

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION PLANNING COMMITTEE 20 JUNE 2018

This report provides supplementary information following publication of the main report, for consideration by committee members in determining this application.

### **Agenda Item 006 - EDC/18/0009**

#### Additional Consultee Comments

KCC Highways and Transportation (15.06.18) - Further comments as follows:

- RSA Designer's response - Noted and accepted
- Parking related to dwellings - Noted and accepted, albeit there is a small number of plots where the allocated parking is particularly poorly related to the dwelling in question.
- Tandem parking within garages - Tandem parking, particularly within garages, can be poorly utilised. Therefore where proposed, consideration should be given to additional, unallocated on-street parking to address any resulting issues of overspill, and is an approach followed elsewhere within Kent. Raise concern that such provision cannot be accommodated in this case due to the presence of the HV cable and highlight the risk of wider overspill across the site.
- 0.5m hardstanding to visitor parking on western site road - Noted and accepted that HV cable would prevent additional land raising, boundary fence can be positioned to prevent egress to grass verge, and that the parking requested for is on a road proposed to remain private, not become adopted public highway.
- Community car park - noted and accepted that an updated travel plan for Eastgate cannot reasonably be required as part of the phase 3 proposals as the Eastgate Centre itself is outside of the application boundary.
- Controlled Spine Road Crossing - Noted that technical approval was granted by KCC for the spine road in April 2018, and planning approval in November 2017, and that a crossing cannot be required through phase 3 proposals as the spine road is outside of the application boundary. Consider appropriate for KCC/EDC to note current lack of pedestrian crossing facilities on the principal desire line between the Phase 3 area and the primary school site.

*EDC Officer Comment: The above matters have been considered in the main report, including that the relationship of parking to dwellings has been improved through updates to the site layout, and that tandem parking is supported by the Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework. The approved spine road layout does provide two uncontrolled pedestrian crossings adjacent to Phase 3, similar in form to those on the built part of the spine road.*

KCC Public Rights of Way (19.06.18) - Are satisfied with the proposed approach of a timetable to be approved for completion of the diverted route for Restricted Byway NU20, and enforcement action available to EDC should this timetable once approved not be complied with, provided it is made clear to the applicant that they would be in breach of a planning condition if they failed to comply with the timetable

*EDC Officer Comment: It will be made clear to the applicant when the timetable is approved that failure to comply with the timetable would be in breach of a planning condition.*

## Building for Life 12 Review

Building for Life is a tool for assessing the design quality of homes and neighbourhoods developed by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (now a part of the Design Council). 'BfL12' is the 2012 redesign of the document, which sets out a range of 12 key criteria under which new developments can be clearly and methodically assessed as follows:

1. Connections
2. Facilities and services
3. Public transport
4. Meeting local housing requirements
5. Character
6. Working with site and its context
7. Creating well defined streets and spaces
8. Easy to find you way around
9. Streets for all
10. Car parking
11. Public and private spaces; and
12. External storage and amenity space

Consideration of the 12 criteria is based on a traffic light system, and the document recommends that proposed new developments aim to secure as many greens as possible, minimise the number of ambers and avoid reds.

A Building for Life 12 review of the Springhead Phase 3 planning application has been carried out by the EDC case officer. The development scored 10 green and 2 amber. Of particular note is the strength of *Connections* (criteria 1) within the development, having two Public Rights of Way (PROW) incorporated within the proposals in addition to other pedestrian paths and a permeable street layout. Two other criteria, *Creating well defined streets and spaces* (criteria 7) and *Easy to find you way around* (criteria 8) were also scored highly on the basis of the legible street hierarchy within the residential area and legible routes within open space areas.

Amber scores related to *Local Housing Requirements* (Criteria 4) due to only 6 of 172 dwellings meeting Building Regulations Part M4(2) Accessible Dwellings standard, though providing level-access to the split-level units on the western side would be difficult, and there is no planning policy or outline permission requirements for this. Additionally, the good mix of types and sizes of dwellings all meeting the Nationally Described Space Standard are positive aspects for this criteria. The other amber score related to *Public and private spaces* (criteria 11), where a stronger demarcation of the private/public boundary for 67 of the 172 dwellings fronting the spine road is recommended. The development is otherwise considered to provide access to good levels private and public outdoor space, and so this score could improve to green when final boundary treatment details are submitted.