



Aylesham Parish Council

Minutes of the Planning, Environment & Transport (including Aylesham Development)
Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 13th May 2020, 11.00am.
Meeting held via Zoom, due to Coronavirus (COVID-19)

SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION AT THE NEXT MEETING

1. Those Present

K. Sutcliffe, J. Pout, I. Thomas, V. Thomas, S. Bott, K. Razzell (Clerk), D. Jenkins (Assistant Clerk), D. Fleck (Resident on Committee), B. Kachchhi (Planning officer)

2. Apologies

M. Townsend, S. MacCallum. B. Oliver,

3. Declarations of Interest

None

4. Public Representation (notified to Clerk in advance of the meeting)

None

5. Dover Planning Application 20/00384

Proposal: Reserved matters application (Phase 2B) pursuant to planning permission DOV/15/00068 for 50 dwellings, associated infrastructure, access, landscaping, layout, scale and appearance, together with details for conditions 57, 63, 64, 72, 81, 87, 90 and 93.

Location: Phase 2B, Land for Aylesham Village Expansion North of, Dorman Avenue North, Aylesham

5.1 B. Kachchhi explained to Councillors what Reserved Matters Application is, and why they are used during developments. An outline planning application is submitted first for an area of land, infrastructure, Section 106 are discussed at this stage. After permission is granted, a Reserved Matters application is then submitted which details the layout, landscaping etc.

5.2 Councillors raised concerns regarding positioning of allocated parking spaces for residents, visitors and layby parking. B. Kachchhi will raise concerns at next meeting with Kent County Council Highways and K. Bennett (DDC Planning Officer). Clerk made B. Kachchhi aware that it had been previously agreed at DDC and Developers Update Meetings that parking bays will be marked out with (v) for visitors and R for residents, or plot number. This was due to no bays being marked in the first phases of the development which causes problems for the residents.

5.3 Councillors also mentioned problems with residents and visitors parking on the pavements causing problems for people with disabilities and pushchairs. B. Kachchhi noted that when Kent County Council adopt the roads within the scheme it will be their rules, this is not something Planning at DDC can get involved in.

5.5 Councillors raised concerns with the traffic counts used for research are from 2018 and not up to date to give a true record of number of vehicles. B. Kachchhi explained due to Covid-19 circumstances a new traffic count also wouldn't give a realistic survey at present, therefore a traffic count will hopefully take place in September 2020. If permission is granted in the meantime to the

developer a condition of the permission would be that they cannot start the development until the traffic survey has been completed in September. B. Kachchhi confirmed to Council that there had been no breach of GDPR regulations on any of the surveys.

5.6 B. Kachchhi confirmed to Council that affordable housing (20% of the development) is spread across the entire scheme, and that there is a legal agreement for this.

Resolved: Clerk to submit concerns raised by Council as noted above. Proposed by J. Pout, seconded V. Thomas. All in favour.

6 Dover District Council Planning Reference: 20/00365

Proposal: Approval of the reserved matters for the strategic Infrastructure Phase 2A. 1, 2A. 2, 2A.3, 2A. 4 and 3.1 including details for conditions 57, 88, 89, 90, 93, 100 and 114 pursuant to permission DOV/15/00068.

Location: Phase 2A.1 and 2A.2, Aylesham Village Expansion Aylesham, Kent

6.1 Councillors raised concerns regarding fly tipping in the area and impact this may have on the community orchard/ native woodlands. Clerk noted to Council she had reported fly tipping, plus a dead rodent recently to Kent County Council Public Right of Way along that PROW EE461.

6.2 No visibility space or access designed in all documents.

6.3 J. Pout raised concerns for the layby as it does not follow the standard protocol of being 2.5 meters wide to allow people to get out of a car safely, and a car would be over hanging the road with the current plan of space being 2 meters wide.

6.4 Clerk read out objections from Kent County Council Highways:

1. Additional speed restraint is required in the main street prior to the proposed 's' bend and I therefore suggest a raised table at the junction with the access to Phase 2A (Residential Street 3).
2. Vehicle swept paths should be provided to demonstrate that a 12.5 metre bus can suitably negotiate the bends in the road and the turn to/from the south at the junction with Ratling Road. It appears that bend widening will be required in a similar manner to other sections of the main street already approved, and the westernmost pedestrian crossing point may need moving a little to the west.
3. The lay-by parking on the south side of the road does not appear to serve any purpose and parked vehicles will obstruct the pedestrian visibility at the adjacent crossing point. It should therefore be removed.
4. A minimum 2 metre-wide, grass-only service margin is required along the southern side of the road where there is no footway. This will need to be widened as necessary to incorporate the forward visibility envelope shown around the bend.
5. The visibility splay to the north of the junction with Ratling Road should be measured to 0.5 metres from the offside edge of the carriageway. Forward visibility of 43 metres is also required from a southbound driver to a vehicle waiting to turn right into the main street.
6. The proposed footway along Ratling Road to the south of the junction should be adjacent to the existing carriageway, and continue southwards to connect to the existing footway network outside number 27 Ratling Road.
7. The proposed footway between the southernmost bend in the main street and Ratling Road should be increased in width to provide a 3 metre-wide shared footway/cycleway.
8. All trees planted in the adoptable highway, including visibility envelopes, must be clear stemmed to a minimum of 2 metres above ground level. The proposed species *Pyrus Calleryana* 'Chanticleer' is not acceptable in the highway. Suitable varieties of Birch, Whitebeam or Cherry would be acceptable.
9. Apart from trees, all adoptable verges must be grass-only.

Resolved: Clerk to raise concerns to BDW and DDC as to who will maintain land? Councillors concurred with Kent County Council comments.

Proposed by. V. Thomas, K. Sutcliffe Seconded. All in Favour.

7. Dover District Council Planning Reference: 19/00821 – SEE 99i KBE APP 30/03/2020

Proposal: 99i – Sports Provisions- Detailed assessment of ground conditions

Location: Aylesham Village Expansion, Aylesham, Kent

Clerk explained to Councillors some of whom were not on the Council last year that this area was at first proposed to be a football kick around area. Councillors agreed this was not a suitable area due to a slope, and it being near an industrial estate and main A road. Councillors discussed the proposed zip wire to be put in place and felt if DDC or developers will be responsible for the land then zip wire was not necessary as it would be unsafe. It was discussed that if the land was maintained by the Parish Council, they could potentially in the future install other.

Resolved: Clerk to ask for clarity of who will be responsible for land.

Proposed by J. Pout, Seconded V. Thomas. All in Favour

8. AOB

Time Meeting Ended -12.07pm