

- a) **DOV/16/00985 – Reserved matters application for the approval of details relating to access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for the erection of 162 dwellings and associated infrastructure and landscaping, pursuant to outline application DOV/07/01081, pursuant to Variation of Condition application DOV/15/00068 (pursuant to DOV/14/00338 and DOV/13/00120) - Aylesham Village Expansion, Aylesham (Phases 1B2 and 1B3)**

Reason for report: Number of contrary views. The application has also been called in to planning committee by Cllr Keen.

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning Permission be granted.

- c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Core Strategy Policies

- CP4 - Developments of 10 or more dwellings should identify the purpose of the development in terms of creating, reinforcing or restoring the local housing market in which they are located and development an appropriate mix of housing mix and design. Density will be determined through the design process, but should wherever possible exceed 40dph and will seldom be justified to less than 30dph.
- CP6 - Development that generates a demand for infrastructure will only be permitted if the necessary infrastructure is either already in place, or there is a reliable mechanism to ensure that it will be provided at the time it is needed.
- DM1 - Development will not be permitted outside of the settlement confines, unless it is specifically justified by other development plan policies, or it functionally requires such a location, or it is ancillary to existing development or uses.
- DM5 - Development for 15 or more dwellings will be expected to provide 30% affordable housing at the site, in home types that will address prioritised need.
- DM11 - Development that would generate high levels of travel will only be permitted within the urban areas in locations that are, or can be made to be, well served by a range of means of transport.
- DM12 - Planning applications that would involve the construction of a new access or the increased use of an existing access onto a trunk or primary road will not be permitted if there would be a significant increase in the risk of crashes or traffic delays unless the proposals can incorporate measures that provide sufficient mitigation.
- DM13 - Parking provision should be design-led, based upon an area's characteristics, the nature of the development and design objectives, having regard for the guidance in Table 1.1 of the Core Strategy.
- DM25 - Proposals that result in the loss of open space will not be permitted unless certain criteria are met.

Land Allocations Local Plan

- DM27 - Residential development of five or more dwellings will be required to provide or contribute towards the provision of open space, unless existing provision within the relevant accessibility standard has sufficient capacity to accommodate this additional demand.

Dover District Local Plan 2002 (Saved Policies)

- AY1 – Land is allocated for up to 1000 dwellings, petrol filling station, formal playing fields and associated children's play, employment land, a primary school and food retail.
- AY2 – An outline proposal for the strategic expansion of Aylesham should cover the whole development area and be accompanied by and based on a master plan.
- AY3 – Proposals for residential development in the development area will be permitted provided: the overall net density shall be at a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare; at least 15 percent of all dwellings are for affordable housing; provision is made for children's play; and the development has variety in design, is energy efficient and avoids standard estate layouts.
- AY7 – Proposals for the Development Area will not be permitted unless: structural landscaping is provided on the eastern boundary with the railway line together with planting to strengthen the ancient hedge line which forms the northern boundary; at least 3.7 hectares of formal playing fields is provided in the development area; a landscape phasing programme is agreed with the Council; and the long term management of all open space and structural landscaping is secured.
- AY8 – Land is allocated to meet additional primary school provision.
- AY10 – Proposals will not be permitted unless they include provision for a spinal footpath and cycle network, extending where practicable into the existing settlement.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraph 14 of the NPPF requires that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date development should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, or, specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.
- Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that "housing applications should be considered in the context of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing sites.
- The NPPF has 12 core principles which, amongst other things, seeks to: proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs; secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future residents; recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside; contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution; and actively manage patterns of growth to make the

fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

- Chapter four of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport. In particular, paragraph 29 states that "the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel".
- Chapter six of the NPPF seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing, requiring Local Planning Authorities to identify specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- Chapter seven requires good design, which is a key aspect of sustainable development.
- Chapter eleven requires that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils. Local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity.

The Kent Design Guide (KDG)

- The Guide provides criteria and advice on providing well designed development.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

The site has an extensive planning history relating to the various phases of the Aylesham Village Expansion, including numerous amendments to previous consents. The following applications are those which are considered to be materially relevant to the current application:

DOV/07/01081 – A) A full application for residential development for 191 dwellings of which 20% will be affordable; all associated works and infrastructure, together with new shops and apartments; alterations to existing shops and apartments; landscaping to existing streets and public open spaces including Market Square; the formation of new public open spaces; upgrade of sports pitch and provision of changing facilities at Ratling Road; formation of squares and a strategic play area; traffic management schemes and new car parking areas; other landscaping works; temporary works and access; construction compounds and off-site highway works: and

B) Outline application for a residential development of up to 1210 dwellings; associated infrastructure and works, including new and enhanced sports and leisure grounds and facilities; new shops and apartments with alterations to existing shops and apartments; temporary construction access and compound areas; an area of live/work units; new and altered roads; parking facilities and traffic management within and nearby to Aylesham village - Granted

DOV/13/00120 – Variation of conditions including 1, 3, 5, 14, 15, 22, 24, 32, 34, 38, 45, 51, 52, 56, 68, 76 and 77 of planning permission DOV/07/01081 (Section 73 application) and modification to legal agreements – Granted

DOV/14/00338 – Variation of Conditions 88, 110 and 112 of planning permission DOV/13/00120 (application under Section 73) - Granted

DOV/14/01206 – Variation of Conditions including 16, 48 and 85 of planning permission DOV/14/00338 (Section 73 application) - Granted

DOV/15/00952 – Variation of Condition 14 of planning permission DOV/14/01206 to introduce a new form of layout for junction 21 (application under Section 73) (amended description/further details) – Withdrawn

DOV/16/00180 - Reserved matters application pursuant to outline application DOV/07/01081 pursuant to Variation of Condition application DOV/14/01206 (pursuant to DOV/14/00338 and DOV/13/00120) for approval of 277 dwellings, access, landscaping, scale and appearance - Granted

DOV/16/01177 - Reserved matters application pursuant to outline application DOV/07/01081 pursuant to Variation of Condition application DOV/15/00068 (pursuant to DOV/14/01206, DOV/14/00338 and DOV/13/00120) for details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of Strategic Infrastructure Phases 1B.1, 1B.2 and 1B.3 (comprising highways, cycleway and footways and the formation of public open space) - Current

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

Principal Ecologist – No comments to make

Kent Police Crime Prevention Officer –

It is appreciated that the applicant have pointed out the KDI and the protocol they have also mentioned prevention of crime however they have confused the issue with Secured By Design (SBD) under the old codes for sustainable homes system for parts 1 and 2 .

A number of changes in Secured By Design (SBD) have taken place to meet and exceed the standards of Approved Document “Q” (ADQ) which came into force as a building regulation on the 01st of October 2015, this included Homes 2016 which has been written and published as a guide and was introduced on the SBD website on the 01st of June 2016 as an alternative option to the architect, developer and builder to enable them obtain Gold Silver or Bronze award for SBD, which replaces the old codes for sustainable homes and the former SBD sections 1,2 and 3.

They have stated in section 4.11 that they have no SBD requirement, however if they purchased certified products i.e. PAS 24 2012/2016 windows and doors they would also automatically discharge the building regulation and qualify automatically for the Secured By Design (SBD) Silver Award, and we would encourage them to do so as a minimum security standard.

Kent Police would welcome the opportunity to work with the applicant and take them through this new SBD process.

Environment Agency – No objection, but have requested that they be consulted on foul drainage and piling conditions.

KCC Lead Local Flood Authority –

Initial response received 15th September 2017

Do not wish to comment on the application. Notwithstanding this, the applicant should consider how soakaways will be accommodated within the proposed layout.

Subsequent response received 26th June 2017

The utilisation of soakaways may have implications for the site layout, given the need for appropriate setbacks and access arrangements. It would be timely and appropriate if the applicant could demonstrate the assumed locations for drainage infrastructure, particularly any soakaways, to ensure that layout does accommodate the structures in appropriate areas.

Natural England –

Initial response received 2nd September 2016

No objection

Subsequent response received 16th June 2017

No objection

Sport England –

Initial response received 30th August 2016

The application falls below the thresholds for Sport England's involvement and, as such, no comments are made.

Subsequent response received 14th June 2017

No objection

Southern Water –

Initial response received 1st February 2017

Due to the vibration, noise and potential odour generated by sewage pumping stations, no habitable rooms should be located within 15 metres to the boundary of a proposed pumping station site.

Subsequent response received 27th June 2017

Due to the vibration, noise and potential odour generated by sewage pumping stations, no habitable rooms should be located within 15 metres to the boundary of a proposed pumping station site.

Southern Gas Networks – There are low/medium/intermediate pressure gas mains near the site. The development should avoid damage to these services.

Affinity Water – The site is located within the Groundwater Source Protection Zone of Broome Pumping Station. As such, the development should be carried out to the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices to reduce groundwater pollution risk.

DDC Strategic Housing Manager - The planning statement submitted with the application recognises the requirement for 20% of all new dwellings provided to be affordable and sets out the number of affordable homes that will be delivered by Persimmon Homes South East within its 3 development phases. Overall PHSE intends to develop 385 new homes of which 77 will be provided as affordable homes thereby complying with the overall affordable housing target for the Aylesham village expansion.

Aylesham Parish Council – Object

Initial response received 4th October 2016

The planning application shows the removal of the Right of Way from its current position and diverting the route through the development losing its permeability.

The loss of the hedgerow within the Garden village is a loss of our natural environment, contravening the National Planning Policy Framework.

Looking at the plan I can see that this would have an adverse effect on the existing properties losing their privacy due to the close proximity of the new builds.

No through road to the existing village from this phase as shown in fig 22 of the SPG preventing vehicle, walking and cycling access, the design goes against the SPG Masterplan shown in fig 23 detailing pedestrian and cycling movements giving links to existing direct routes to all areas, no access to the existing village.

The plan shows bulked parking spaces which can be seen from the front of properties which clearly has a visual impact, there should be car barns to compliment the rest of the new properties and the car spaces need to be carefully looked at with it being a garden village not just lots of tarmac.

The proposed development is over bearing and has a visual impact on the neighbouring properties.

Subsequent response received 8th February 2017

Visual impact of the development.

The parish council's following objections with regard to the visual impact of the development are underpinned by the promise in the original master plan which emphasises a focus on the quality of the site in relation to the visuals of the design. Due to the original structure of Aylesham, the parish council still object to this part of the development because of its visual impact. Further concerns surround the open view of vehicles in open parking as opposed to concealing vehicles within and around houses. This follows from the previous objection raised in 2016.

The parish council also object to the choice of tree planting in respect to the original promise of desired avenues and idyllic public scenery.

The parish council hold some objection with respect to the chosen cycle routes and storage facilities for the newly built properties.

Further objections lay with the proximity of houses in the proposed development. Some houses (ref. houses 157, 162) .The visual ramifications are prevalent with regards to side windows on some properties being blocked, despite the parish council's understanding that these are newly built properties of which buyers should beware.

Re-rooting footpaths and "Right of Way"

The major objections from the parish council stem from the newly proposed diversions on public rights of way in the development. It is the parish council's understanding that, with reference to the Highway Act 1980, only under the interests of the public may a development warrant a diversion path from the original of which the parish council believe the current diversion is not within the interests of the public due to restrictions on village access and community disunity issues. Additionally, the parish council object to the current diversion as, it must terminate where the original path terminates. Similarly, in accordance to the Planning Inspectorate, it cannot take up an original right of way, as the new development does. While the Planning Inspectorate states that new diversions may "inpart" follow an existing path under Section 118, the current development has in places closed routes and followed an existing path in excess. Further objections exist around highway access. There is a maxim "once a highway always a highway", in the case of *Harvey v Truro RDC*.

The parish council object to the development's plan to restrict vehicle access to current highways as it is unlawful to remove the right to use the highway. A final concern stands with the route of the proposed path being longer than the original.

Re-rooting / Loss of vegetation on the southern boundary of the site

While the parish council understand the current hedgerow near Brookside will be kept in accordance to our previous objections, we understand that, alongside the new development, it requires maintenance and is the landowner's responsibility to facilitate this. The parish council therefore propose that Dover District Council maintain this for interests of surrounding residents.

Connectivity to the village

The parish council object to the development's chosen use of cycle routes and links to the village. Furthermore, the council holds concerns over the width and length of some roads with regards to emergency services. The restrictions on these roads also stands illegitimate in the parish council's view for no public consultation had been convened. The parish council also believes that an extension would alleviate traffic and remove the strain to local enterprise that the current development will cause by restricting access to local shops.

The parish council also hold objections to the development's failure to recognise the impact of the volume of traffic with concern to the roads it proposes. Given the absence of pedestrian crossings around the Dorman Avenue North area and the increased traffic from new inhabitants, the parish council proposes greater measures for infrastructure to cope with the volume of traffic.

A final objection is the decision to enforce 6ft fences with regards to crime. It is the parish council's belief that lower fences would enhance community cohesion and weaken the ability of burglars or other criminals to use the neighbourhood as a hiding spot.

Further response received 3rd August 2017

Following a Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting which took place on 27th July 2017 Aylesham Parish Council have a request for a holding objection in relation to the above planning application made by the Persimmons Development.

- The Developers have infringed a public right of way without consultation with the Parish Council and local residents at EE288, and it has been developed over.
- One of our Parish Councillors, Barbara Morgan, has already submitted a complaint about this to the Highways Authority and the reference she was provided with is 323490.
- Also that at EE461 that the right of way be preserved in the development.
- Please can you also include a condition on the planning application that the Developers ensure that motorcyclists are restricted from having access to the beginning, middle and end of the development area.

In the interim, we as a Parish Council would request that Persimmon be contacted and requested to refrain from taking any further steps to develop at this site at this time.

Shepherdwell with Coldred Parish Council –

Initial response received 22nd September 2016

Note the application, but have passed no comments

Further comment received 22nd June 2017

No objection

Eythorne Parish Council – No objection

Denton with Wootton Parish Council –

Initial response received 8th September 2016

Concerns are raised regarding the increased traffic movements onto the nearby A2 and the inability of the slip road and local roads to cope with increased traffic.

Subsequent response received 26th January 2017

The main issues are the increased traffic and safety issues in the area. A project of this size will lead to increased congestion at the Barham flyover junction and increased traffic on the B2046 to Wingham. The 'slip road' at the flyover has also been identified as not being fit for purpose for the increased amount of traffic and should be lengthened to improve safety for those vehicles joining the A2.

There will also be an increased traffic flow on the A260 road through Denton which Kent Highway Services has already identified as having major traffic issues.

Nonington Parish Council – Concerns are raised about the traffic increase through the village and the increase in tailbacks whilst trying to access the A2 via Adisham Rd due to the Aylesham expansion project. During the morning rush hour the traffic now tailbacks from the roundabout well passed the Nonington turn off.

Barham Parish Council – Object. The development will lead to major issues of increased traffic onto the A2 and the inability of the slip road and local roads to cope with the increased traffic. There will be an increase in traffic at the Barham flyover junction and increased traffic on the B2046 to Wingham. The slip road onto the London bound A2 should have been improved. The access to Folkestone Road should also be improved.

KCC Highways and Transportation –

Initial response received 18th January 2017

Phase 1B2

1. The Masterplan extract in the Design and Access Statement shows pedestrian links to Buttermere Gardens and Thirlmere Gardens to the south east, as well as connections to and retention of the existing Public Right of Way along the boundary. However, these pedestrian links are not shown in the proposed layout and should therefore be included. I also advise consultation with our PROW Team on the proposals.

2. The Masterplan extract also shows tertiary road links to the northern end of Coniston Drive and to the land parcel to the east of plots 254-258, which again are not shown in the proposed layout. Whilst vehicular links are not essential there should at least be shared pedestrian/cycle links provided..

3. The plan does not reflect the extension to the adjacent Central Boulevard submitted under application number 16/ and the subsequent amendments to those proposals, which have a bearing on the layout and parking for phase 1B2 and should therefore be incorporated.

4. The necessary visibility splays at the junctions of roads with the Central Boulevard and Aylesham Street should be shown.

5. Vehicle swept paths for an 11.3 metre refuse vehicle have not been submitted.

6. Although dimension of streets are referred to in the Design and Access Statement, it is not clear where they apply on the layout and this should therefore be clarified.

7. The remote location of parking from the front doors of dwellings and/or tandem parking arrangements are likely to generate unacceptable on-street parking on the highway outside plots 141-143, 211-221, 238-240 and 250-253. Existing and proposed lay-by parking along the roads fronting these plots therefore needs to be reconsidered accordingly.

8. The remote location of parking from the front doors of dwellings is likely to create unacceptable on-street parking too close to the junction with the highway outside plots 147, 179, 233 and 237. Parking arrangements for these plots therefore need to be reconsidered.

Whilst the streets within the site are to remain private and these are not issues likely to affect the highway, you may wish to consider the following in relation to those private streets:

- Details of visibility splays /forward visibility envelopes have not been shown.
- There are no 1 metre margins in front of some banks of 90 degree parking (to provide visibility for drivers exiting).
- There are some 3, 4 and 5 bedroom plots with tandem parking arrangements rather than independently accessible parking spaces.

Phase 1B3

9. The plan does not reflect the extension to the adjacent Central Boulevard and SUDS Street submitted under application number 16/01177 and the subsequent amendments to those proposals, which have a bearing on the layout and parking for phase 1B3 and should therefore be incorporated.

10. Although dimension of streets are referred to in the Design and Access Statement, it is not clear where they apply on the layout and this should therefore be clarified.

11. Vehicle swept paths for an 11.3 metre refuse vehicle have not been submitted.

Whilst the street within the site is to remain private and these are not issues likely to affect the highway, you may wish to consider the following in relation to the private street:

- Details of visibility splays /forward visibility envelopes have not been shown.
- There are some 3, 4 and 5 bedroom plots with tandem parking arrangements rather than independently accessible parking spaces.
- It would appear that a connection would be desirable between the street and the footpath around the village edge to the north.

Subsequent response received 16th June 2017

Phase 1B2

1. The plans appear to now show a vehicular connection to Coniston Drive, which is acceptable. However, the proposed street connecting to Coniston Drive appears to be a shared surface and whilst all the proposed streets are to remain private, they should make suitable connections to the existing highway. The existing footways in Coniston Drive should therefore be extended 1.8 metres beyond the connection point into the shared surface and dropped kerbs provided, to allow suitable pedestrian access to /from the new street. There should also be a ramp at the entrance to the shared surface, to encourage lower speed and help identify to drivers that they are entering a shared surface.

2. The remote location of parking from the front doors and/or tandem parking arrangements are likely to lead to unacceptable on-street parking on the highway outside plots 141-143, 147, 179, 233 and 237.

Whilst the streets within the site are to remain private and these are not issues likely to affect the highway, you may wish to consider the following in relation to those private streets:

- Details of visibility splays/forward visibility envelopes have not been shown.
- There are some 3, 4 and 5 bedroom plots with tandem parking arrangements rather than independently accessible parking spaces.

Phase 1B3

Amended plans do not appear to have been submitted for the above. Whilst the street within the site is to remain private and these are not issues likely to affect the highway, you may wish to consider the following in relation to the private street:

1. Details of visibility splays /forward visibility envelopes have not been shown.
2. There are some 3, 4 and 5 bedroom plots with tandem parking arrangements rather than independently accessible parking spaces.
3. It would appear that a connection would be desirable between the street and the footpath around the village edge to the north.

KCC Public Rights of Way – No comments received

KCC Archaeology – No comments received

Public Representations – Twenty two letters of objection have been received, raising the following concerns:

- Loss of hedgerows
- Loss of a Public Right of Way
- The public right of way is well used by walkers, runners, dirt bikers and other members of the public`
- Harm to wildlife and their habitats
- The removal of vegetation would include pollution
- Loss of privacy
- The proximity of new houses to existing houses would be detrimental to security
- Parking areas would be more aesthetically pleasing if they were car barns
- Lack of permeability being the development and the existing village to the south
- The development would harm the character and appearance of the area
- The existing cul-de-sacs should remain cul-de-sacs
- Loss of countryside views

- f)
1. **The Site and the Proposal**
 - 1.1 The application site is located to the north of the village of Aylesham within the permitted village extension. The land, with the exception of the land around the Public Right of Way EE416 (PRoW) to the southern boundary of the site, has already been cleared and fenced off as part of the extensive works that are underway across the whole site.
 - 1.2 A number of the early phases of the development have now been constructed, and are occupied; however, a significant portion of the outline planning permission is still to be implemented.

- 1.3 This reserved matters application seeks consent for 162 dwellings split across two parcels of land. Parcel 1B2, which is the larger of the two parcels and would provide 136 dwellings, is located to the south of the site and directly adjacent to the existing village. Phase 1B3, which would provide 26 dwellings, is located further to the north. The development would include the provision of 27 affordable dwellings.

2 **Main Issues**

- 2.1 The main issues are:

- The principle of the development
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on the local highway network
- The impact on living conditions
- Ecology
- Contamination

Assessment

Principle

- 2.2 The site lies within the designated Aylesham Expansion area. The site benefits from outline planning permission for the erection of up to 1210 dwellings, together with associated development. This outline permission remains extant. Subject to meeting the conditions set out by the outline permission and being acceptable in all other material respects, the principle of the development is acceptable.

Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

- 2.3 The development would provide 162 houses, split across two parcels of land. The parcels of land would provide the following housing mixes.

Dwelling Type	Parcel 1B2	Parcel 1B3	Totals
One Bed	0 (0%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
Two Bed	25 (18%)	0 (0%)	25 (15%)
Three Bed	76 (56%)	4 (15%)	80 (49%)
Four Bed	28 (21%)	15 (58%)	43 (27%)
Five Bed	7 (5%)	7 (27%)	14 (9%)
Totals	136	26	162

- 2.4 This housing mix is considered to provide a good range of housing types, with a preference for larger, family housing. Correspondingly, the affordable housing also seeks to provide a range of housing sizes, including twelve two-bed, thirteen three bed and two four bed dwellings. The scale of the houses proposed responds to the broad mix envisaged within the Aylesham Masterplan SPG and it is therefore considered that the housing mix proposed is appropriate.
- 2.5 The development would provide 27 affordable houses spread over three areas, within the larger Parcel 1B2. These areas would provide eight, eight and eleven units respectively. It is considered that the distribution of affordable housing through the site ensures that an appropriate balance is struck between integrating these dwellings into the scheme, aiding social cohesion, and grouping dwellings to ensure they can be efficiently managed. The design of the buildings would not differ from that of the market housing with the same house types being

used. As such, the affordable housing areas would be indistinguishable from the market housing.

- 2.6 Condition 67 of the approved outline permission requires that the development provide 20% of the total number of dwellings as affordable dwellings. The 27 affordable dwellings to be provided in this application equates to a 16.7% provision. Whilst this falls below the 20% required, the applicant overprovided affordable housing within earlier phases of the development. Consequently, the 27 affordable dwellings proposed within this application, together with the affordable houses provided within earlier phases, would equate to an overall provision of 20% across the site.

Character and Appearance

- 2.7 The layout of the development takes the form of strong street fronting development along the northern and western edges of the site where the buildings will front onto the main boulevards of the Aylesham, whilst loose perimeter blocks are proposed towards the centre and south of the site. Predominantly, each block of houses faces outwards onto roads. The perimeter blocks address a variety of boulevards, roads and shared surfaces, whilst the blocks themselves vary in size, shape and orientation. The effect of the variation throughout the layout of the scheme is to provide a series of 'places' as one navigates the development, whilst providing a legible layout and avoiding long unrelieved streets. Whilst the majority of the layout functions well in this regard, there are some areas which have been less successful, such as where dwellings front onto areas of car parking or where there are expanses of car parking adjacent to roads. Whilst these features detract from the character of the development, it is considered that they are unavoidable as a result of the irregular shape of the site and the Masterplan and Design Code requirements from strong street fronting development, and a lack of vehicular accesses, onto the main boulevards. The applicant has explored opportunities to reduce the impact of these negative features and has broken up expanses of car parking with landscaping wherever possible which has undoubtedly improved the scheme. Whilst some detracting aspects of the scheme remain, it is not considered that these result in an unacceptably poor quality scheme. Overall, the layout of the scheme reflects the layout envisaged by the Masterplan and Design Code.
- 2.8 The scheme comprises a mixture of terraced, detached and semi-detached dwellings, together with some, limited, flatted accommodation, although detached and terraced houses are predominant. The Masterplan identifies different character areas and attributes suggested densities and building types to these areas.
- 2.9 The types of dwellings and the densities proposed generally relate well to the identified areas within the Masterplan, with the areas attributed as 'High' and 'Medium' density containing the majority of the terraces and flats and the lower density areas containing predominantly detached and semi-detached properties. Whilst there are some detached dwellings in the high density area and some terraced dwellings in the low density area, contrary to the recommendations of the Masterplan, such instances are rare and have been designed sensitively, so that they do not cause visual harm. Furthermore, it is considered that the introduction of a small number of detached dwellings in higher density areas has allowed the development to address corners more successfully. Overall, it is considered that the density and building types therefore respond well to the Masterplan.

- 2.10 The proposed houses are a mixture of two and two and a half storeys in height. In addition the two flat blocks are three storeys in height. The two and two and a half storey buildings which predominant respond positively to the typical height of development within the Aylesham Expansion and the dwellings to the south of the site in the existing village. The two three storey blocks of flats are located on important corners along the main boulevard through the wider development, forming visual landmarks, as required by the Design Code. The height of these buildings is therefore justified.
- 2.11 The designs of the buildings have a strong theme, providing unity to the overall character of the scheme and responding to the design of the previous approved phases of development. However, whilst sharing similar characteristics, the design of the dwellings include 12 different building types, which would themselves differ across the site, adding variety throughout the development. The housing types are traditionally designed and proportioned, responding positively to the simple yet attractive traditional vernacular of Aylesham and the earlier phases of development. The materials used in the construction of the dwellings is also varied with buildings constructed of a mixture of red brick, yellow brick, white render and white weatherboarding, each with contrasting detailing, under roofs finished in either red or dark grey double Roman tiles. Together with the variety of building designs, the variety of materials used will add interest to the development and allow each of the two parcels to sit comfortably with the earlier phases and Aylesham more generally.
- 2.12 The development incorporates areas to the fronts of buildings which allow opportunities for soft landscaping, with houses set back from the road. Within these areas, between the front elevations of buildings and the highway, a mixture of hedges, lawns and shrubs are proposed. Whilst the depth of the landscaped areas varies across the scheme, it is considered that as a whole these areas will soften the appearance of the development. The scheme also includes the provision of a generous number of trees, which will be of a reasonable size when planted, affording soft visual relief from the outset.
- 2.13 Concern had been raised regarding the scale and prominence of areas of car parking, which have the potential to appear dominant and unattractive. Subsequently, these areas have been amended; subdividing stretches of parking and providing intermittent trees to provide visual breaks. The revised landscaping plans also now include a variety of native species, including trees, hedges and scrubs.
- 2.14 The amended scheme also retains the vast majority of the PRow (EE416) which runs adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. This footpath would be set within a landscaped buffer, which would retain important trees and provide new soft landscaping to improve its setting.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 2.15 Sub-phase 1B2 would be separated from existing properties, which lie to its south, by the retained PRow and the landscaping buffer around it. Separation distances between the proposed properties adjacent to the southern boundary of the site and existing properties on Derwent Way, Coniston Drive, Buttermere Gardens, Thirlmere Gardens, Coleridge Gardens and Tennyson Gardens typically vary between 14 and 22m. Whilst there are some proposed dwellings located slightly closer than this, they are positioned to the side of, or at an angle to, existing properties so as to ensure that no unacceptable loss of light or sense of enclosure is caused. The majority of properties within the development prevent overlooking towards existing dwellings by avoiding windows in their south facing

elevations. However, where windows are proposed within south facing elevations, overlooking is avoided by positioning dwellings such that they are a reasonable distance from existing neighbours or by orientating dwellings to face roads rather than houses. This phase would also be well separated from other phases of development which have already been granted within the Aylesham Expansion area and, therefore, would not lead to any loss of amenity to those properties.

- 2.16 Sub-phase 1B3 would be set well away from existing properties in Aylesham and from earlier phases within the Aylesham development. As such, this aspect of the development would cause no harm to the living conditions of neighboring properties.
- 2.17 The development has been designed to provide a strong frontage to the 'Central Boulevard which runs from roughly north east from Derwent Way along the northern boundary of Phase 1B2 and the southern boundary of phase 1B3. Within the core of each phase the houses would generally form loose perimeter blocks, although in some instances these blocks fragment where the shape of the site narrows, as discussed above. This layout allows the majority of properties within the site to be well separated from each other, avoiding unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers. Where tighter relationships exist, the orientation of houses is such that overlooking is reduced to acceptable levels. All habitable rooms within the buildings would be of a reasonable size, whilst each house would be provided with a well sized private garden. For these reasons, it is considered that the proposed dwellings would benefit from an acceptable standard of accommodation. All habitable rooms would be located in excess of 15m from the pumping stations, as required by Southern Water, ensuring that future occupants would not be unacceptably affected by vibration, noise or odour.
- 2.18 Concern has been raised by third parties that the development would result in the loss of views of the countryside. The loss of views is not a material planning consideration and does not, therefore, carry any weight.

Impact on the Highway

- 2.19 The development proposes a range of road types, including streets with footpaths, shared surfaces and mews'. This range of road types produces a hierarchical character to the development which improves its legibility and defines routes which pass through each parcel and those which provide localised access to properties. The application has been amended to propose a vehicular access to Coniston Drive. With this connection, it is considered that the site provides a reasonable level of vehicular permeability and connectivity between the development and the existing community. Vehicle speeds through each of the two parcels would be naturally reduced due to the geometry of the road layout, bends and narrowing's in the road and table junctions. Tracking plans have been submitted which demonstrate that large vehicles, including refuse lorries, would be able to navigate the site safely.
- 2.20 The application has been supported by parking plans which demonstrate the number and location of both private and visitor car parking spaces. Within the first parcel, 1B2, the vast majority of dwellings would be provided with two private car parking spaces, albeit the two flat blocks which contain two bedroom units, would be provided with one space per flat. In addition 25 visitor spaces would be provided across this phase. The Masterplan and Design Code direct that the low and medium density areas should provide approximately 2 car parking spaces per dwelling, whilst the high density areas, which include the areas fronting the

main boulevard (where the flat blocks are located), should provide one car parking space per dwelling. Consequently, the car parking provision shown would be slightly above, but broadly consistent with, that envisaged. Concern has been raised by KCC Highways and Transportation that some of the car parking spaces are too remote from the dwellings they serve, which may increase the likelihood of inappropriate parking on the public highway. Whilst such relationships are not ideal, most spaces are located closely adjacent to the properties they serve and, at worst, are around 15-20m from properties. Consequently, it is not considered that such relationships would lead to a severe adverse impact on the highway. Within the second parcel, 1B3, each property would be provided with two car parking spaces, whilst an additional five visitor spaces would be provided. This level of provision would meet the needs generated by the development, according with the requirements of the Masterplan and the Design Code. In some instances, spaces would be provided in tandem, reducing their usability. However, as these spaces are not prevalent it is not considered that harm would be caused to the highway network. In reaching the conclusions regarding the proximity of spaces to dwellings and instances of tandem parking, particular regard has been had for the previous approval under application number DOV/16/1177 for the strategic infrastructure (roads and open space) around the development which included details of the central boulevard. That permission included the provision of around 30 car parking spaces around the perimeter of the application site within laybys, which would substantially reduce the likelihood of inappropriate parking.

- 2.21 A range of forms of car parking are included within the development, including laybys to the sides of roads and accesses, private driveways to the fronts and sides of buildings and parking courts to the rear of properties. This approach replicates the approach which has been used in the earlier phases of development and is consistent with the Masterplan, which advocates a mixture of courtyard parking and on plot parking. Overall it is considered that the development provides an appropriate number and form of car parking spaces to meet the needs of the development without harming the local highway network.
- 2.22 A high standard of pedestrian permeability through the site is achieved with regular footpaths being provided between properties within Phase 1B2, in accordance with the requirements of the Masterplan and Design Code. Within Phase 1B3 footpaths are provided to either side of the road through the phase, which extend through the open space to the north before joining the strategic footpath network which runs around the perimeter of the village expansion area. Concerns have been raised by local residents and Aylesham Parish Council that the development would result in the loss of a PRoW which runs along the southern boundary of the phase 1B2. The application has been amended to retain the vast majority of the PRoW along its current alignment within a soft landscaped corridor. Whilst, towards the east of the 1B2, there is a slight realignment of the footpath before it joins the central boulevard (which is on the existing alignment of the PRoW), it is not considered that this small change to the existing route detracts from its amenity value, whilst retaining a high level of pedestrian permeability. Furthermore, the submitted plans show the PRoW to be hard surfaced. It is considered that, as the proposed development would be likely to significantly increase the use of this PRoW, it would be reasonable to include a condition requiring details of the improvements to the path. For these reasons, it is considered that pedestrian movement has been prioritized by the application.
- 2.23 Concern had been raised that the lack of vehicular access to the site from Coniston Drive would inhibit integration between residents of the new development and the existing village and would mean that response times for the emergency services would be unnecessarily lengthened. The amended drawings

now show that vehicular access will be provided to and from the site from Coniston Drive, as previously discussed.

- 2.24 The Parish Council, in their most recent representation, has raised concerns regarding the infringement of a second PRoW, the EE288. This PRoW lies outside of the application site and would not be affected by this application.
- 2.25 The Parish Council have also requested that a condition be attached to any grant of permission to require the developer to provide measures to restrict motor cycles from using the retained PRoW. This relates to an existing problem which would not be caused or exacerbated by the current application. As such, it is not considered that such a condition would not be reasonably necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and, as such, would not comply with the tests for attaching conditions.

Ecology

- 2.26 The two parcels of land were last used for agricultural purposes and almost wholly comprise land of negligible ecological value. However, to the southern boundary of Phase 1B2 is an existing PRoW which is itself bounded by vegetation, including several lengths of hedgerow and trees. Concerns have been raised by third parties that the loss of these hedges and trees would result in a loss of habitat and harm to wildlife. Having considered the original Ecological Report submitted with the outline application, together with considering the vegetation on site having regard for Natural England's Standing Advice, it is not considered likely that the vegetation supports protected species. Notwithstanding this, following the amendment of the application to retain this PRoW, it is noted that the majority of this vegetation is to be retained and incorporated into the development.
- 2.27 The outline permission included a series of conditions which require the submission of bat and reptile surveys prior to the commencement of development and requiring that care is taken to avoid harm to birds, particularly during the breeding bird season. These conditions will remain in force and appropriately safeguard and mitigate habitats and species.
- 2.28 Previous applications for earlier phases of development have commented upon the potential for new fences across within development to prevent the movement of hedgehogs across the site. Such a consideration is equally relevant in respect of this application and, accordingly, it would be appropriate to include a condition on any grant of permission requiring details to be submitted and agreed of the boundary treatments proposed. These boundaries shall either be provided by hedges or fences which incorporate gaps, allowing native species such as Hedgehogs to pass under.
- 2.29 The development would not cause harm to ecology in any other respect.
- 2.30 The submitted landscaping plan would provide a wide variety of species, including native and fruiting species, which would provide greater botanic diversity than the former agricultural use of the land.

Archaeology

- 2.31 The application has not been supported by an archaeological statement. However, Condition 87 of the approved outline permission addresses archaeology, requiring that a detailed archaeological investigation be carried out

prior to the commencement of the development. This condition will need to be separately discharged in advance of development taking place.

Contamination

- 2.32 Likewise, whilst a contamination assessment has not been submitted, condition 114 of the outline permission requires that a preliminary risk assessment and site investigation scheme is submitted prior to the commencement of the development of each phase. Based on the conclusions of this investigation, an appraisal and remediation strategy, together with a verification report to demonstrate that the remediation has been carried out must be submitted. The contaminated land assessments carried out previously indicate that this site has a low likelihood of contamination. This condition will need to be discharged in advance of development taking place.

Drainage

- 2.33 The drainage for the site follows the same principles which have been employed on the earlier phases of the development of Aylesham. The applicants have submitted a drainage strategy which confirms that surface water drainage will be dealt with by way of a mixture of drains, gulleys, borehole soakaways and attenuation tanks. Condition 100 attached to the outline permission requires that full details, including calculations, an implementation timetable and a management and maintenance plan, be submitted and approved prior to development taking place. Whilst the details which have been submitted are not sufficient to discharge this condition, which will remain in force, the details do demonstrate that the proposed layout can be accommodated on the site.
- 2.34 Foul drainage will also be accommodated in the same manner as earlier phases, with the on-site infrastructure being constructed to adoptable standards and linking to the existing off-site infrastructure. Southern Water has raised no concerns regarding the capacity of the network, whilst no objections have been raised in relation to existing or future capacity. Condition 102, which was attached to the outline permission and requires that works for the disposal of sewerage are provided prior to occupation, remains in force.

Overall Conclusions

- 2.35 The submitted application complies with the outline planning permission, whilst the detail of the scheme responds to the requirements contained within the Aylesham Masterplan SPG and the subsequently approved Design Code. Furthermore, it is considered that the development would provide an acceptable quality built environment and standard of residential amenity, both to existing and future residents. Whilst understandable concerns have been raised regarding the realignment of a section of PRow towards the west of the site, the vast majority of the PRow will be retained within a landscaped buffer and it is not considered that the modest realignment proposed would detract from the amenity provided by the footpaths. Later phases of the development will also need to have regard for the continuation of the PRow, however this is not a matter for the current application. The development would retain a good level of permeability, prioritising pedestrian movement. The scheme is acceptable in all other material respects, subject to the approval of details which have been secured by condition. It is therefore recommended that this application be granted.

g) Recommendation

- I Reserved Matters BE GRANTED subject to conditions to include:-

(1) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, (2) details of boundary treatments to allow the movement of native species, (3) details of hard and soft landscaping to and around PRow EE416 and details of public access to be provided in perpetuity between PRow and Central Boulevard.

- II Powers to be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions, in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by Planning Committee.

Case Officer

Luke Blaskett