practice*

*Light*

*The applicant has submitted a lighting plan for the proposed development (Wirefield Maidstone Hospital MSCP V2 10/01/2020) and includes a number of lighting plans including a plan showing the predicted light spill beyond the parking area. ....The contractors will need to ensure that an assessment is carried out after installation to ensure the lights meet the condition and predicted light spill. The prediction would meet our standard planning condition .....*

(Officer response, condition 8 requires the lighting scheme to be submitted in accordance with the approved details and maintained thereafter)

## KCC Highways Comments 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2020

KCC

### *"Summary and Recommendations*

*KCC Highways recognises the need to ensure suitable parking provision and access to the Hospital is available and provided in such a way as to meet the needs of the present, the Hospital's future needs and to do so without causing an unsustainable impact on local congestion, air quality and the environment.*

*The applicant has been unable to conclusively evidence a robust forecast for extent of the impact this proposal is likely to have on the local highway network. While it is not anticipated that the effect of these proposals will constitute a significant impact on the local highway network, the lack of robust trip generation forecasting or modelling of junctions prevents any conclusive assessment being made. Due to the sensitivity of the local highway network, it is especially important that the potential impact of this proposal can be accurately assessed.*

*For the above stated reasons, KCC Highways raises a holding objection to this proposal on the grounds that insufficient evidence has been gathered and made available to determine the impact of this proposal on the local highway network. KCC Highways recommends that the applicant should be required to:*

- Provide evidence of a robust methodology used to determine a forecasted trip generation of the proposal.*
- Provide junction capacity assessments to assess the impact of the proposal on both access junctions with the hospital site, including all elements of both junctions.*

*It should be noted that these proposals, the forecasted annual increase in staff trips to the site and the mode share targets within the hospitals Travel Plan do not represent a sustainable solution to meeting the hospital's parking needs in the long term. "*

### Local Residents

Whilst no additional neighbours have commented, existing objectors have made supplementary comments following publication of the Officer report. The relevant comments include:

- Setback of the new deck overcomes main concern
- Concerns regarding the delivery and longevity of the living wall
- Poor state of the eastern boundary
- Impact of construction hours of work

These matters are addressed through the planning conditions.