

Supplementary Agenda Advice

**Page 22      MC/20/1180      89 Ingram Road, Gillingham**

**Representations**

**Additional** information from the applicant is attached in full to this supplementary advice agenda.

**Relevant Planning History**

**Replace** MC/19/2855 with MC/19/2588.

**Page 38      MC/21/0440      Medway Bridge Marina, Manor Lane  
Rochester**

**Recommendation**

**Delete** the words 'Medway South' from the Primary Care Network s106 contribution

**Representation**

**Representation** received from Kelly Tolhurst MP clarifying her position with regard to any interest in the site.

**Appraisal**

**Delete** the words 'Medway South' from the Primary Care Network s106 contribution on P.68 within the S106 Matters section.

**Page 72      MC/20/1867      Land North of Commissioners Road,  
Strood**

**Representations**

**Two additional** letters of representation have been received. Both are attached in full to this supplementary advice agenda.

**Officer's Response** to the points made in the representation sent to Members by email is as follows:

- 1 Members are aware that there are two applications on this site. This one is for design, appearance and layout. Access is already approved at Outline stage. The second application deals with landscape. Please note that this is the main application and shows the areas that are to be dedicated to landscaping. The principles of landscaping are set out within the layout of the overall scheme. The landscaping application is more detailed in relation to materials and plant species, some of which is still being confirmed.
- 2 (1) In terms of notifications in relation to this application, the Council have gone above and beyond the statutory requirements in relation to letter consultation. Letters were sent out to all nearby residents. Site Notices were erected and the application was also advertised in Kent Messenger.  
  
(2) Within the S106 for this site (signed with Outline application) additional highway works were agreed. These were:
  1. A raised table and an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point in the vicinity of the junction with Banks Road
  2. A series of speed cushions, including carriageway resurfacing and associated signs and road markings
  3. A pedestrian crossing island between the site access junction and Wingrove Drive
  4. The provision of a 2 metre wide, resurfaced footway along the site frontage
  5. New system of street lighting

The trigger for these works, as set out within the S106, is:

- Prior to first Occupation of any part of the Development to enter into the Highways Agreement with the Council in respect of the Highway Works.
- Not to Occupy nor permit Occupation of any part of the Development until the Highway Works have been completed in accordance with the Highway Agreement.

It is therefore considered that the traffic calming measures are not yet triggered.

(3) The officer report has included measurements of distances between the existing housing and proposed development. It is not considered necessary for these section drawings to be included here.

(4) This site is already approved for residential development. Any potential noise impacts were considered at the Outline stage. As

part of this application the Councils Environmental Protection team have been consulted and no concerns have been raised.

(5) It is noted that the infill is taking longer than originally stated, however due to availability of spoil, Covid and Environmental Licences there have been numerous delays along the way. There is a significant housing need across the whole of Medway and this site is a good site in a sustainable location. Whilst inconvenience and disturbance to neighbours is noted, all attempts are being made to ensure that this is kept to a minimum and that the time of infilling operations is being adhered to and the CEMP is being complied with.

(6) Under building regulations, it will be necessary to demonstrate suitable ground conditions for development. This is not a planning matter as such, and whilst the point is understood there is currently no reason to believe that the development will be erected on 'loose fill'.

(7) Dust suppression has been an ongoing issue at this site for residents. The Council are regularly checking on this situation and are assured that currently the following steps are being complied with:

- There is a sprinkler system by the office which is switched on
- The water bouser (in the van) runs up and down the ramp all day; and
- The lorries remain to be tipping in the point furthest away from the neighbours.
- Members may also be aware, the applicants did construct a bund along the boundary last year and we believe this is also helping with reducing the dust impact.

(8) There is no reason to assume that construction vehicles would not use the existing route through the Medway City Estate. Highway Works are not to be carried out until 'Prior to Occupation' so it would be reasonable to assume that this is when the width restrictions could be relocated (back to their original position).

- 3 The additional flats are considered to benefit the overall development by creating a more spacious proposal with better landscaped areas and more planting opportunities. The description set out the overall number of units proposed – no breakdown of the types of units being provided was ever covered within the description.
- 4 The resident here is expressing an opinion, which has been covered within the design justification in the main report.

## Appraisal

**Add** the following section to the main report:

### *Flood and Drainage*

Initially the information submitted in relation to flood and drainage was considered to be insufficient and additional information was requested. This has now been received and is satisfactory.

The proposed drainage strategy includes permeable paving, swales with check dams, an attenuation tank, and a lined attenuation pond which discharges at a restricted rate of 5l/s into the Southern Water Surface Water Sewer.

Given the above, it is therefore considered acceptable that condition 22 can also be discharged.

**Page 116      MC/21/0445      Buddy's View, Perry Hill, Cliffe**

## Recommendation

**Amend** condition 3 to read as follows:

- 3      The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Mr and Mrs Frank Ball and their children Priscilla Ball, Charlotte Ball Jr, Buddy Ball, Frank Ball Jr, Brandon Ball, Joanne Ball and Brittney Ball and their dependents. When any of the additional caravans hereby permitted cease to be occupied by any of the abovementioned individuals, then within one month of the cessation all the materials and equipment, including caravans, amenity blocks, hard surfaces and cesspool, brought onto the land in relation to that caravan area, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land restored to its condition prior to the use and development taking place

**Amend** condition 6 by removing the words 'of the buildings or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner' and **replacing** with the words 'of any of the additional units'

**Add** new condition 7 as follows:

- 7      None of the additional caravans shall be first occupied until measures to deal with foul and surface water connections have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be installed prior to occupation of any of the additional caravans and shall thereafter be retained

Reason: To ensure appropriate measures are installed in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

## **Recommendation**

**Add** new condition 11 as follows:

11. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the measures to address energy efficiency and climate change set out within the Committee report and the application submissions. Prior to first occupation of the development a verification report prepared by a suitably qualified professional shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that all the agreed measures have been undertaken and will thereafter be maintained on site

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and to positively address concerns regarding Climate Change in accordance with the NPPF.

## **Representations**

**Additional** representation received raising concerns with the robustness of the applicant's submitted 'Parking Stress Report'.

**Officers' response** to the additional representation:

Although neighbours have outlined that some [garages] are used for parking, generally older garages are of limited size are not particularly well suited for modern vehicles, it likely many are being used for storage. As outlined, the applicants provided an updated Transport Note which indicated that a maximum 8 vehicles were observed to park within the site.

Whilst the objectors have outlined parking space dimensions, it is noted that this standard be applied to formal parking spaces and not informal on street. It is considered that even if the applicants extended the spaces to 6m, given the parking stress, sufficient space would still be available to accommodate any potential overspill resulting from the redevelopment of the site. In any case on this site there are no conditions restricting the use of the existing garages to for vehicle parking only, meaning that it would be unreasonable to prevent their 'loss' for such use.

Similarly, the use of open parts of the site by neighbours for parking cannot reasonably be a requirement of the proposed use of the site because it is not adopted highway, therefore if the site owner wished to barrier the access tomorrow, its essentially private land.

**Additional** information has been provided by the applicant in relation to the use of the garages. The information is as follows:

1 How many garages were in use?

As of 20/4/21, 18 of the 19 garages on site were let.

2 If used for parking, how many were residents within the close vicinity?

The table below shows the locations of those letting the garages. The 'Norfolk Garage Occupation Plan' (copied below for ease of reference) shows these on a map.

As of 20/4/21

Tenanted	Garage Address			Home Address	
Yes	715	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	716	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	717	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	718	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	BROOMCROFT ROAD	RAINHAM
Yes	719	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	ALEXANDRA AVENUE	GILLINGHAM
Yes	720	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	GILLINGHAM
Yes	721	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	GILLINGHAM
Yes	722	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	BETTESCOMBE ROAD	GILLINGHAM
Yes	723	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	NORFOLK CLOSE	DANSON WAY
Yes	724	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	725	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	726	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
No	727	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	728	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	SEALAND DRIVE	ROCHESTER
Yes	729	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	PARKER CLOSE	GILLINGHAM
Yes	731	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	BETTESCOMBE ROAD	RAINHAM
Yes	732	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	BEDFORD AVENUE	RAINHAM
Yes	733	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	DANSON WAY	RAINHAM
Yes	734	NORFOLK CLOSE	Rainham	MOORPARK CLOSE	RAINHAM



### 3.4 Site Analysis/ Existing Garages

The existing garages are concrete block/frame construction, with low pitch corrugated sheet roofing. The internal dimensions are approximately 2350 by 5000mm - which would fall short of the recommended size of a single garage (3000mm wide). Therefore it is anticipated the garage units are typically use for storage rather than day to day car usage.

Data supplied by the client shows that 18 of the 19 garages are currently let, the adjacent diagram shows nearby garage sites.

- Garage sites such as this, where activity is concealed from the street front have the potential for harbouring anti-social behaviour. Anti-social behaviour crime incidents are the second most reported crime within the Rainham North area over the past 12 months. Development would eliminate these hidden areas and potentially reduce anti-social incidents.

### 3 Were the uses asked to vacate recently?

A notice to terminate their letting is yet to be issued. The garages are currently let and will continue to be up until around 1 month before works are due to start should the application be approved. Alternative garages will be offered to those vacating.

### 4 Was there any commercial use of these garages (storage)?

The letting agreement stipulates that the garages should only be used to store a vehicle. Notwithstanding that, users do store items in their garages.

## Planning Appraisal

**Replace** reference to 55 Danson Way with 53 Danson Way in the second paragraph of the Neighbouring amenity section.

**Page 146 MC/20/3293 18 Broom Hill Road and Land to Rear, Strood**

## Recommendation

**Add** the words 'of House 7' after the words 'Details of the windows design...' to condition 27.

**Add** the words 'of House 8' after the words 'Details of the windows design...' and **replace** the number 7 with the number 8 in condition 28.

**Add** new condition 30 as follows:

- 30 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the measures to address energy efficiency and climate change set out within

the Committee report and the application submissions. Prior to first occupation of the development a verification report prepared by a suitably qualified professional shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that all the agreed measures have been undertaken and will thereafter be maintained on site

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and to positively address concerns regarding Climate Change in accordance with the NPPF.

**Page 166      MC/21/0607                      264 Napier Road, Gillingham**

### **Recommendation**

**Replace** Condition 3 to read as follows:

- 3      The use shall not commence until a scheme to minimise the transmission of noise from the use of the premises has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Noise from the premises should be controlled, such that the noise rating level (L<sub>Ar,Tr</sub>) emitted from the development shall be at least 10dB below the background noise level (L<sub>A90,T</sub>) at the nearest residential facade. All measurements shall be defined and derived in accordance with BS4142: 2014. All works which, form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before the use is commenced and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

### **Representations**

**Amend** the number of signatures to the petition from 94 to 151.

**2 further letters** have been received raising the following objections:

- There are already 2 garages nearby and another is not needed.
- Proposal would result in a traffic hazard.
- Proposal would result in additional noise in Conservation Area.
- The objection is not to the company itself but to the use.

**26 additional letters** have been received making the following comments in support of the application:

- This is a good business.
- Proposed use would reduce the number of HGVs in Napier Road.
- The site has more space than other businesses in the area and all customers would be able to park on site.
- Less noise than previous use.



- Should support small businesses.

## **Planning Appraisal**

### *Amenity*

**Add** the following paragraph before the last paragraph of this section:

The applicant has submitted a Noise Report. It is concluded that noise transmission from the building would not have a significant impact on neighbouring residents at the rear in Nelson Road and in Napier Road. The report states that noise will be 10dB below background noise levels with the roller doors shut. A noise management plan is therefore recommended to ensure that noisy works are carried out with the roller doors shut. Condition 3 has, therefore been amended to reflect this recommendation. Subject to this condition, no objection is raised in terms of noise.

**Page 174      MC/21/0692                      266 Hempstead Road, Gillingham**

**Add** new condition 12 as follows:

- 12 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the measures to address energy efficiency and climate change set out within the Committee report and the application submissions. Prior to first occupation of the development a verification report prepared by a suitably qualified professional shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that all the agreed measures have been undertaken and will thereafter be maintained on site

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and to positively address concerns regarding Climate Change in accordance with the NPPF.

**Page 187      MC/21/0903                      Charwood, 239 Walderslade Road, Chatham**

**Add** new condition 15 as follows:

- 15 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the measures to address energy efficiency and climate change set out within the Committee report and the application submissions. Prior to first occupation of the development a verification report prepared by a suitably qualified professional shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that all the agreed measures have been undertaken and will thereafter be maintained on site

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and to positively address concerns regarding Climate Change in accordance with the NPPF.

## **89 Ingram Road, Gillingham – Planning Committee 23.6.21 (Agenda Item 5)**

**Background** - The applicant & the HRA have been in negotiations for the sale of the whole site (Blocks A & B) since early 2020. Due to the absence of a consent for all of Block B (9nr proposed), the HRA solely purchased Block A (17nr units) & associated land ownership with a willingness to conclude the whole site purchase upon an acceptable planning consent. Despite considerable engagement by the applicant & the HRA, an acceptable resolution to planning remains outstanding. The HRA still remains willing to purchase Block B for their stock. Currently Block A (HRA) have 12 parking spaces within their Land Ownership, Block B has 8nr such spaces.

1. The following comprises the applicant's comments on the Officers' case report.
2. The development relates to one block (Block 'B') of a development, already approved and completed for a development involving a number of residential flats. A total of 22 units has already been approved through planning permission MC/17/3455, subsequently varied by a second permission ref MC/19/2588.
3. Both the above permissions allowed for Block A to house 15 units and Block B to contain 7 units. A number of conditions imposed re. approval of details has already been approved by the Council and discharged. It is now retrospectively proposed that the ground floor of Block B, which has been labelled as a gym, cycle & bin store and laundry area would, instead, be fitted out to contain three additional flats. A further flat has also been accommodated on the second floor.
4. The case report recommends that planning permission be refused on the basis of two issues; firstly, inadequate parking and, secondly, the outlook of a unit (Flat 18) within Block B which has already been approved.

### **Parking**

5. The Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards 2010 (Reviewed 2014) requires a minimum of 1 space per 1-bed unit, a minimum of 1.5 spaces per 2-bed unit, and 0.25 spaces per unit for visitor parking matrix for such is supplemented by a written indication that reductions of the standard will be considered if the development is within an urban area that has good links to sustainable transport and where day-to-day facilities are within easy walking distance.
6. In the above connection I refer to a successful planning appeal in 2014 for a nearby residential scheme at 65 Ingram Road (*APP/A2280/A/14/2216376*) whereby the Inspector states in paragraph 16:

*“...However, the site is in a very sustainable location, there being no parking restrictions within Portland Road. There was also no shortage of kerbside space within nearby streets at the time of my site visit.”*

7. On this basis the Inspector acknowledged the Council’s proviso for reducing the standard, referred to above, and stated:

*“...I conclude that in this case an exception is justified.”*

8. Planning permission MC/17/3455, for a total of 22 flats with the redevelopment of 89 Ingram Road was granted in **May 2019**, with the following split:

[17 x 2-bed, 5 x 1-bed – giving a total requirement of **36** spaces (which includes 0.25 spaces per unit). In effect, **22** on-site spaces were to be provided, and was approved by Members following a positive recommendation by officers]

9. The committee report for the above application, in justifying the acceptability of the reduced provision states in this regard:

*“A review of 2011 Census car ownership data shows that the level of car ownership within the Gillingham North ward is 0.94 per dwelling; based on the size and tenure of the proposed dwellings, it is estimated that the development would generate a demand for 19 spaces. The applicant commissioned a parking survey of surrounding roads within a 200m radius. This demonstrated that, whilst the demand for on-street parking is high in some streets, some of the areas closest to the site – Church Street, Church Path and Gillingham Green – had spare capacity. On this basis, and taking, and taking into consideration the proximity of the site to local amenities and public transport, the parking provision is considered acceptable and no objection is raised in respect of Policy T13 of the Local Plan.”*

10. This gave a relative percentage of **61.1% (or 1 per flat)**.

11. Subsequent to the above planning permission being granted a variation of the approved layout, whilst still proposing 22 units was approved in **June 2020**, under MC/19/2588. With a slightly different mix (18 x 2-bed and 4 x 1-bed) giving a slightly increased requirement of **36.5** spaces, now only **20** spaces were to be provided. This was approved in **June 2020**, with a reduction to **54.79% (or 0.9 per flat)**.

12. The relevant case report, in commenting on the reduction of two spaces, stated *“...no objection can be raised in terms of parking under Policy T13 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 109 of the NPPF.”*

13. The current proposal, MC/20/1180, validated back in September 2020, would involve an additional 4 flats, giving a total of 26 units, but with an additional two parking spaces, showing the following split:

[20 x 2-bed, 6 x 1-bed. With **22** to be provided, this equates to **51.76% (or 0.85 per flat)**].

14. In support of the latest proposal a specialist consultant 'GTA Civils & Transport' was commissioned who, by letter dated 11 December 2020, on the basis of the most recently published car ownership figures for North Gillingham. The findings took a similar line to the Council's approach above and, on this basis, calculated the total maximum parking demand for the latest proposal to be **20.54** spaces; within the **22** spaces incorporated into the revised scheme.
15. An already approved Parking Management Plan would be revised, as necessary, should planning permission be granted, and would be reassessed by the Council at the Conditions stage. Two additional electric charging points to that approved under MC/19/2588 are provided. Accordingly, and with regard to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, it is requested that the Council reassesses its stance, as no significant harm from the reduced provision has been demonstrated, nor would realistically result.
16. Taking into account all these factors it is considered that the 22 parking spaces provided at the site is sufficient.

*Please note that the car club referred to on page 33 of the case report was explored but, given the circumstances, it has been decided not to further this option.*

## **Outlook**

17. To allow for less open-air parking at the site the approved under-cover refuse and cycle store facility in Block A (as approved with the scheme under MC/19/2588) has been relocated across the site with a wooden fenced compound erected nearer to Block B for this purpose.
18. The earlier permission (MC/17/3455), with a slightly different footprint, allowed for undercroft parking immediately outside Block A, whilst the communal bin store was to be located on the site boundary to the south of Block B.

19. The current scheme has two separate bin stores for each Block. Block B's store has been relocated slightly along the site's south boundary whilst Block A's store sits off the north boundary ahead of two parking spaces beyond Flat 18's second bedroom window. The proximity of these parking spaces to Flat B's window, and hence its outlook, has already been approved under MC/19/2588. This arrangement is not dissimilar to Flat 4 in Block A, although the wooden bin compound is distanced at a minimum of 2.82m from the wall of Flat 18.
20. Flat 18's kitchen/diner also has a second window in the side wall of the unit. Further, the outlook from **all** the ground floor flats in Block B, being close to the site's perimeter wall, was deemed acceptable by way of the original planning permission.
21. On the above basis, and with regard to the previous planning permissions, it is considered that the outlook from Flat 18 is, on balance, acceptable.

## **Summary**

22. It surely makes sense for the ground floor of Block B to accommodate residential flats, making a better use of internal space than that of a gym and laundry room (which potentially could be under-utilised). Should members consider that the recommended Reasons for Refusal are not sustainable then it must follow, given the various material considerations, that the proposed scheme does **not** constitute an overdevelopment of the site.

**Email from Kelly Tolhurst MP to Members of the Planning Committee sent 8 June 2021**

**Subject:** MC/21/0440 - Comments made re my letter of representation

Dear Councillors

I write following the Planning Committee of the 26<sup>th</sup> May and the comments made by the Head of Planning in relation to my letter of representation about the application MC/21/0440 at Medway Bridge Marina.

To clarify, I made this representation as the constituency MP for the area, having been contacted by a significant number of residents (more than on many planning applications) who had contacted me to express their concerns.

My parents' home is indeed affected by this application and they made their own representation to the Council. However, the representation was not made in relation to the interest of my parents, who are also constituents, but was in light of the sheer number of constituents who have contacted me concerning this application, including other constituents neighbouring the application site who would have otherwise been deprived of representation and support by their Member of Parliament.

Therefore, I urge the planning committee to seriously consider the concerns and questions that my constituents have raised in relation to this application when it comes back for your consideration.

Yours sincerely  
Kelly

**Kelly Tolhurst MP**

Member of Parliament for Rochester & Strood

Tel: 0207 219 5387 – Westminster

Website: [www.kelly4rochesterandstrood.com](http://www.kelly4rochesterandstrood.com)

House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA



**Subject:**

FW: Comments on Officers report regarding planning application - MC/20/1867 - Land North of Commissioner's Road,

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 16 June 2021 21:54

**To:** representations, planning <planning.representations@medway.gov.uk>

**Cc:** hubbard, stephen <stephen.hubbard@medway.gov.uk>; iles steve (external) <steve.iles@live.co.uk>; chitty, jane <jane.chitty@medway.gov.uk>; adeoye, sijuwade <sijuwade.adeoye@medway.gov.uk>; bhutia, tashi <tashi.bhutia@medway.gov.uk>; bowler, nick <nick.bowler@medway.gov.uk>; buckwell, chris (external) <chris.buckwell@btopenworld.com>; chambers, diane <diane.chambers@medway.gov.uk>; curry, simon (external) <simoncurry03@gmail.com>; etheridge, gary (external) <strood48@gmail.com>; hackwell, gary <gary.hackwell@medway.gov.uk>; mcdonald, dan <dan.mcdonald@medway.gov.uk>; opara, gloria <gloria.opara@medway.gov.uk>; potter, martin (external) <mpotter.rainham@gmail.com>; stamp, chrissy <chrissy.stamp@medway.gov.uk>; thorne, richard <richard.thorne@medway.gov.uk>; tranter, stuart (external) <stuart-tranter@btconnect.com>; harris, dave <dave.harris@medway.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Comments on Officers report regarding planning application - MC/20/1867 - Land North of Commissioner's Road,

I would like to make a number of comments regarding the Officers report relating to application MC/20/1867. I would like the committee to seriously consider these points when reviewing the officers report.

1. Firstly, can the council officer advise why they are reviewing MC/20/1867 and MC /20/1868 a month apart and at separate meetings? Residents can only assume that this is yet another cynical ploy to dissuade residents from attending meetings and making justified comments. It should be noted that this follows the recent incident of denying residents access to the planning documents. Such disingenuous behaviour simply further erodes trust between residents and council officers.

The following points are in the order that they appear in the report - rather than by importance.

2. The list of representations is incomplete and belittles the comments made by residents. Some examples follow:

2.1 The report states "the application advertised on site , and by individual notification" - Local business were NOT informed.; even those that will only be separated from the development by the footpath were not notified. see also 2.4

2.2 The comment - No consultation on traffic calming is misleading- In 2017, when outline approval for MC/16/4268, was granted. The planning office (David Harris) advised that there would be consultation on the proposed traffic calming measures shown for **Commissioners Road**. As yet no such consultation has taken place. Surely the developer's proposals need to be considered at the same time as reviewing the traffic calming proposals. A simple joined up / holistic approach is required. Otherwise it makes useful comment on the access road to the proposed estate of limited value. Therefore approval should be delayed until such time as Traffic calming measures in Commissioners road are included. The current plan to build the access road on a blind bend is beyond belief. I would add that enforcing any parking restrictions on existing residents just to accommodate the new development is extremely unwelcome and completely unfair.

2.3 Comments relating to the omission of sectional drawings showing impact on existing housing are missing. Why? Surely drawings should be available to show the height disparity and proximity between existing houses and the proposed blocks - and these shared with residents and committee members ???? If there is not a problem, then simply share the drawings.

2.4 The list of representations fails to mention completely that the height and location of the apartment blocks mean that any future residents of these units will suffer intolerable noise problems. The blocks are located close to PDA plastics - a plastics recycling company on the estate , just the other side of Donkey Hill. Or is the Council planning to close PDA plastics to facilitate this development? PDA were not notified of the plans.

2.5 Representations relating to timing have been omitted completely-for example -



Residents were told infill of the site would be 2017 to 2019 . We are now well past The original deadline, and yet advised the infill will take another year / eighteen months. What is infill completion date? Do the council care about the protracted disturbance to local residents?. What is the proposed timing for the building operation and will this be allowed to drag on endlessly ? The plans do not mention how long disruption will last regarding building sewers and other utilities across Commissioners Road. How many years disruption to existing residents does the Council consider reasonable?

2.6- Also omitted are the comments re "loose fill" - or will this be covered at the next meeting - for reference the missing comment is as follows: As things presently stand the plans indicate that two four story buildings will be built at the east of the site. This is the present location of the site huts and entrance. It should be noted that this area has only been loose filled and not "engineered/compacted " . Can the Council advise how it is proposed to excavate and refill this area without moving the existing site entrance? Or can the council confirm that it is happy to see four story building built on loose fill?

2.7 The contractor refuses to apply any level of dust suppression. How is this acceptable? It is contrary to the CEMP but no action is taken. Is the council now taking full liability for health related issues caused by dust? I am amazed that the council believe that 3 residents being sent to A & E for dust related breathing difficulties is "perfectly acceptable" ( and at least a further 16 to GP for medical treatment). Will residents health and wellbeing be equally irrelevant in the next stage of the development?

2.8 Is it intended that the new estate access road will be used by construction vehicles i.e. via Banks road and Commissioners road ?

3. Page 8 , final paragraph. "The introduction of the second block of flats (which has come about as a result of ongoing discussions throughout the application process ". This has been added surreptitiously - **it was not even listed in the summary of changes**. It has, at no point been discussed with residents. These apartment blocks are a disgrace. Is the council deliberately trying to create another "Liberty Park" in Commissioners road - together with all of its anti social behaviour?

4. page 10 - para 7. " The proposed flats are set back within the site, so despite the flats being 4 storeys high, the closest existing neighbour is some 48m away. This distance is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact as it will not detrimentally harm the occupants already in the area". This is simply nonsense. 48 m is completely insufficient - although the plans indicate a much smaller distance. There is insufficient screening - The apartment blocks are not a well constructed design - they are an abomination. Would the planning committee like these enforced on their doorsteps? They are out of place and over imposing.

I would implore committee members to reject this application . It should only be reconsidered when the developer complies with existing the planning conditions, regulations, the CEMP, and when the plans have a reduced impact on the quality of life of local residents.

I would be more than happy to discuss any of the points with members of the committee. Should you have any questions , or require additional information , please do not hesitate to contact me.

regards [REDACTED]



**Objection to Planning Application MC/20/1867 and all applications relating to the development of the Land of North of Commissioner's Road, Strood, Kent ME2 4EQ**

Dear Sirs

**RE: Land North of Commissioner's Road Strood Rochester Kent ME2 4EQ**

Further to the council's report on the above proposed application, we submit herewith, further objections. It appears the residents' concerns have not been adequately addressed.

The proposed development and the proposed number of houses are an absolute nuisance. The well being of the current residents is again disregarded. The facilities in the area completely ignored. There are not enough school and doctor places to cover the current residents thus, strongly emphasising that the density of the development is not justified.

The national average, as of 2018, for cars per household is 1.3 cars per household, thus emphasising the issues parking will cause should the proposed number of houses and flats be allowed. The allocated 1 - 2 parking spaces per flat and house are thus, not realistic. In turn this will cause enormous issues with parking spilling over on Commissioners Road and the terrible traffic on Commissioners Road. Cars go as fast as at least 80 miles per hour on Commissioners Road. The damage that extra parking will cause to Commissioners Road is unbearable.

The council have not in their report addressed the infill levels and the height of the houses from the road level. The current dwellings are set lower than the road level and should the new development be set any higher than this (as the proposed buildings are 3 storey high) will cause not only privacy issues but an utter nuisance to the current dwellings and the current residents.

The developer has showed no consideration to the current residents and as previously mentioned damage to our homes remains from the previous vibration and ground movement. The developer has ignored all previous conditions set upon them in the CEMP - what will happen when the developer fails to maintain the landscape as per condition 6? What safeguards will be put in place? They have continuously refused to apply any level of dust suppression. How is this acceptable?

Furthermore, the introduction of the second block of flats (which has come about as a result of ongoing discussions throughout the application process, has been added surreptitiously - **it was not even listed in the summary of changes**. It has, at no

point been discussed with residents. These apartment blocks are a disgrace. Is the council deliberately trying to create another "Liberty Park" in Commissioners road - together with all of its anti-social behaviour?

The distance of 48 metres between the new development and the exiting dwellings is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact and will not detrimentally harm the occupants already in the area. This is simply nonsense. 48 metres are completely insufficient, and the plans as presented indicate a much smaller distance. There is insufficient screening. Would the planning committee like these enforced on their doorsteps? They are out of place, over imposing and will impact in the current character of the neighbourhood.

We ask the committee members to reject the current proposal until the number of the dwellings is reduced considerably not to impact negatively on the current dwellings and residents. We have all suffered enough detriment so far. It must be rejected until the plans provide an accurate representation of the development and its actual impact on the current area. The number of allocated parking spaces are considered based on realistic data. Any proposals should only be reconsidered when the developer complies with existing planning conditions, regulations, the CEMP, and when the plans have a reduced impact on the quality of life of local residents.

It is our firm belief that the concerns, we as residents have submitted, have not been considered accordingly and allowing this developer to continue ignoring its obligations will only cause us further detriment.

Yours faithfully

Mr and Mrs Silverton