

Ditton
Ditton

TM/16/00955/FL

1. An extension and refurbishment to the existing clubhouse building to provide for a higher standard of social and function space and 2 teaching rooms. 2. An extension and refurbishment of the existing squash and gym building to provide a further 3 squash courts and wet and dry changing rooms as well and a gym space and dance studio. 3. A new build changing room block to provide changing facilities for 4 teams and associated officials. As well as spectator toilets and a kitchen space with serving hatch. 4. Provision of 2 3G pitches on the existing sports field at Cobdown Sports And Social Club Station Road Ditton for Marpaul Southern Limited

Kent Bat Group: I would like to strongly re-iterate our opinion that in granting this planning permission without appropriate professional ecological surveys, the council is failing in its legal obligation with regard to protected species, with reference to the standing advice from Natural England: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/bats-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects>

If no assessment has been made, how are you able to conclude that there will be no impact on bats? The tree survey report makes no mention of bats at all, but includes photographs which seem to show trees with at least some potential roosting features. With regard to the floodlights, the proposed scheme clearly shows the horizontal light spillage across the Ditton stream.

Private Reps: 4 further letters received raising the following objections:

- Unacceptable use of air horns on the hockey pitch;
- Previous application for floodlights in 1995 was refused and nothing has changed since then so current application should also be refused;
- Inadequate parking provision as hockey pitch will be placed where bowls players park;
- No footpath on both sides of Station Road at the access;
- Road cannot accommodate more traffic, contrary to the view of KCC Highways;
- Impact of increased traffic on air quality;
- Proposal intends the erection of two no. 800 seat stands that have not been mentioned in correspondence and the site could not accommodate this level of additional use.

DPHEH: The matters raised by the private representations are addressed in detail within the main report. To clarify, the application does not propose two no. 800 seat stands. The drawings clearly indicate one no. 100 seat stand on the south side of the proposed 3G football pitch.

Since publication of the main report, the applicant has submitted a revised Flood Risk Assessment in order to address the comments made by the EA (paragraph 5.5 of the main report). The EA are currently reviewing this information with a view to providing further comments.

It is understood that ecologists are shortly to commence survey work on behalf of the concerning bat presence within the site. Given the objections raised by the Kent Bat Group and KWT, I consider it prudent to await the results of those surveys before moving forward with the application. The application is therefore withdrawn from the agenda pending the submission of the survey work and any subsequent consultation required. It will be reported back to APC3 in due course.

WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA

Aylesford **TM/16/00021/FL**
Aylesford South

New cold store and ancillary office link to existing building at Kent House Priory Park Ditton Court Quarry Mills Road Quarry Wood Industrial Estate Aylesford for Kent Frozen Foods

DPHEH: Further comments were received from KCC (H+T) regarding their assessment of Trics data in relation to the trip generation in connection with proposed development. This confirms that:

- i) the additional trips that would be generated by the proposed increased B8 floorspace would represent only a 0.65% increase during the AM peak, (7.30 – 8.30), and a 0.7% increase during the PM peak, (16.45 – 17.45);
- ii) taking account of the recent traffic survey information relating to A20 at the junction with Mills Road and Hall Road, the additional trips that would be generated by the proposed increased B8 floorspace would represent only a 0.39% increase during the AM peak, (7.30 – 8.30), and a 0.50% increase during the PM peak, (16.45 – 17.45). This is assuming all traffic turns to and from the east.
- iii) To the west of the A20/Mills Road/Hall Road junction the additional trips would represent an increase of 0.69% during the AM peak and 0.81% increase during the PM peak, again assuming that all traffic turns to and from the west.

It is on this basis that KCC (H+T) maintain that there is no justification to refuse planning permission on grounds of highway impact.

RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED

Aylesford (A) TM/15/01462/FL
Aylesford (B) TM/15/02927/LB

(A) Change of use from public house (Use Class A4) to residential dwelling
(B) Listed Building Application: Replace ground floor front window and repaint front of building with a white limewash at The Little Gem 19 High Street Aylesford for Mr James O'Callaghan

No supplementary matters to report

Snodland TM/16/00360/FL
Snodland West & Holborough Lakes

Proposed new house and garage in the rear garden to No 36 St Katherines Lane and replacement garage to existing house of No 36 at 36 St Katherines Lane Snodland for Mrs Daphne Hopkins

Private Reps: Local residents have submitted a joint statement to their MP setting out their objections to the scheme as follows:

- Prime example of “garden grabbing”;
- Cramped, incongruous and overbearing;
- Impacts on highway safety and parking provision;
- Contrary to many national and local policy guidelines specifically the Kent Structure Plan, PPS1 and PPS3.

DPHEH: To clarify, none of the national and local policies cited by residents in this statement apply any longer. They have been entirely superseded by the NPPF and LDF, the relevant parts of which have been cited throughout the main report.

It is correct to say that the proposal involves the development of a portion of the rear garden serving 36 St Katherines Lane but current national and local policy has not placed an embargo on the development of such land. The NPPF simply states that land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens is not considered to be "previously developed land" i.e. brownfield land. More fundamentally in the consideration of this planning application, there is a general presumption in favour of sustainable development and the best use of land within urban areas. This is supported by policy CP11 of the TMBCS which states that development should be concentrated in urban areas including Snodland. There is therefore, no objection to the principle of the development in question.

The remaining matters raised in the statement have been addressed in detail within the main report.

For the avoidance of doubt, the application as originally submitted was accompanied by a brief Design and Access Statement. During the course of the assessment, the application was amended to reduce the scale and change the design of the proposed building to what is now before Members for determination. The Design and Access Statement was not updated but as the amendments represented a reduction in the scale of the scheme as a whole, this was not required. Reference within that document was made to the provision of disabled parking spaces to serve the existing and proposed dwellings. The plans under consideration do not expressly show bays of a size that would support this claim but in any case there is no requirement for development of this scale to make such provision. The proposal as it stands therefore complies with the adopted parking standards, as set out in my main report.

RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED
