

FAVERSHAM TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING SCHEDULE – 11th July 2022

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST WERE MADE BY:

There were no declarations of interest.

- 22/503104/TCA** **57 STONE STREET, FAVERSHAM**
(WARD: ST. ANN'S)
CONSERVATION AREA NOTIFICATION: CROWN LIFT ONE PRUNUS AVIUM – BIRD CHERRY , UP TOT 6M ABOVE GROUND LEVEL, THIS WILL BE ACHIEVED BY REMOVING THE 3 LOWEST BRANCHES BACK TO PRIMARY LIMBS.
Recommendation: No Objection
- 22/502800/FULL** **MONTGREENAN, ST CATHERINES DRIVE, FAVERSHAM**
(WARD: WATLING)
INSTALLATION OF NEW FORM ENTRANCE DOOR WITH AN OPEN PORCH, AND ALTERATIONS TO THE SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS
Recommendation: No Objection
- 22/502866/FULL** **2 EGBERT ROAD, FAVERSHAM**
(WARD: WATLING)
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND ERECTION OF A PAIR OF SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS
Recommendation: Objection
Reason:
1) Members considered the design to be detrimental the to the character of the area. For example, bay windows are a common feature on the London Road and have not been incorporated into the design.
2) Members noted the concerns raised by neighbours concerning loss of light and privacy in their garden, and ask SBC Officers to investigate.
3) No environmental mitigation
Comment:
1) Members commented that replacing one bungalow with two dwelling could be a sensible use of space.

The proposal could be improved by changing the design so one property faced Egbert Road and the other the London Road which would improve both streetscapes.

22/502936/FULL

54A SOUTH ROAD, FAVERSHAM

(WARD: ST. ANN'S)

ERECTION OF A REPLACEMENT SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH PITCH ROOF AND ROOF LIGHT.

Recommendation: No Objection

Reason:

- 1) Members considered the proposal to be a reasonable application which didn't adversely impact the streetscape on South Road.**

22/502676/SUB

CLEVE HILL SOLAR PARK, CLEVE HILL, GRAVENEY

SUBMISSION OF DETAILS TO DISCHARGE

REQUIREMENT 4 OF THE CLEVE HILL SOLAR PARK

ORDER 2020 – PHASE OF AUTHORIZED DEVELOPMENT

22/503259/SUB

SUBMISSION OF DETAILS TO DISCHARGE

REQUIREMENT 12 OF THE CLEVE HILL SOLAR PARK

ORDER 2020 – CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

MANAGEMENT PLAN

Recommendation: Objection on lack of evidence base at this stage.

Reasons:

- 1) A key constraint is the road bridge over the railway at Graveney. Discussions have been undertaken with Network Rail who own the structure and permission has been given to move the loads over the railway bridge subject to a number of conditions. These include specific trailer configurations and also the requirement to undertake pre and post movement surveys of the structure – No evidence of this in the documents.**
- 2) Average 80 two way HGV movements per day so 40 vehicles. Peak construction at week 100 could see 222 two way vehicle movements (111) vehicles. This is a significant amount of vehicle movement past two small villages , a primary school and a nursery. What are the air quality impacts of this? Further has consideration been given to mitigation of traffic**

during the school run or the phasing of work during the school holidays.

- 3) There is no mitigation for cyclists and the challenges they face. The Town Council has offered full support to the Solar Cycleway. A Community Corridor should be in place before construction, providing a long term cycle route in the area. It is understood by members that Sustrans are undertaking a viability study.
- 4) Head Hill Road / and Seasalter Road is only 4.5 m wide. It is single track and is proposed as the primary access road. The traffic management plan says that this is enough to pass a large HGV and car along the majority of the road. Members disagreed with this statement, their experience is that it is often difficult to pass two cars on Head Hill let alone a large HGV.
- 5) It states in the traffic plan at 7.2.1 that a Traffic Management Group will be set up with members of National Highways, KCC, SBC Graveney Parish Council, Graveney Primary and Residents. To the Town Councils knowledge, this has not happened, and Members seek reassurance that it has. The TMG will play a vital role in monitoring
- 6) KCC has signed off elements of the plan including the mitigation but that isn't included in the application.
