

**Platt**  
Borough Green And  
Long Mill

**22 August 2017**

**TM/17/02688/RD**

Proposal: Details submitted pursuant to Condition 23 (junction safety measures) of planning permission TM/16/01766/FL (Erection of 3 Industrial buildings for mix of B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Storage/Distribution) use, and associated vehicle access and parking)

Location: Phase 3 Platt Industrial Estate Maidstone Road Platt Sevenoaks Kent

Go to: [Recommendation](#)

---

## 1. Description:

1.1 Members may recall that a resolution was passed by the Area 2 Planning Committee on 25 January 2017 granting planning permission for 3 industrial buildings (mix of B2 and B8 uses) under planning reference TM/16/01766/FL. This was subject to an additional condition, Condition 23 of the planning permission, which was to be imposed in the interests of public safety and amenity, in particular to safeguard pedestrian safety at the junction between the Platt Industrial Estate access road and the A20 Maidstone Road. The condition states that:

*23. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the junction alterations and a strategy and timetable for measures to improve both the safety and the environmental conditions of the access road for vehicles and pedestrians around the A25/Platt Industrial Estate junction shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The junction alterations and strategy shall be implemented as approved.*

1.2 This application therefore seeks approval of details submitted to discharge Condition 23.

1.3 Members may also be aware that, as part of application TM/16/01766/FL, the applicant offered up a Unilateral Undertaking to implement improvement works to the A20 junction. This Undertaking required that the works to the junction be completed on or before the commencement of the approved scheme.

1.4 Within the process of revising the details of the junction alterations for this reserved details application and for a Section 278 Agreement with the local highway authority (KCC H&T), amendments to the works have been secured within a revised Unilateral Undertaking, dated 5 September 2018 (provided as an annex to this report).



- There are many instances of HGVs mounting the pavement even though swept path diagrams tell us a maximum length artic can leave the junction without mounting the pavement, whereas the evidence shows that is not always the case.
- I presume the applicant is experiencing technical difficulties in devising alterations that comply with KCC's Highway and pedestrian sightline demands because of land ownership problems.
- When the permissions were originally granted for the warehousing, the applicant had ownership of No 1 Whatcote Cottage, and could then demonstrate the ability to take any land required to achieve the required standard.
- However, we now know that he immediately sold the property, and the current residential occupant now shares the same concerns as other residents. In an attempt to protect his house and family from the noise of the estate entrance, the resident has planted a screen of bamboo. As we understand it, bamboo is a grass and is therefore not subject to the normal rules governing trees and hedging in proximity to Highway land, and cannot be cut back to achieve the sightlines required for Pedestrian Safety.
- The modifications to the old Platt Industrial Estate entrance proposed by the applicant will marginally improve matters, they are still a poor compromise for improving Highway safety, and do nothing to address residents' genuine concerns for Pedestrian Safety, Air Quality or noise impact.
- The new access road approved last year by Area 2 provides a true solution to all the problems above, so we no longer have to accept the worst option.

5.2 PC (05.11.2018): The PC strongly object to this application which is an extremely unsafe proposal. There appear to be bollards on the inside of the footpath rather than adjacent to the carriage way to stop the large lorries mounting the path, also no barriers on the west corner. This plan will not help heavy traffic exiting west on to the A25. The restriction of the footpath puts adults and children at risk. The building of the new school is due to start next year on the adjacent site to the industrial estate and the residents of Whatcote Cottages will have to cross the access road to the industrial estate to reach the school. Furthermore, there is only a 1 m footpath access to the rear of the Whatcote Cottage properties. Platt Parish Council urge the Planning Committee to visit the area to assess the situation before reaching a decision.

5.3 KCC H&T: The following comments have been provided:

12.10.2018

- No plan of the existing arrangement is provided and it is considered that a detailed base from a topographical survey is required. In particular the wall adjacent to no. 1 Whatcote Cottages needs to be accurately shown. I understand there is a question mark over the ownership of this feature and I note a 'communal' pathway to the rear of these cottages which extends to as far as no. 16 Whatcote Cottages.
- An important element of the detailed design of these S278 works will be to not compromise the pedestrian crossing arrangements at this access in terms of visibility to vehicles exiting the industrial estate. Widening of the industrial estate road north of the highway boundary line is a new design element of the proposals and the impacts (detriment?) of this with regard to safety for pedestrians waiting to cross is questioned. The current extent of pedestrian visibility to approaching vehicles needs to be quantified from a detailed topographical survey and the extent of pedestrian visibility to approaching vehicles as a result of the proposals also needs to be confirmed. An independent safety audit of the proposals is also requested.
- It is further considered that measures incorporating traffic calming/management/warning on the private industrial estate road for exiting vehicles would be helpful. Consideration should be given to use of graduated spaced bar markings or 'dragons teeth', coloured surfacing and use of 'on road' warning signage, such as TSRGD no. 544 (Schedule 12, Part 20 Sign 7 – in the new 2016 TSRGD).

23.01.2018

- I note the latest amended drawing uploaded on 15 January. However this drawing does not address any points raised in my response of 12 October 2017. I would be grateful if these issues could be considered before completing my response on behalf of this authority. Currently the proposals do not address these concerns.

22.08.2018

- I am pleased to see that this drawing/proposal does not compromise pedestrian crossing visibility by moving the tactile paving's/crossing point area, back. This in my view is a more important, detrimental issue than the swinging out of large vehicles, which is recognised and described in Rule 221 of the Highway Code.
- I can confirm that in the last 19 years there have been 3 slight and one serious injury crash at this junction. Of the slights, one involved a 50cc motorcycle hitting a sunken drain cover, one involved a westbound car turning into the

path of an eastbound car and one involved an eastbound, slow moving traffic, rear end shunt.

- The serious incident which occurred in 2011 is well known and documented. This involved a lorry turning right into Platt Industrial Estate and clipping a pedestrian walking along the southern footway. Remedial safety measures regarding this crash have since been implemented. No injury crashes have occurred in over 19 years involving lorries emerging from Platt Industrial Estate. The evidence indicates therefore that either lorries emerge when there is an appropriate gap and/or drivers of through traffic appropriately hold back on the A25 to allow large vehicles to complete their manoeuvres as advised in Rule 221 of the Highway Code.
- In reflecting on this junction, the eastern corner should only be widened if the pedestrian crossing visibility to traffic approaching on the Platt Industrial Estate private road, is not made any worse.

06.09.2018

- There is no doubt that pedestrian visibility at the eastern corner to approaching traffic on the private Platt Industrial Estate Road is much better than it has historically been. However, as discussed previously, on further reflection of previous measures proposed here, I consider it important (more important than the tracking of large vehicles out onto the A25), that the pedestrian crossing position is not compromised by it being moved back (eastwards).
- I confirm that there is a SLOW marking in the Platt Industrial estate private road as described. I confirm, as I believe the agent has recently confirmed, that the wall does not belong to this authority.

25.10.2018

- The additional drawing submitted is noted.

## **6. Determining Issues:**

- 6.1 This condition requires details of the junction alterations and the provision of measures to improve the highway safety environment at the junction for both pedestrians and vehicles.
- 6.2 The proposed junction alterations have been provided on Drawing No.280 F and for all intents and purposes have been implemented under a Section 278 agreement with KCC H&T. It is important to note that this junction proposal retains the existing junction's form and layout. The only change is the extension to the parking bays on the northern side of the A25 to the east of the junction which is now in situ.

- 6.3 The proposed/implemented junction layout revises that previously agreed by KCC H&T as part of the Unilateral Undertaking for planning reference TM/16/01766/FL. The previous layout involved a reduction in the extent of the footway on the northeast sweep. KCC H&T have reassessed this and have concluded that pedestrian visibility at the eastern corner to approaching traffic on the private Platt Industrial Estate Road is much better than it has historically been and that, on review of previous measures proposed, it is considered more important that the pedestrian crossing position is not compromised by it being moved back than the tracking of large vehicles out onto the A25 eastwards.
- 6.4 Other measures to the junction have been proposed. These include:
- A 'SLOW' (Diagram 1024) and Pedestrians (Diagram 544) road markings have been proposed on the layout plan (Drawing No 280 F) to be applied to the road on the approach from the Estate. The SLOW marking has already been provided. The Pedestrians triangle marking has not yet been provided as proposed. It is also noted that a Pedestrian with Child sign is in situ on the approach to the junction from the Estate.
  - The hedge/verge, which is owned by Prime Securities, has been partially removed back to the front wall of No.1 Whatcote Cottages and it has been stated that the hedge will be maintained so that it does not spread back towards the gatepost. It has been requested that this should also state that the hedge be maintained so that it does not encroach outside or beyond the visibility lines shown on Drawing No.4863-050 Rev A. This provision will be confirmed within the supplementary report.
- 6.5 The junction works and measures proposed, other than the Pedestrians road marking, have been implemented. A timetable for the provision of this additional marking has been requested and will be clarified within the supplementary report.
- 6.6 The applicant has clarified the ownership of the land in and around the junction which is provided on Drawing No.4863-050 Rev A. In short, Northfleet Development owns the access road, the applicant (Prime Securities) owns the reservation area between the access road and No.1 Whatcote Cottages and the wall and pier adjacent to the junction are under the ownership of No.1 Whatcote Cottages.
- 6.7 Members should be made aware that the applicant was encouraged to liaise with the owner of No.1 Whatcote Cottages to discuss the possibility of the pier adjacent to the junction being removed/modified to provide a corner cut-off pedestrian entrance to No.1 Whatcote Cottages. This is likely to have improved visibility for pedestrians further. The applicant advised that an approach was made to the owner(s) of No.1 Whatcote Cottages in relation to this but no response was received.

- 6.8 The details therefore need to be assessed on their individual planning merit. I note the concerns raised by the Parish Council relating to pedestrian safety at the junction. However, this is considered to be a technical highways matter and it is noted that the applicant has liaised with KCC H&T in order to provide junction alterations and measures that KCC H&T are now satisfied would improve safety at the junction. Accordingly, it is considered that the details submitted are acceptable and sufficient to discharge this condition.
- 6.9 A revised unilateral undertaking that reflects the details submitted within this reserved details application has been agreed with the Council (dated 5 September 2018). It has been noted that this shows an earlier revision of Drawing No.280 (D). It has therefore been requested that this be amended to reflect the drawing submitted with this application and which was issued for construction (Drawing No.280 F. An update regarding this will be provided within the supplementary report. As mentioned previously, these works have now been implemented.
- 6.10 It is therefore recommended that Members resolve to approve this application for reserved details and endorse the revised unilateral undertaking agreed.

## **7. Recommendation:**

- 7.1 **Reserved Details be Approved** in accordance with the following:

Drawing 280 F received 20.08.2018, Topographical Survey LPS2089 received 20.08.2018, Planning Layout 4863-050 A received 19.09.2018, Planning Statement received 03.09.2018, Other Land Registry Map received 03.09.2018.

Contact: Mark Fewster