

Erection of 38 no. residential units and associated works.

Westerham Town Council supports this application in principle.

Despite the report provided by the developers commenting on community consultation this Council has had no previous direct discussions with Linden Homes on the plans submitted to avoid pre-judging. As a result there are a number of issues that we believe have a material impact on the development and cannot be left to conditions.

The site appears as though it has been designed as a cul-de-sac with a reducing road width despite the developers knowledge that the road must be provided as access to a future development set out in the **SDC ADMP**. Given the higher expectation of through traffic in the immediate future the shared use of the road by pedestrians, cycles and cars is wholly inappropriate. This is potentially made worse when looking at the parking provision which seems to exaggerate the spaces provided by double counting the garages as independently accessible on some plots. This will inevitably lead to parking on the road, which pedestrians would need to navigate around.

PPS3 of the Kent Design guide puts good design at the heart of parking provision allowing for space for the size of vans rather than cars, this development fails to meet this policy objective or meet the priority needs of pedestrians and cyclists.

This site allocation under the **SDC DMP policy H1** was originally for 30 dwellings with emphasis on provision for older occupants given the demographic profile of the local community. The application is for 38 units, none of which refer to the specific provision of design or services for older occupiers. We believe this fails **Policy SP 5**

The Council will seek the provision of an increased proportion of housing designed to the lifetime homes standard that can be readily adapted to meet the needs of older people and people with disabilities.

The massing on the site with predominantly two and a half and three story buildings give a high density both in terms of scale and occupancy on a fringe Town location where the overriding developments are more widely spaced which would give a more open and green effect. The majority of units will be for family occupation.

The site as designed provides only limited pedestrian footpaths otherwise the expectation is for shared use of the main road through the development.

We believe this fails **SDC transport strategy**

“Maintain and improve accessibility to jobs, shops and services by non-car means, including walking, cycling, public transport and community transport”.

ADMP Policy SP 2

2. Seek improved facilities for cyclists and pedestrians

The proposal is for pedestrian access to the main London Road and Town to be via a footpath to the south of the development. The application advises that it is the responsibility of Westerham Town Council to improve and maintain this, the developer simply cutting back vegetation. The fact is that WTC has a license to use the track from KCC giving access to the allotment site to the east of the development. It is not this council's responsibility to provide a foot or cycle path.

The design statement and drawings also fail to explain how cyclists, particularly occupying the flats would store their cycles other than in the shared refuse

sheds which seems highly improbable. We believe the application fails **Policy T2 - Vehicle Parking-**

Vehicle parking provision, including cycle parking, in new residential developments should be made in accordance with the current KCC vehicle parking standards in Interim Guidance Note 3 to the Kent Design Guide (or any subsequent replacement).

There is in addition no lighting plan for the site despite the need for pedestrian access along a deeply shaded and dark track and shared use of the road. It is further noted that no charging points have been provided for the common car spaces servicing the flats. This should be a condition of any approval. In accordance with **Policy T3 - Provision of Electrical Vehicle Charging Points- For all major non-residential development proposals the applicant should set out within their Transport Assessment a scheme for the inclusion of electric vehicle charging infrastructure.**

Schemes for new apartments and houses with separate parking areas should include a scheme for at least one communal charging point.

In summary we believe that this is an overdevelopment of a site on the fringe of the Town, its density being more appropriate for an urban settlement. By squeezing in so many dwellings they have compromised the safety of the scheme by requiring common use of the road by residents on foot, bicycle and disability carriages as well as vehicles. This concern also takes into account the future development of the adjacent site as set out in SDC ADMP.

Given its location in Westerham travel by car is considered essential and the residents have a higher than average car usage which means that a higher than average provision of parking and garage space should be provided. It is disappointing that this scheme although having well designed buildings in keeping with the local character fails to demonstrate a cohesive development in which residents can live safely. As a result we believe it fails **Policy EN1 -**

Design Principles-

d) the proposal would ensure satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provide adequate parking and refuse facilities;

f) the design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, would be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;

new development would be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access of those with disabilities; and
h) The design of new developments would result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

Where appropriate, proposals should include details and strategies for the effective management and maintenance of sites following their completion.

Cllr Bird re-joined the meeting

- SE/15/03163/FUL

Site of Bloomfield Cottage, Hortons Way, Westerham

Erection of an 8 unit Residential Building.

WTC supports the application subject to the absence of affordable housing bring acceptable in the circumstances. The change of use is appropriate given the lack of demand for office space in the Town. We would also wish to know

	<p>what the settlement in lieu of the affordable housing might be and whether this would benefit Westerham as it should be used in our community under CIL conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE/15/03322/LBCALT April Cottage, French Street, Westerham TN16 1PW Internal and external repairs to Dining Room, Lounge, north end Utility/WC and 1st Floor bathroom and external French drain. WTC supports this application subject to the agreement of the SDC Conservation officer. 	
6.	<p><u>Planning Appeals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE/15/01726/HOUSE Dunsdale House Westerham Road, Westerham TN16 1LJ An extension to the kitchen at the rear of the house to provide a conservatory/garden room. An appeal has been made to the Planning Inspectorate 	
7.	<p><u>Planning Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE/02022/FUL 59 High Street, Westerham, Kent Replacement of an existing single storey abandoned office building with a two storey residential extension to serve 59 High Street. Withdrawn • SE/15/02247/HOUSE 31 Granville Road, Westerham Demolition of existing rear extension. Erection of a rear extension. Granted • SE/15/02847/HOUSE Ragstone Cottage, Hosey Hill, Westerham Erection of a single storey rear extension to create a garden room. Granted • SE/15/02664/FUL Chartwell, Mapleton Road, Westerham Improvements to the existing secondary car park. Granted 	
8.	<p><u>Village Design Statement</u> Cllr Ashley reported that the next meeting on the VDS followed this meeting. Cllr Ashley had received a quote from a Planning Consultant and this would be discussed at F&GP on 23rd November.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Consultations</u> None</p>	
10.	<p><u>Reports From Councillors</u> Cllr Bird reported that KGF was covered with debris after the football, the Clerk</p>	

	to pass this onto the Deputy Clerk.	
11.	<p><u>Correspondence</u> The following were noted:- 11.1 SDC Enforcement update 11.2 SDC Planning Forum – Cllr Bates and the Clerk to attend. 11.3 SDC - Local Plan Placemaking Workshop – Cllr Marsh and the Clerk to attend. 11.4 GACC press release</p>	
12.	<p><u>Westerham & Brasted Gazette and web-site</u> None</p>	
13.	<p><u>Matters for District and County Councillors</u> Moorhouse Tile Works application</p>	
14.	<p><u>Further Matters for Consideration at the next meeting</u> None</p>	
15.	<p><u>Date of next Meeting</u> Thursday 3rd December 2015 Cllrs Ashley and Bird gave their apologies.</p>	

The meeting was concluded at 11.10 am

Minutes confirmed as a correct record:

Chairman