

ADDENDUM 10th December 2019

Item No 6	282 Kings Drive	181178
<p>Response to Daylight and Sunlight study received from Right of Light Consulting – summarised as follows:-</p> <p>We note that the applicants BRE daylight & sunlight study highlights some relatively borderline results concerning our client's property and we could therefore like to review the analysis on which these results are based.</p> <p>We request that no decision in favour of the application is made until the applicant permits us to review their daylight and sunlight study analysis. We will require a copy of their computer model and analysis be forwarded to us so that we can advise our client accordingly on the accuracy of the results. We will be happy to liaise with our client to arrange access for the applicant's surveyor to visit so they can gather the necessary internal measurements for the assessment.</p> <p>If our client is forced to seek an injunction from the court preventing the construction of the proposal any fees that are incurred will be sought for reimbursement from the applicant. We aim to avoid these further courses of action. Therefore, we strongly advocate that the issue is resolved during the planning stage - in particular, to avoid planning permission being granted for a development that may not be built due to legal rights of light restrictions.</p>		
<p>Additional comments received from advisor to objector summarised below:-</p> <p>Whilst these measures may well reduce the overall impact of the building, it will not address specifically the major impact that the development will have on your property given its extreme proximity to your dwelling.</p> <p>Indeed, rather than specifically addressing your concerns as a neighbour they have chosen rather to take a simplistic approach which is to keep the existing building with minimal change and simply move it back and move it down.</p> <p>The revised drawings and data appear to demonstrate a minimal impact to your property. However, you should be mindful of this rather lackadaisical approach.</p> <p>In respect to their daylight report, having opted for a less stringent test they conclude that only a few windows will be affected with a minimal or negligible reduction in light.</p> <p>However, it appears that both W6 and W8 windows face the same direction whereas they label them Southwest and south east respectively. There is also a conservatory, which perhaps the council need to be reminded, is "A room with a glass roof and walls attached to a house at one side and used as a sun lounge or for growing delicate plants"</p> <p>No account has been made to measure the daylight within this room, but it is quite clear that virtually the whole of this elevation will be impacted. This is a significant loss of amenity which deserves at the very least an accurate account of the effects from the development.</p>		

Furthermore, I note that in respect to the elevations and sections, which incidentally are the only drawings to include neighbouring properties, that it is significant that the height of those neighbouring properties is labelled "indicative only". Thus, ensuring that the actual impact is at best inaccurate and at worst deceptive.

In addition, the elevation and section do not appear to tie up, with the elevation indicating that the building is submerged far deeper than is shown on the section. Such graphics may not provide an accurate version of what is likely to be built and I am sure that this is unlikely to alleviate your concerns nor give you confidence that the reality will be any worse than you currently fear.

With a project proposal of this size I see no reason why the council do not insist that the submitted drawings and consultant papers present an accurate representation of their proposal and the likely impact on neighbouring properties prior to any formal decision being made.

Eight additional letters of objection received, comments are summarised below:-

- Daylight survey drawings are not to scale;
- Insufficient information to determine application;
- Question the need for 80 units on viability grounds as public consultation had stated only 65 required;
- Concern that lowering site level will impact on drainage due to presence of groundwater;
- Redistributing spoil within the site will impact upon ecology;
- Wrong to fell mature trees;
- Building will be too prominent;
- Dumped soil may sink into ground and into Decoy Stream;
- The proposed building encroaches into the wild area;
- Garden encroaches into wild area;
- Area around the stream could easily be developed at a later date;
- Should be a system to prevent residential plots being lost;
- Building remains overbearing and inappropriate;
- Wildlife corridor will be interrupted;
- Will be too much traffic.

Item No 7	Woods Cottages, Langney Rise	190339
Amendment required to para. 10.4 (approved plans condition):- No. from 289300 No. 06 Rev. F should read 289200 No. 06 Rev. F.		
Petition objecting to the scheme due to parking and highway safety concerns received. The petition has 48 signatories. Additional letter of objection received, a summary of matters raised is provided		

below:-

- Site notice not displayed;
- The pond to the south of the site is not dry and falls within Flood Zone 2;
- A sequential Flood Risk Assessment was carried out but not an Exception Test;
- Additional flood risk tests should be carried out due to the changes to the southern part of the site;
- During heavy rainfall the storm drains fail and gardens on Swanley Close to the south of the site are flooded;
- Removal of trees will reduce drainage capacity of site;
- Increase in cars will reduce air quality which is already poor;
- There are many protected species within the site;
- Road will be extremely dangerous for pedestrians;
- Difficulty of access for emergency services;
- New road should be in position of construction access from the north of the site;
- Not enough local amenities available;

The letter also included plans showing drainage layout on Swanley Close and images of surface water flooding on the street. Copies have been distributed to members.

Item No 8	First Church of Christ Scientist, Spencer Road	190461
<p><u>Condition 9 reworded to include additional windows:</u> Windows 10, 12, 14, 15, 22, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37, as shown on approved plan No: 2018-60-16, shall be obscure glazed and non-opening to a height no less than 1.7m above internal finished floor level, prior to first occupation of the development, hereby approved and retained as such for the lifetime of the development, unless agreed otherwise by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residential occupants.</p> <p>New Condition 10: Condition to control any potential light pollution for neighbouring occupants.</p> <p>New condition 11 The finished floor level of the second floor shall be no less than 1.7m from the sill level or operable/non-obscurely glazed part of any approved window. Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residential occupants.</p> <p>New Condition 12 All windows shown on the approved drawings as being blocked up, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings prior to first occupation of the development, hereby approved and shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residential occupants.</p>		

Item No 9	42-44 Meads Street	190717

Nothing further to add.

Item No 10	Langney Shopping Centre Car Valet	190604
<p><u>Paragraph 5.3 should read:</u></p> <p><i>'A total of 23 parking spaces would be provided for future residents.'</i></p> <p><u>Paragraph 8.3.3 should read:</u></p> <p><i>'All proposed units would meet the minimum internal space standards in terms of the total Gross Internal Area and individual bedroom sizes required by the 'Technical housing standards - nationally described space standards'.</i></p> <p><u>Paragraph 8.7.1</u></p> <p>The final sentence should read:</p> <p><i>'As such, the location shown on the submitted plans is considered to be acceptable and should be provided prior to first occupation'.</i></p> <p><u>Condition 11</u></p> <p>Condition 11 requires that a maintenance and management plan for the drainage system is submitted prior to commencement of development – The applicant has requested that this be required prior to first occupation and this is considered to be reasonable. As such, it is recommended that this be incorporated and reworded, to read:</p> <p><i>A maintenance and management plan for the entire drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development, hereby approved, to ensure the designed system takes into account the design standards of those responsible for maintenance. The management plan shall cover the following:</i></p> <p><i>a) This plan should clearly state who will be responsible for managing all aspects of the surface water drainage system, including piped drains.</i></p> <p><i>b) Evidence of how these responsibility arrangements will remain in place throughout the lifetime of the development</i></p> <p><i>Thereafter, the system shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding, both on and off site, to protect and improve the water quality.</i></p> <p><u>Condition 18</u></p>		

Condition 18 should be deleted.

Condition 19

Condition 19 should read as follows:

Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby approved, further testing recommended by the Combined Geotechnical and Ground Contamination Risk Assessment by Ashdown Site Investigation Ltd, dated July 2019, including parts of the site not already tested and any imported soils, shall be carried out by a suitably qualified land contamination specialist and the results submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, any recommended remediation of the site, or any other recommendations, shall be carried out in full and a verification report demonstrating the completion of the remediation scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the land is remediated to protect future occupants of the development and local water sources from unacceptable levels of pollution.

Item No 11	Land South of Langney Shopping Centre	190668
<p>LLFA objected to the original submission and uphold their objection to the redesigned scheme. Therefore the recommendation is amended to delegate authority to the head of planning for negotiate with the LLFA authority. Should the LLFA not withdraw their objection on submission of further information the application will be reported back to committee.</p> <p>Following submission of landscaping plan and drawing number for clarity to site entrance road plan, condition 2 amended to;</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">GEG/1011/1 Rev B – Proposed Site PlanGEG/1011/2 Rev B - Proposed Floor Plans for Plots 1-6GEG/1011/3 Rev B - Proposed Elevations Plots 1-6GEG/1011/4 Rev B – Proposed Floors Plans & Elevations for Plots 7-9GEG/1011/5 Rev B – Proposed Street SceneGEG/1011/6 Rev B – Proposed Roof PlanGEG/1011/7 Rev A - Site Entrance Road2876 Rev B – Landscape Proposals <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <p>Following submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan Condition 15 is</p>		

amended as follows;

Throughout the construction period, including any ground works or works of demolition, the submitted Construction Management Plan dated November 2019 shall be implemented and adhered to in full and in particular the applicant will have due consideration of but not be restricted to the following matters,

- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
- the method of access and egress and routeing of vehicles during construction,
- the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors,
- the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
- the provision and utilisation of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),
- details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the area.

Additional condition requested;

A maximum of one car parking space shall be allocated per dwelling, with 4 remaining spaces being retained as visitor parking spaces, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure suitable provision of car parking spaces, allowing spaces for visitors.

Land Contamination condition:

Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby approved, testing results for any imported soils, as recommended by the Combined Geotechnical and Ground Contamination Risk Assessment by Ashdown Site Investigation Ltd, dated July 2019, shall be carried out by a suitably qualified land contamination specialist and the results submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the resulting site does not comprise any contamination to protect future occupants of the development and local water sources from unacceptable levels of pollution.

Item No 12	6 Jellicoe Close	190751
Nothing to report		