
PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held at the site listed below on Monday, 20 March 2017 from 9.30 am - 9.53 am.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Bobbin, Mike Dendor, James Hall, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Prescott.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Paul Gregory, Kellie MacKenzie and Alun Millard.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Cameron Beart, Andy Booth and Roger Clark.

1253 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

1254 16/506986/FULL 116 OAK LANE, UPCHURCH, KENT, ME9 7AY

The Chairman welcomed the applicants, the applicants' agent, the applicants' architect, Parish Council representative, and members of the public to the meeting.

The Planner introduced the application which sought planning permission for the demolition of existing bungalow, and the erection of a pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings and a detached 4 bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space at 116 Oak Lane, Upchurch.

The Planner reported that the elevation of the semi-detached dwellings would front Oak Lane and measure 9 metres in depth and 5.9 metres in width and be 5.2 metres to the eaves, and 8.8 metres in overall height. The dwellings would access Oak Lane, each with two parking spaces at the front. The Planner stated that the detached dwelling would front Wallbridge Lane and have a floor area of approximately 8 metres by 9 metres. The dwelling would measure 5 metres to the eaves and be 8 metres in overall height. Two parking spaces would be provided along Wallbridge Lane with a 1.8 metre footpath proposed along the perimeter of the site.

The Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation Officer explained that whilst the application did not meet the criteria to warrant comment from KCC, he would be able to advise and assist Members in considering the application.

The KCC Highways and Transportation Officer stated that he did not consider there to be a particular problem with the proposed new access onto Oak Lane, as visibility to the south was in accordance with the guidance, and this was the direction that vehicles would approach from on the nearest side of the carriageway. To the north visibility was slightly impeded by the neighbour's hedge, but approaching vehicles would generally be on the opposite side of the road and could be seen over the appropriate distance. He advised that on balance he considered

the proposed scheme would improve visibility for the neighbours access and for motorists using Wallbridge Lane onto Oak Lane.

Mr John Collins, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. He noted that the KCC Highways and Transportation Officer considered the application provided good visibility onto Oak Lane, and that the vision splays would provide visibility in perpetuity.

Parish Councillor Rosewell, representing Upchurch Parish Council, stated that whilst the Parish Council did not object in principle to the application, they had concerns in respect of the neighbour's access onto Oak Lane, and also the neighbours hedge which already restricted visibility. He advised that the Parish Council had applied to KCC for the existing highway signs to be moved, as they considered they were not in the correct position.

A local resident asked whether KCC had carried out a risk assessment on the impact the development would have on the vehicle access. The KCC Highways and Transportation Officer explained that the advice he had provided was effectively the Stage 1 Safety Audit for the application.

In response to a query from a local resident, the KCC Highways and Transportation Officer reported that the vision splay onto Oak Lane was approximately 25-30 metres. A local resident claimed that it was actually 15 metres and that the existing drawings showed this.

Local residents raised concerns which included: Oak Lane was 4 metres wide, not wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass safely; cannot believe the developer was proposing access onto Oak Lane; 40 years ago KCC had considered Oak Lane to be a 'track' and imposed a 30mph speed limit, they say they can not afford to provide the necessary line restrictions; cars already mounted the pavement along Oak Lane due to the narrowness of the road; KCC Highways and Transportation were considering the application acceptable on the basis that it was a 2-way road, which it was not; over-development of the site; the footpath along Oak Lane was already dangerous for pedestrians and was 'an accident waiting to happen'; vehicles often lost wing mirrors along Oak Lane due to the narrowness of it; pedestrians often had to 'step back' to avoid vehicles mounting the pavement; chicane road calming mechanisms should be provided along Oak Lane; highway signs were in the wrong place and 'Slow' signs should be provided; there had been a serious road accident at the site; cars speeding and unable to pass caused accidents mounting the pavements and damaging residents' walls; the existing building should be protected and was not an 'eyesore'; and why could the access not be onto Wallbridge Lane?

The applicants' agent, responded to a query from a Member and confirmed that the footpath would end at the application site.

In response to queries from Members, the KCC Highways and Transportation Officer stated that they could not reasonably ask the applicant to provide other mitigation measures to the highways as part of the application to address existing concerns over the width of the road or adherence to the speed limit; the appropriate 30 mph signing was provided; planning permission would not be required for a

dropped kerb along Oak Lane as it was not a classified road; and vehicles travelling at night would have their headlights on.

A Member queried whether the application was an over-development of the site. The Planner provided a copy of the layout plan of the site for Members.

Members then toured the site with officers.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel