



## AGENDA

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, 12th September, 2006, at 10.00 am** Ask for: **Andrew Tait**  
**Council Chamber, Sessions House, County** Telephone: **01622 694342**  
**Hall, Maidstone**

*Tea/Coffee will be available from 9:30 outside the meeting room*

#### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)*

#### **A. COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

1. Substitutes
2. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting.
3. Minutes - 18 July 2006 (Pages 1 - 4)
4. Future meetings of the Committee:-

|    |                           |                            |
|----|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| A4 | Tuesday, 10 October 2006  | Tuesday, 11 September 2007 |
|    | Tuesday, 7 November 2006  | Tuesday, 9 October 2007    |
|    | Tuesday, 13 December 2006 | Tuesday, 6 November 2007   |
|    | Tuesday, 16 January 2007  | Tuesday, 11 December 2007  |
|    | Tuesday, 13 February 2007 | Tuesday, 15 January 2008   |
|    | Tuesday, 20 March 2007    | Tuesday, 12 February 2008  |
|    | Tuesday, 17 April 2007    | Tuesday, 18 March 2008     |
|    | Tuesday, 15 May 2007      | Tuesday, 15 April 2008     |
|    | Tuesday, 19 June 2007     | Tuesday, 13 May 2008       |
|    | Tuesday, 14 August 2007   |                            |
5. Site Meetings and Other Meetings

#### **B. GENERAL MATTERS**

#### **C. MINERALS AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS**

1. Application TM/05/4134 - Expansion and improvement of the sludge recycling centre including improvements to the site access junction with Bull Lane, improvements to visibility splays and creation of passing bays along the access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford; Southern Water. (Pages 5 - 28)

2. Application TH/06/729 - Retrospective application for recycling centre at Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate; MPL Recycling Ltd. (Pages 29 - 44)

#### **D. DEVELOPMENTS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

1. Proposal AS/06/1270 - Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Faversham Road, Kennington, Ashford; Governors of The Towers School and KCC Children, Families and Education. (Pages 45 - 54)
2. Proposal CA/06/554 - Retrospective amendment to positioning of playground extension at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Pilgrims Way, Canterbury; Governors of Pilgrims Way Primary School and KCC Children, Families and Education. (Pages 55 - 64)

#### **E. COUNTY MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

1. County matter applications (Pages 65 - 76)
2. Consultations on applications submitted by District Councils or Government Departments
3. County Council developments
4. Detailed submissions under Channel Tunnel Rail Link Act 1996 (None)
5. Screening opinions under Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999
6. Scoping opinions under Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999 (None)

#### **F. OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT**

##### **EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)*

Peter Sass  
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership  
(01622) 694002

*(Please note that the background documents referred to in the accompanying papers may be inspected by arrangement with the Departments responsible for preparing the report. Draft conditions concerning applications being recommended for permission, reported in sections C and D, are available to Members in the Members' Lounge.)*

Monday, 4 September 2006

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 18 July 2006.

PRESENT: Mr R E King (Chairman), Mr A R Bassam (Vice-Chairman), Mrs V J Dagger, Mr J A Davies, Mr J B O Fullarton, Mr T Gates, Mrs E Green, Mrs S V Hohler, Mr S J G Koowaree, Mr C J Law (substitute for Mr R A Marsh), Mr J F London, Mr T A Maddison, Mr J I Muckle, Mr W V Newman, Mr A R Poole, Ms B J Simpson and Mrs P A V Stockell.

OTHER MEMBERS: Mr K Sansum.

OFFICERS: The Head of Planning Applications Group, Mr B J Murphy (with Mr J Crossley); and the Democratic Services Officer, Mr A Tait.

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**54. Membership**

The Committee noted the appointment of Mr G A Horne in place of Mr R F Manning.

**55. Minutes**  
*(Item A3)*

RESOLVED that subject to the inclusion of “and local Members” after “Manston Parish Council” in Minute 50 (5) (b), the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2006 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**56. Site Meetings and Other Meetings**  
*(Item A4)*

(1) The Committee agreed to the cancellation of its meeting on 15 August 2006 subject to there being no urgent business.

(2) The Committee agreed to visit the site of the proposed Waste Transfer Station at Waterbrook Park, Sevington on Wednesday, 2 August 2006.

**57. Proposal SW/04/1453 – Amended Alignment of the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road, Milton Creek Crossing at Land between Ridham Avenue, Kemsley and Castle Road, Sittingbourne; KCC Highways**  
*(Item D1 – Report by Head of Planning Applications Group)*

(1) Ms B J Simpson addresses the Committee in her capacity as local Member but did not take part in the decision making process.

(2) The Head of Planning Applications Group tabled correspondence from Grovehurst Energy Ltd and PFA Consulting together with an amplified recommendation. He also reported the views of the local Member, Mr R Truelove supporting the application.

(3) Mr G Eves from PFA Consulting and Rear Commodore W Petty addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. Mr J Farmer, the Regeneration and Projects

Manager spoke in reply and answered questions concerning the proposal for Milton Creek crossing.

(5) In agreeing to permit the development, the Committee asked for further consideration to be given to the design of the Milton Creek Bridge with a view to protecting the Creek from sterilisation.

(6) RESOLVED that the proposal be referred to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government as a departure from the Development Plan and subject to her giving no direction to the contrary, and subject to the confirmation in writing of the applicant's undertaking to provide a sum of money to cover compensation for the loss of inter-tidal habitat associated with the proposed development and the implementation of a programme of bird monitoring following completion of the proposed development:-

- (a) permission be granted to the proposal, as amended, subject to conditions, including the standard time condition; the submission of details (including external materials) of all proposed structures, including bridges, roundabouts, walls/fencing, railings, gates, traffic signage, paving scheme and all hardened surfacing (including pedestrian/cycle routes) and highway lighting; the submission of long sections and typical cross sections of the proposed scheme; the submission of details of all drainage proposals (including drainage lagoons and culverts) and water pollution control devices, including specific measures to protect surface watercourses during the construction phase and to prevent any pollution of Milton Creek; the submission of details of the contractors' access and compound(s); the submission and implementation of a scheme of landscaping (including all new planting, earth bunding and wildlife protection) and a programme for its maintenance; the submission of a protection scheme for existing trees during construction; the submission of details of any surplus spoil arising from the construction project and the proposals for its disposal; controls over the hours of construction activity and the routing of construction traffic; controls over handling of excavated material (including the storage and handling of topsoil); controls to suppress the generation of dust and prevent the deposit of mud on the public highway; the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable; the submission of detailed management plans for mitigation measures for all protected and other species; the submission and implementation of a monitoring strategy for reptiles translocated to receptor sites; the restriction of construction works over the winter months for the Milton Creek Bridge and during the period when the criteria for a severe weather ban on wildfowling are met; the submission of a scheme for the monitoring and mitigation of the impacts of the proposed Milton Creek crossing on inter-tidal sedimentary deposits; the submission of further details relating to bat protection and works carried out to existing trees; and the submission of a desk top study identifying potential contaminants, including a Risk Assessment and a Method Statement detailing any necessary remediation; and
- (b) the applicants be advised of the views and recommendations of Swale Borough Council; the detailed requirements of the Environment Agency, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and the Kent Wildlife Trust; the detailed advice of the Lower Medway Internal Drainage Board, Transco and

National Grid; and the comments made by the Public Rights of Way Unit with regard to the diversion and temporary closure of Public Footpaths.

**58. Proposal SE/06/1256 – Three new pagodas at The Bradbourne School, Bradbourne Vale Road, Sevenoaks; Governors of The Bradbourne School and KCC Children, Families and Education**  
(Item D2 – Report by Head of Planning Applications Group)

RESOLVED that permission be granted to the proposal subject to conditions requiring the submission of the pagoda colours to the County Planning Authority; and the development being carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

**59. Proposal DO/06/714 – Retrospective application for the corrected siting of 2 Storey business resource centre and relocation of basement plant room to ground level at St Edmund’s Catholic School, Old Charlton Road, Dover; Governors of St Edmund’s Catholic School and KCC Children, Families and Education**  
(Item D3 – Report by Head of Planning Applications Group)

(1) The Head of Planning Applications Group tabled 5 drawings setting out amendments to the proposal together with a revised recommendation. He informed the Committee that the revisions to the proposal consisted of:-

- (a) the pulling back of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor by 1.8m on the left hand side of the building when viewed from the front;
- (b) the trimming back of the roof overhang at the front by 1.1m;
- (c) additional obscure glazing in the front elevation to extend from the floor level;
- (d) further changes of the cladding to cedar in the front elevation;
- (e) additional planting around the building to soften the impact;
- (f) the windows facing Barton Road being non-opening; and
- (g) a reduction in the external café area facing Stanhope Road.

(2) The Head of Planning Group reported the receipt of correspondence from Dover DC objecting to the unamended proposal.

(3) Mr A R Bassam moved, seconded by Mr T A Maddison that the revised recommendations of the Head of Planning Applications Group be agreed.

(4) Mr W V Newman moved, seconded by Mr J A Davies as an amendment that consideration of this matter be deferred to allow full consultation on the revised drawings.

*Amendment Lost 6 votes to 7*

(5) Mr J I Muckle moved, seconded by Mr J B O Fullarton that the question be put.

*Carried with 3 votes against*

(6) In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 2.20(3), Mr J A Davies asked for his vote against the proposal to be recorded.

(7) On being put to the vote the original motion was carried by 10 votes to 6 with 1 abstention.

(8) RESOLVED that permission be granted to the proposed development, as amended by Drawing Nos. 04.991001B, 04.99.1002A, 04.99.1003A, 04.00.1004A and 04.00.1004A and 04.99.1005, subject to conditions including conditions covering the

development being carried out strictly in accordance with the above approved plans; the submission of a scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment for implementation during the first available planting season and its ongoing maintenance; hours of construction being restricted to between 0800 and 1800 on weekdays, between 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays and no activity at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays; the hours of use of the building, other than the proposed café, being restricted to between 0800 and 2100 Mondays to Saturdays, with no use on Sundays and Bank Holidays; the hours of use of the external café space being restricted to between 0900 and 1630 with no use on Saturdays, Sundays or Bank Holidays; the external door to the proposed café and internet area being kept closed after 1630 hours and no music being playing in the café; the imposition of a noise limit for the mechanical services plant and the submission of a necessary scheme of attenuation; and the provision of close boarded timber fencing between the proposed building and the neighbouring properties in Stanhope Road.

**60. Proposal CA/06/469 – Erection of a single storey nursery building to the rear of the existing school building at Herne Bay Infant School, Stanley Road, Herne Bay; Governors of Herne Bay Infant School and KCC Children, Families and Education**

*(Item D4 – Report by Head of Planning Applications Group)*

(1) Mr C J Law addressed the Committee in his capacity as local Member but did not take part in the decision-making process.

(2) The Committee agreed to the Chairman's offer to write to the Acting Director of Kent Highway Services to request that Highways Officers attend meetings of the Committee whenever their contribution to the issue under discussion was potentially significant.

(3) Mr T A Maddison moved, seconded by Mr J B O Fullarton that permission be granted to the proposal subject to the School Travel Plan being vigorously applied.

*Carried unanimously*

(4) RESOLVED that permission be granted to the proposal subject to a condition requiring that the School Travel Plan be vigorously applied.

**61. Proposal AS/06/530 – Provision of single storey toilet, office and kitchen space at Kent Communicative and Assistive Technology Service for Children and Young People, Wainwright Place, Newtown, Ashford; KCC Children, Families and Education**

*(Item D5 – Report by Head of Planning Applications Group)*

RESOLVED that permission be granted to the proposal subject to conditions requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans; and requiring that the land allocated for parking/turning be kept clear of obstruction and not used other than for parking of vehicles in connection with the development.

SECTION C  
MINERALS AND WASTE DISPOSAL

Background Documents - the deposited documents, views and representations received as referred to in the reports and included in the development proposals dossier for each case and also as might be additionally indicated.

---

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

A report by Head of Planning Applications Group to Planning Applications Committee on 12 September 2006.

Expansion and improvements of the Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access junction with Bull Lane, improvements to visibility splays and creation of passing bays along the access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134

For Permission

Local Member: Mr. G Rowe

Unrestricted

#### **Introduction**

1. Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) dates back to the early 1900's, predating modern planning legislation and since this time has expanded incrementally over the years. No planning permission therefore covers the overall operation of the site. An extension to the WWTW was granted in 1971 and a replacement sludge press building was permitted in 1993. Permissions have been granted which allow industrial liquid waste to be treated at the works.
2. The WWTW provide preliminary, primary and secondary treatment for Aylesford and the wider Maidstone urban area, pumped to the site via the Allington Wastewater Pumping Station. The works discharges the treated effluent into the tidal reaches of the River Medway. The existing Sludge Recycling Centre (SRC) produces a 'conventionally' treated digested sludge cake product for use in agriculture. The current plant does not consistently meet the required standard and temporary lime treatment is often required to meet the microbiological standard. The SRC treats in the region of 2865 tonnes of dry solid per year (tds/y), most of which arises from Aylesford SRC. There are limited sludge liquid imports from neighbouring WWTW (approx. 800 tds/y).
3. Members visited the site on 21 March 2006, a copy of the notes of that visit are appended to this report.

**Item C1**

**Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**



**Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works**

Scale: 1:10 000

- Extent of land owned by Southern Water
- Planning application area

Based upon the Ordnance Survey map with the permission of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright O.S. Licence No. WJ1 200530. Southern Water Services 2006.



## Item C1

# **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

### **The Site**

4. The WWTW is located on a site between the villages of Aylesford and Eccles, off Bull lane. The Southern Water owned site is extensive, covering an area of 15.6ha, and extending as far as the River Medway to the south west. The planning application boundary covers the entire site although the Sludge Recycling Centre lies to the north and east of the main treatment works on land that is lower than the rest of the site.
5. A 2m high chain link fence surrounds this area with embankments to all sides. The embankments to the north, east and west are outside Southern Water's ownership and form part of the mineral excavation works operated by CEMEX. Two thirds of the SRC is taken up with sludge storage, comprising low concrete bays. The tallest structure in the SRC are the digesters, two of which are 10 m high however these are largely screened by the topography of the site.
6. To the south and south east, the WWTW is bordered by the arable fields that maintain the open rural setting of the Friars Priory. Quarrying activity is located to the north, north east and east of the WWTW, beyond which are large open arable fields gently undulating and rising towards the village of Eccles. There are various footpaths running through this area. To the west and north west, before the river, is the Island Site. This area is characterised by redundant industry, open concrete based storage areas intermingled with rough grassland, woodland pockets, reedbeds with standing deadwood and wet scrubland'.
7. There are two access routes to the WWTW off Bull lane. Southern Water with Cemex, shares the northern most access road. This is a narrow, enclosed macadam road and is the main access used by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) accessing the site. The second access is provided off a junction shared with the Friars. This access road provides vehicular access to Corporation Cottages along with the Island Site and in part is also a public right of way. Southern Water predominantly uses this access for light vehicles.

### **Background**

8. Implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (UWWTD) and other EU Directives has meant that the amount of sludge produced in UK has risen, as a greater proportion of sewage is treated and higher treatment standards are required of that proportion. Southern Water in reviewing its Sludge Strategy has concluded that existing sludge treatment facilities in Kent are, overall, insufficient to meet future needs. 'Doing nothing' is not an option for them because it would lead to significant volumes of sludge either not being treated to the required standard for recycling to agricultural land, or not being treated at all.
9. Members will recall that they granted planning permission at the 20 June committee meeting for an expansion and upgrade of the Ashford Treatment Works and Sludge

## Item C1

# **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

Recycling Centre that will deal with the East Kent catchment. This application seeks to expand and improve the Aylesford Sludge Recycling Centre and is intended to address the deficiencies in current sludge treatment provision in West Kent, and also provide additional capacity to treat the modest growth in sludge generation for this area.

### **Proposal**

10. In brief the planning application to expand and improve the SRC proposes :

- enclosed sludge cake reception building and conveyor plant, sludge screens and sludge cake silo;
- liquid sludge reception tank;
- digested sludge transfer pumping station;
- new primary digester
- screened sludge storage tank and picket fence thickener;
- centrifuge building;
- liquor balance tank and pumping station;
- odour control system;
- new sludge storage bays.

11. Other existing plant within the SRC will be refurbished so that it can be used as part of the new SRC. All of the works would take place within the existing operational boundary of the site on largely previously developed land.

12. The northern most access would continue to be used for the expanded SRC It is proposed that moving the kerbline would widen the entrance to the access road and vegetation would be removed to improve the visibility splays. It is also proposed to incorporate passing bays along the access so that HGV's could pass one another.

13. The existing raw liquid sludge tanks are uncovered and there is no permanent odour control system. It is proposed to provide odour control plant to treat foul air arising from the raw sludge tanks, sludge cake reception building and the associated treatment plant.

14. Existing landscaping would be bolstered to further screen the new development.

15. Proposed site operation hours are 0700 to 1800 Monday to Friday and 0700 to 1300 on Saturdays. The plant itself operates on a 24 hour basis. It is intended that the construction phase would take 18 months from start to finish with construction working hours proposed to be 0700 to 1900 weekdays and 0700 to 1300 on Saturdays.

## Item C1

# **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

### **Main Planning Policy Designations**

16. There are no site-specific policies or planning and environmental designations covering Aylesford WWTW. The site is however considered to be in the Countryside and has a number of adjacent designations. Policies in the Kent and Medway Structure Plan and Tonbridge and Malling Preferred Options Report seek to protect the countryside but recognise there may be occasions when the need and nature of a proposed development may be acceptable in such locations. The nature of the WWTW means that traditionally they have been developed within the countryside, away from large population concentrations. The proposed expansion of the Aylesford SRC is required to meet improvements in treatment standards and growth of sludge arisings.
17. There are a number of employment areas allocated close to the WWTW within the Island Site. Immediately west of the WWTW, land is designated for industrial uses. A further allocation extends northwards along the River Medway, 30m from the site boundary. Here the allocation is for General Industrial Use and Open Storage Uses. Access to these sites is currently via Bull Lane.
18. Less than 100m north east of the WWTW is a significant area of land reserved for possible strategic housing provision. Policy P2/8 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan safeguards the land for its potential for meeting residential needs in the post 2011 period or earlier, should the need arise. The Local Development Framework Issues Report (2003) stated the intention to retain the safeguarding in the period up to 2021, in particular to capitalise on the significant recreation, nature conservation and transportation improvements that development could bring about for the East Bank of the River Medway. The Preferred Options Report published in 2005, takes this further by seeking to further expand the Area of Opportunity to include additional land around the WWTW and furthermore, incorporate the land into the Strategic Gap.
19. The WWTW is surrounded by land allocated as Strategic Gap to the north, east and south of the site where development will not be permitted which significantly extends the built confines of existing rural settlements or urban areas reserved for development. The proposed development, being within the existing operational area, would not affect the functioning of the Strategic Gap or any future proposed expansion of the Gap.
20. An Area of Local Landscape Importance is designated immediately south of the WWTW. In these areas development will not be permitted which would materially harm the landscape character of the area. The area west of the Friars is considered to be important in maintaining its rural setting. The Friars itself dates back to the 13<sup>th</sup> Century and is designated both as an Historic Park and Garden and a Conservation Area and contains a number of listed buildings.

## Item C1

# Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134

---

## Planning Policy Context

21. There is a range of planning policy implications relating to the proposed scheme. The Supporting Statement and Environmental Report provides an overview of the key policies and guidance at European, national, regional and local levels, a summary of the relevant policies follows:

## Government Guidance

22. Circular 17/91 – Water Industry Investment: Planning Considerations  
Circular 06/05 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Planning Policy Statement 1:      | Delivering Sustainable Development              |
| Planning Policy Statement 7:      | Sustainable Development in Rural Areas          |
| Planning Policy Statement 9:      | Biodiversity and Geological Conservation        |
| Planning Policy Statement 10:     | Planning for Sustainable Waste Management       |
| Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: | Transport                                       |
| Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation   |
| Planning Policy Statement 23:     | Planning and Pollution Control                  |
| Planning Policy Guidance Note 24: | Planning and Noise                              |
| Planning Policy Guidance Note 25: | Development and Flood Risk                      |
| Planning Policy Statement 25:     | Development and Flood Risk (consultation draft) |

*Circular 17/91 – Water Industry Investment: Planning Considerations* – acknowledges that local planning authorities have a key role in facilitating water industry development proposals. It confirms a presumption in favour of the expansion of wastewater treatment facilities in the interests of long term wastewater management, providing the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact, and that any such adverse impact is minimised. The circular advises, “*in considering development proposals expeditiously, local planning authorities should nevertheless assess and weigh thoroughly all material considerations and any conflicting demands*”.

## Regional Policy

### 23. RPG 9 – Regional Planning Guidance for the South East 2001

The regional context for the proposed scheme is set out in RPG9, which identifies the following key development principles for the region:

- Urban areas should be the main focus for development,
- Greenfield development should normally take place only after other alternatives have been considered,

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

- Protection and enhancement of the region's biodiversity, landscape and built and historic heritage.

RPG 9 calls for local authorities to establish or maintain ongoing liaison with the Environment Agency and sewage statutory undertakers in order to ensure timely and sustainable provision of infrastructure for the supply of water, sewage treatment and discharge systems.

#### **The South East Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy)**

24. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out the statutory basis for a new system of spatial planning, based on Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and Local Development Frameworks. The South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) is the responsible body charged with undertaking the preparation of the RSS for South East England, 'The South East Plan', which will set out the development framework for the period to 2026.
25. The Draft South East Plan was published for consultation in January 2005 and on 29 July 2005 the Draft South East Plan Part 1: Core Regional Policies was handed to Government. The full plan, to include Part 2 – sub-regional details was submitted for Government approval on 31 March 2006, with an examination in Public due to commence in late 2006.
26. In addressing wastewater and waste issues, the South East Plan takes 'Sustainable Natural Resource Management' as its theme. Its aim is to ensure greater efficiency in the use of natural resources, the reduction of pollution and waste and ensure that features of importance are protected and enhanced, including wildlife and landscapes.
27. The Plan recognises that with a growing population, extra demands will be placed on sewage treatment infrastructure and waters receiving effluent. Policy NRM1 deals with Sustainable Water Resources, Groundwater and River Water Quality Management and promotes a twin-track approach to demand management and water resources development, including the provision of wastewater infrastructure. Development should not give rise to unacceptable deterioration of water and should be in step with current and planned wastewater treatment infrastructure. Local Authorities are expected to work with water and sewerage companies and the Environment Agency to identify infrastructure needs and allocate areas and safeguard these for infrastructure development.

#### **Draft Regional Economic Strategy for South East England, 2002-2012**

28. Effective infrastructure and the sustainable use of natural resources are key objectives of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). Priority 18 of the RES calls for sustainable management of water, waste and energy.

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

#### **The Kent and Medway Structure Plan**

29. The Plan notes that water companies are “investing heavily in upgrading (wastewater) treatment processes provided at coastal sites”. The proposed policy for wastewater is Policy NR9, the relevant part of which states:

*“The development of new or expansion of existing water supply or wastewater facilities will be supported where:*

*There is a demonstrable need to serve existing and/or development proposed in accordance with the development plan; and  
This represents the best environmental option; and  
Land use and environmental impacts are minimised through appropriate mitigation.”*

The following policies are also relevant to this proposal:

|      |  |
|------|--|
| SP1  | seeks to conserve and enhance Kent's environment and ensuring a sustainable pattern of development.  |
| SS3  | seeks protection of Strategic Gaps   |
| EN3  | seeks to conserve, protect and enhance Kent's landscape and wildlife.  |
| ENV8 | seeks to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity  |
| QL11 | seeks protection and enhancement of existing community facilities  |
| QL17 | protection and enhancement of public rights of way   |
| TP3  | seeks development to be located where there is a good choice of transport  |
| TP15 | seeks development which generates significant increases in traffic, especially HGV's, to be well related to the primary and secondary road network.                            |
| NR5  | development should be designed to avoid or adequately mitigate, pollution impacts.   |
| WM2  | proposals should demonstrate that they represent the best balance between the most efficient and most environmentally sustainable method of managing a specific type of waste. |

#### **Kent Waste Local Plan 1998**

30. The Kent Waste Local Plan 1998 recognises that the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive will require the provision of additional treatment facilities. There are no specific policies for wastewater treatment in the Waste Local Plan. However the Plan correctly predicts, “Compliance with the EU Directives will lead to an increase in the quantity of sewage sludge created within Kent. At present, most sewage sludge within the County is used as a soil enhancer for agricultural land. The future of current agricultural practices is uncertain and it is likely that more advanced treatment will be required prior to applications to the land.”

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

31. The relevant text concludes, “*Proposals for new wastewater treatment and sludge treatment works or extensions to existing works will be supported in principle.*”
32. Under the new planning system, the Kent Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) will replace the existing Waste Local Plan. ‘Preferred Options’ on the Waste Development Documents are expected to be published in January 2007.

#### **Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan**

33. There are no site-specific policies in the Local Plan or designations covering Aylesford WWTW. The planning designations surrounding the site are discussed earlier in the report.

#### **Consultees**

34. **Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council:** Object on the following grounds:

- The local highway network of Bull Lane through the village of Eccles and its junction with Pilgrims Way is inadequate to accommodate the significant increase in Heavy Goods Vehicles without resulting in hazardous highway conditions for road users and pedestrians;
- The stated fall back position does not appear to be correct, as it is implied that the number of HGV movements will be in the same order as those predicted with the SRC. This indicates that the amount of sludge produced at Aylesford would be of similar order to the rest of West Kent. However, the existing and proposed sludge production tables on pages 18 & 19 show that the rest of West Kent deals with a greater proportion of sludge than Aylesford, not of a similar order;
- The increase in traffic movements will result in significant disturbance and harm to the residential amenity of the properties fronting onto Bull Lane;
- The proposed handling, storage and transportation of the digested sludge will result in odour nuisance unless an appropriate management plan can prevent the re-wetting of sludge and resultant production of ammonia;
- The development will result in the harmful impact on the quality of water through the discharge of water from the sludge recycling centre into the River Medway;
- The level of odour emissions should be assessed at the lower 10µgE/Cubic metre standard as this is a substantial new build, rather than relying on the 50µgE/Cubic metre standard for existing premises.

**Aylesford Parish Council:** Strongly objects to the project based on the current proposals for transport arrangements and the effect these would have on the village of Eccles. The Parish Council would wish to see the re-opening of the alternative rear access situated to the west of the site considered. The re-opening of this access could be considered in line with other site developments proposed by SCA. The expansion of the WWTW should not

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

be opened until the new Court Road, Burham By Pass is created in conjunction with the new proposed river crossing.

**Burham Parish Council:** If planning permission is granted road improvements are necessary at the junction of Bull Lane/Pilgrims Way, the sight lines in this particular area are very restricted due to the layout of the roads. A code of conduct for all vehicles entering and exiting the site if no other access route is available. Vehicles should obey a 20 mph speed limit down Bull Lane in Eccles

**English Nature:** no objection, subject to no development commencing until a detailed mitigation programme for slow worms following good practice guidance is submitted and agreed.

**Kent Wildlife Trust:** no objection subject to conditions securing the proposed mitigation and compensation measures detailed in the application.

**Environment Agency:** no objection subject to appropriate groundwater and contaminated land mitigation measures, the present discharge consent being complied with, and appropriate dewatering licenses being applied for.

**SEERA:** consider the proposal does not conflict with or prejudice the implementation of the current regional spatial strategy (RPG9) and the Government's Proposed changes to the Regional Waste Strategy.

**English Heritage:** advise the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.

**Divisional Transport Manager:** The Bull Lane/Pilgrims Way junction has a good safety record and tunnels under Bull lane are found to be stable. Following recent traffic calming improvements in Eccles, undertaken by Kent Highways, there has been requests for an additional central pedestrian island to be placed near to the recreation ground (adjacent to Alma Road), so as to help address community severance and give easier access to the school, church, shop and recreation ground. I understand that Southern Water is willing to enter an agreement to provide such a facility. Furthermore Southern Water is also willing to avoid traffic accessing its site to avoid school start and finish times which is to be welcomed. The footpath to the south of the village narrows and runs out on the eastern side at a point where pedestrian continuity transfers to the western side of Bull Lane. This crossing point represents the best place to cross on this section of road. Sight lines are adequate and there has been no history of crashes here in over 10 years. It is considered that for the section of footway that runs adjacent to the carriageway here on the eastern side, an improvement to the width of the footway and thereby to the safety of pedestrians, could be made simply by removing loose material that has accumulated at the back of the footway. This should be funded by the applicant and be undertaken at an early stage. The maximum number of HGV movements should be conditioned to 42 per day and permanent automatic



## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

traffic counters should be installed within the site access and data shared with the proposed community liaison group. The applicant has shown via the Transport Assessment (TA) that lorry movements are not prejudicial in terms of operational capacities to the junction of Bull Lane with the site access or the junction of Bull Lane with Pilgrims way. Appropriate visibility splays and right turning facilities are achievable subject to agreement with the Highway Authority. It is understood that whilst the construction phase is identified in the TA as a busy period, this does not conflict with the maximum HGV movement proposed above.

**Jacobs (noise, dust and odour):** no objection

**Jacobs (landscaping):** adverse effects generally slight hence no objection subject to appropriate planting and landscaping mitigation.

**PROW:** no objection

**KCC Biodiversity Officer:** no objection subject to mitigation strategy for reptiles and a biodiversity strategy being submitted, the employment of an ecological clerk of work and the avoidance of the bird breeding season.

**County Archaeologist:** no objection

#### **Local Member**

35. The Local Member, Mr Geoff Rowe was notified of the application on 15 December 2005. At the Members site visit Mr Rowe supported the local residents in objecting to the scheme.

#### **Publicity**

36. A neighbour notification exercise has been undertaken, the proposal advertised and several site notices posted in the surrounding areas. Approximately 544 letters of objection have been received (241 of which came via the local MP). The following points are made:

- The proposal will result in an unacceptable number of large vehicles transporting sewage through the village Eccles on roads which are totally unsuitable for any additional traffic, thereby increasing the risk of traffic congestion and accidents.
- There are usually cars parked along Bull Lane in the village reducing the width so that vehicles already have to stop and give way to each other., this proposal will only matters worse.
- The increase in traffic associated with the proposal will pass by the local schools and important play area resulting in dangerous road conditions for elderly, mothers with pushchairs and children.

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

- The footpath from Aylesford Eccles is dangerous and too narrow for a mother to walk with a pushchair and other children as it is regularly overgrown with weeds, brambles and nettles.
- The route through the village of Eccles is already used by HGV's accessing the Island site and vehicles using the existing sewage works with the result that two lorries cannot pass each other and often mount the kerb; and they often travel at high speed with no regard to other road users and pedestrians.
- The junction of Bull Lane and Pilgrims Way is already an accident blackspot; adding further traffic here can only make matters worst.
- There are alternative routes out of the sewage works site that could be used with little effect on the villagers of Eccles.
- The unbearable smell from the sewage works forces us to keep our windows closed during the summer months and an expansion of this facility can only make matters worst.
- The tunnels that run beneath Bull Lane are structurally unsound.
- The Friars at the bottom of Bull Lane hold many events throughout the year already generating a significant volume of traffic through Eccles.
- Pollution levels from the extra traffic would rise significantly to the detriment of the village.
- Other sites within Kent are more suitably located for a sludge treatment facility.

37. The local MP Jonathan Shaw supports the local residents' strong objections to the scheme.

### **Discussion**

38. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There is a significant policy emphasis on supporting the provision of improvements to the wastewater infrastructure. It is acknowledged that the water industry is required to meet the increasingly stringent standards for water quality and sludge treatment set out in European directives. However this cannot be at any cost. It is therefore necessary to consider, in accordance with safeguarding policies, the environmental and amenity impacts the proposed development may have upon the existing surroundings. The report will discuss the main impacts in the following paragraphs. Although this application did not require an Environmental Impact Assessment the Applicants did consider alternative sites as part of a regional study prepared to consider the potential alternative locations and options for a sludge treatment facility in this part of Kent. The supporting statement and environmental report (SSER) accompanying the planning application explains the choice of sites and treatment methods and I will start with an examination of these considerations.

## Item C1

# **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

### Alternatives Sites

39. The Aylesford sludge recycling scheme forms an integral part of Southern Water's Sludge Strategy for Kent which itself was prepared in the light of Government Guidance for sustainable waste management (PPS10) and of emerging regional spatial strategy and the County Council's own Waste Development Framework. PPS10 advises planning authorities that "the planned provision of new (waste management) capacity and its spatial distribution should be based on clear policy objectives, robust analysis of available data and information, and an appraisal of options and the application of sustainability appraisal". The methodology used to identify the preferred option for sludge treatment in Kent followed a similar approach and is set out in detail within the supporting statement and environmental report. The study is submitted to inform the planning application. The study looked at end use options, sludge treatment options and then further considered those options against objectives, such as use of resources, health impacts, traffic, feasibility and deliverability and so on.
40. Having identified a preferred option for treating the sludge this was then considered against a series of siting and locational criteria. The preliminary appraisal process identified 6 sites that were then considered in further detail, Aylesford, Ham Hill, Edenbridge, Tunbridge Wells North, Tunbridge Wells South and Bidborough. The SSER concludes that Aylesford is the optimum location. The other sites are either more remote, not technically feasible or would involve development that would be a major departure from the development plan. I am satisfied with this conclusion, however following Ham Hill being proposed by a number of residents in Eccles as a better location than Aylesford (largely because of its location adjoining the strategic highway network) the Applicants have revisited the selection process as far as it relates to this site. They have given significant attention to the existing uses, land availability, sensitivity of surrounding areas and the need to make provision for future expansion of the wastewater treatment facilities to meet future catchment growth. They conclude that to develop an SRC at Ham Hill would result in the need to relocate wastewater tankering, the development would have significant visual impact and there would then be no room for future growth. Ham Hill along with Tonbridge and Edenbridge Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW's) would still need to act as intermediate sludge recycling centres to dewater liquid sludge and hence reduce the volume before onward transfer to the main centralised sludge recycling centre. This by itself may result in the need for some additional facilities, irrespective of meeting growth in population within their own catchments.
41. Aylesford WWTW by contrast is the main works providing treatment for the Maidstone Urban Area and covers 15ha. Of all the WWTW's within the study area it produces by far the greatest volume of indigenous sludge (2,535 tds/y by 2015 compared to the next largest producer Ham Hill which would have an output of 1,465 tds/y). It is worth noting that even if the SRC were built somewhere other than Aylesford the liquid sludge arisings from its own catchment would need to be tankered away for treatment at the regional SRC. The flows of HGV traffic associated with this would be greater than those associated with this application

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

and could be generated without any planning control. I will discuss the traffic issues further later in my report.

42. I am satisfied that the Aylesford scheme was selected following a comprehensive and robust strategic assessment of sludge disposal, treatment and siting options. It should be remembered that the County Council has to consider the application in front of it not all the alternatives and therefore I shall now turn to consider the specific environmental issues arising from the proposed development at Aylesford.

#### Traffic

43. Members may recall that similar traffic concerns were also raised for a partly retrospective application submitted in 2003 for the infilling of storage lagoons using inert wastes on the nearby Island Site. This proposal also involved the use of Bull Lane through Eccles by HGV traffic. In considering this application (Ref TM/03/487), Members resolved to impose conditions restricting HGV movements to no more than 100 per day and the controlling of timing of these movements to a submitted code. As a consequence of this permission a vehicle monitoring group which was given a remit to review HGV movements in the area was established. This met several times in 2003 but has not met since the completion of infilling at the Island Site.
44. The SSER submitted with this application considers alternative proposals to access the site, across the Cemex quarry to Rochester Road and accessing the site from the north west utilising the private access track within the Island Site. It also considers the use of rail transport and river transport. It concludes that these alternatives are not viable or environmentally acceptable. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application concludes that the existing highway network has the capacity to accommodate the increase in vehicle movements and consequently it is proposed that the existing northern most access is used to enter and exit the application site. It is proposed that new passing bays be provided along the private access track which is shared with Cemex vehicles accessing the adjacent sand quarry. It is also proposed that the existing junction (and thus visibility) with Bull Lane is improved. The Divisional Transport Manager concurs with these conclusions.
45. As discussed above, the proposal would without doubt result in an increase in traffic accessing the public highway. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly the SRC would be a centralised treatment centre for the West Kent catchment and therefore imports into the site would increase. Secondly due to the increased volumes of sludge being taken into the site the volume of treated sludge cake for export to agricultural land would also increase thereby resulting in an increase in HGV traffic both to and from the site. This has been a significant area of concern for local residents, as evidenced by the earlier application for infilling on the Island Site, who do not consider that Bull Lane is adequate to accommodate this additional traffic and are concerned that the junction with Pilgrims Way is unsafe. The Divisional

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

Transport Manager has commented that the junction has a good safety record because drivers do approach with caution. Following further investigation he has also been able to confirm that the two tunnels beneath Bull Lane are both structurally sound.

46. I have had regard to the concerns of local residents and have asked the Applicants to give further consideration to traffic generation from the proposed scheme. As a result the Applicants have submitted an Operational HGV Traffic Regime, which looks at management of HGV movements. The traffic forecasts have now been further clarified and are now lower than those presented in the planning application. The planning application predicts an average of 32 visits (64 movements), with a maximum of 63 visits (126 movements). The operating regime estimates traffic to be, during normal operations, 17 visits (34 movements) during import only periods and 37 visits (74 movements) during import and export periods. The import and export periods is estimated to be for 12 periods within each year; the length of operations will depend upon agricultural demand for sludge and the distance from the SRC where the number of HGV visits may rise to 42 (84 movements). The main reason for the reduction is that Southern Water has agreed to divert liquid sludge imports to Ham Hill for dewatering, which greatly reduces their volume, before export to Aylesford SRC. It is proposed that HGV movements in and out of the works be restricted to 0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0700-1300 on Saturdays, although it is not anticipated that there will be any HGV movements associated with the SRC on Saturday mornings. Furthermore, no HGVs would leave the works or be accepted into it a quarter of an hour before and after school start and finish times in Eccles. The Applicant has also suggested that a liaison group for the Aylesford WWTW and SRC be established. These proposals are similar to the controls which were required by condition in the permission granted in May 2003 for the Island Site.
47. The Divisional Transport Manager comments that he welcomes the opportunity to establish a liaison group with particular regard to traffic monitoring but he considers that it would be appropriate to condition the upper limit of HGVs to 42 a day. He also considers that it would be appropriate to further secure a financial contribution towards pedestrian improvements along Bull Lane. These being a pedestrian traffic island near to the main pedestrian entrance to the recreation ground (adjacent to Alma Road) and some footway clearance and widening along part of Bull Lane.
48. It should be borne in mind that even if the SRC is not located at Aylesford the number of vehicle movements likely to be generated in association with the need to transport liquid sludge from Aylesford would be similar those generated as a result of this SRC proposal. This export of liquid sludge to another site would take place without any opportunity for any planning control. Locating the SRC at Aylesford presents the possibility to place restrictions on HGV movements, secure highway safety improvements and traffic management measures.
49. To summarise, whilst I appreciate the longstanding concerns of local residents to traffic using Bull Lane, the Divisional Transport Manager raises no objection subject to imposition of conditions on traffic movements and timing. If Members are minded to grant permission I

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

recommend that in addition, Southern Water be requested to re-establish a new Liaison Group to replace the vehicle monitoring group which met on several occasions in 2003.

#### Odour

50. The potential for odour nuisance from this site is not surprisingly another major concern amongst local residents and for the Borough Council. The closest residents at Corporation Cottages (former workers cottages on site) have also expressed concerns about odour. The SRC proposals would improve upon existing odour control within the works. It is proposed that an Odour Management Plan for the SRC would set stringent operating standards that would have to be met. Proposed mitigation measures seek to reduce odour emissions by a combination of best practice, best practicable means and use of appropriate technology. However Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council raise particular issues about odour emanating from re-wetted sludge and the odour compliance monitoring level that is proposed. The Applicants have clarified that in their experience re-wetted limed sludge is a potential source of ammonia odour but that re-wetted digested sludge is not and liming operations at the site would cease as a result of the proposed scheme. The Applicant's interpretation has been confirmed by DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) the authors of the 'Code of Practice on Odour Nuisance from Sewage Works. Jacobs the County Councils odour consultants raise no objections to the proposals and are satisfied with the odour monitoring standard and scope for the proposed odour management plan.

51. The applicants have responded to TMBC's comments that the level of odour emissions should be assessed at the lower 1 ouE/m<sup>3</sup> standard as the proposal is substantial new build and not at 5 ouE/m<sup>3</sup> as proposed. They dispute that this proposal represents a substantial new build and refer to other KCC decisions (including Ashford WWTW's in June 2006 and the Margate and Broadstairs schemes in January 2005) where the latter standard has been approved. Jacobs have confirmed that they accept that the standard proposed by the applicants is acceptable.

#### Ecology

52. The WWTW is considered to be of limited ecological value but some protected species have been identified at the site. The Applicant would be required by condition to submit a Code of Construction Practice which would include a commitment to:

- working in accordance with a badger licence from DEFRA;
- preparing a reptile mitigation strategy, which includes enhancing reptile habitat within the WWTW;
- employing an ecological clerk of works; and
- precautions to avoid disturbance to nesting birds.

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

English Nature has no objection to the proposals subject to the provision of a mitigation programme for slow worms following good practice guidance. Kent wildlife Trust has no objection in principle to the proposals subject to a condition securing the mitigation and compensation measures contained in the SSER.

53. There will be no significant impact, arising from the minor change to the WWTW discharge, on the Burham Marshes SSSI, which is 12km downstream of the WWTW and this would still be within the current discharge consent. The Environment Agency do not object to the proposals.

#### Landscape

54. The WWTW is located within a landscape of varying quality and was the subject of a landscape and visual assessment. The embankments formed by the adjacent mineral extraction works largely screen the SRC. The majority of these embankments are vegetated by scrub and trees, which is likely to develop over time. Additionally, it is proposed to extend a large internal vegetated mound which already helps to screen the site from external views. This mound would be increased in size by utilising suitable materials from structures currently on site which are to be demolished as part of a current asset management scheme. The enlarged bund will then be planted using appropriate species. These proposals would also have the added benefit of expanding the variety of planting and thus the diversity of species habitat. The County Council's landscape advisers is satisfied that the 'slight' adverse effects on countryside character could be mitigated through appropriate hedge planting and other landscape works; and the 'very slight' adverse visual impacts on residential properties and slight adverse visual impacts on public footpaths could be reduced through appropriate landscape works.

#### **Conclusion**

55. The existing sludge treatment facilities in Kent are insufficient to meet future needs resulting from more stringent standards and population growth. The Applicants in reviewing their Sludge Strategy for Kent have identified a need to extend treatment capacity and capability for both east and west Kent. 'Doing nothing' is not an option because it would lead to significant volumes of sludge either not being treated to the required standard for recycling to agricultural land, or not being treated at all. The Aylesford SRC is designed to deal with the increase in sludge arising in the West Kent catchments. This site has been chosen following a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of alternative treatment and location options.
56. There is considerable policy support for the provision of improvements to the wastewater infrastructure. It is acknowledged that the water industry is required to meet the increasingly

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

stringent standards for water quality and recycling of sludge set out in European directives. The need for the development is outlined above and given the policy support for such infrastructure improvements is considered in principle to be in accordance with the development plan. There is of course, always the potential for significant environmental impact resulting from such proposals and the choice of site. Following the presentation of Aylesford as the favoured location the SSER highlights that the physical redevelopment of Aylesford WWTW would be limited and that it would benefit from the re-use and modification of the existing sludge treatment units. The proposal also offers the opportunity to improve the access road and junction with the public highway as well as improving landscaping within the site and thus species diversity. Furthermore an odour management plan could be adopted for the SRC, incorporating an odour control regime where none presently exists of the same order as those likely to be generated by this proposal. I am satisfied that with appropriate mitigation as discussed above the proposed improvements are both necessary and acceptable and hence recommend that planning permission be granted.

#### **Recommendation**

57. I RECOMMEND that subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the highway safety improvements discussed in the report above (and any other matters appropriately covered by legal agreement) PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions covering amongst other matters, time limit, details of materials, hours of operation for vehicle movements, submission of traffic operating regime, submission of a code of construction practice, submission of an odour management plan, limits to the number of HGV's, avoidance of school start and finish times for visiting HGVs, mitigation measures for ecological interests and landscaping details.
58. I FURTHER RECOMMEND that Southern Water be requested to instigate the setting up of a community liaison group to involve representatives from the local community and Parish and District Council representatives.

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| Case Officer: Andrea Hopkins |
|------------------------------|

|              |
|--------------|
| 01622 221056 |
|--------------|

|  |
|--|
| Background Documents - see section heading |
|--|



## Item C1

# **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

### Appendix 1

#### **APPLICATION TM/05/4134 – PROPOSED EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE SLUDGE RECYCLING CENTRE AT AYLESFORD WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS, BULL LANE, AYLESFORD**

NOTES of a Planning Applications Committee Members' site meeting at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works on Tuesday, 21 March 2006.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr R E King (Chairman), Mr J A Davies, Mrs E Green, Mr G A Horne, Mr T A Maddison, Mr J I Muckle, Mr W V Newman, Mr A R Poole and Mr F Wood-Brignall. *Mr G Rowe was present as the Local Member.*

OFFICERS: Mrs A Hopkins and Mr M Hare (Planning); Mr T Drury (Kent Highways) and Mr A Tait (Democratic Services).

THE APPLICANT: Southern Water: Mr P Kent; Mr M Ayres (AD); Mr M Hendry and Mrs S Ellis (Adams Hendry)

OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES: Tonbridge and Malling BC: Cllrs Mrs C Ridsdill-Smith, D Davis, D Dalton; Mr A Hill (Planning); Aylesford PC: Cllrs Walrond, Leach, Stokes; Mr Flindell (Clerk)

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Mr R Kenway and Mr J Priddey.

ALSO PRESENT were three members of the public who had been invited by the Chairman to join the site inspection.

- (1) Prior to the meeting, Members met about 40 local residents outside the site gates. The Chairman thanked them for indicating the strength of feeling about the traffic implications of the application and invited them to send a few representatives to join the visit.
- (2) The Chairman opened the meeting by explaining that its purpose was for Members of the Committee to see the application site and listen to the views of those present.
- (3) Mrs Hopkins introduced the application by saying that Southern Water currently treated sludge so that it could be used as an agricultural soil conditioner. This

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

treatment took place on site at the Sludge Recycling Centre (SRC). As sludge treatment standards were now becoming more stringent, a number of Southern Water's facilities needed to be modernised.

- (4) Mrs Hopkins went on to say that it was intended that the existing West Kent sites at Ham Hill, Tonbridge and Edenbridge would continue as intermediate sites, before transporting sludge to Aylesford. The applicants had said that locating to Aylesford would involve the fewest number of vehicles of all the options available.
- (5) Mrs Hopkins then pointed out the location of the proposed sludge cake silo and additional treatment plant. She explained that after digestion and dewatering, the treated product would be transported to the cake storage bay for a period of 70 days. It would then be treated in the Waste Water Treatment Works with the purified liquid being discharged into the River Medway. The hours of operation at the site would be 7am to 6pm on weekdays and 7am to 1pm on Saturdays. The plant itself operated on a 24 hour basis, so access to the site might be needed outside these hours for maintenance or emergencies.
- (6) Mrs Hopkins continued by saying that construction was expected to take place over an 18 month period, including 15 weeks for commissioning. The hours of construction activity would be 7am to 7pm on weekdays and 7am to 1pm on Saturdays.
- (7) Mrs Hopkins then turned to the question of access. This was shared with Cemex. The proposal was to widen the access road and improve access onto Bull Lane. The proposal would generate 32 HGV visits (64 movements) per day, via Pilgrims Way and Bull Lane. There would be additional sludge tankers, sludge import trucks and sludge cake export vehicles.
- (8) Mrs Hopkins said that the Borough Council's Development Control Committee was due to meet in two day's time. The County's Biodiversity Officer had responded to consultation by asking for a detailed mitigation strategy for reptiles. He had also asked to see details on badgers, bat roosts and enhanced biodiversity. In addition, there had been a large number of representations from local residents and the local MP. These were principally concerned over the traffic impacts of the proposal.
- (9) Mr Kent from Southern Water said that the site had been chosen after a great deal of thought. It was the best possible site for the proposed operation.
- (10) Mrs Ellis (Adams Hendry) said that the operation currently generated 30 vehicle movements per day. The figure for vehicle movements given in the proposal took

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

these movements into account.

- (11) Mr Davies asked how many HGV movements took place daily along Bull Lane through Eccles. Mr Drury (Kent Highways) replied that he was not aware of the HGV figure but that the figure for all vehicles was 2,000 per day. He said that he would investigate what the overall figure for lorries was.
- (12) Mr Poole asked whether the sludge could be collected elsewhere. Mr Kent said that most of the sludge came from the sewer. It would not be economic to put in a pipeline for the quantities involved.
- (13) Mrs Hopkins said that the volume of sludge brought on site would be determined by condition. This amount could only be brought in along Bull Lane as the only possible alternative route through Aylesford Village was closed to vehicles of this size.
- (14) Mr Stokes (Aylesford PC) said that he was curious about the proposed hours of operation. Lorries were already travelling to the site, starting well before 6am, travelling down Bull Lane throughout the night. They were also working on Sundays.
- (15) Mr Kent said that, at present, there were no constraints on working arrangements at the site. Conditions on hours of working could only be imposed if permission were granted.
- (16) Mr Kent replied to a question by saying that Southern Water did not take water from the River Medway. Discharge into the river had Environment Agency consent.
- (17) Mr Couch (a local resident) suggested that another access route could be built between the villages of Burham and Eccles. He asked why Southern Water had not held discussions with the neighbouring landowners, Trent Hall with the aim of reducing traffic impact. This was particularly important as it was likely that the number of tankers entering and exiting the SCA Island site would also increase.
- (18) Mr Hill from Tonbridge and Malling BC said that his Council would be considering a report on this application in two day's time. Officers were recommending a strong objection on the grounds that the local highways network was inadequate to cope with the significant increase in HGVs; that there would be a harmful impact on residential amenity and properties arising from the additional traffic; that the handling, storage and transportation of the digested would result in odour nuisance unless an appropriate management plan could prevent the rewetting of sludge and resultant production of ammonia; and that air quality would deteriorate for the

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

residents of Corporation Cottages. He asked the Committee Members to note that the Environmental Statement did not cover the question of air pollution despite the flare stacks and boilers that formed part of the application.

- (19) Mr Leach (Aylesford PC) said that the application neglected the fact that it would result in serious concern arising from its major impact on the village. He said that a similar application had been refused in 1993 on the grounds of traffic impact. He was aware that the applicants had undertaken a survey that had not treated the road network as a significant matter.
- (20) Mr Walrond (Aylesford PC) said that the number of HGV movements proposed was 64, whereas it had been 126 in 1993. There was concern throughout the village that the number of such movements could eventually escalate beyond the figure initially conditioned.
- (21) Mrs Ridsdall-Smith (Tonbridge and Malling BC) said that a large number of coaches travelled to the Friars. It would be impossible for these coaches and HGVs to pass one another. She asked whether the applicants had consulted them on their proposals. Mr Kent confirmed that the Friars had been consulted on this question.
- (22) Mr Davies (Tonbridge and Malling BC) said that Bull Lane had seen a number of accidents as a result of its layout and narrowness. Furthermore, the Pilgrims Way dual carriageway to the north of Bull Lane was not in the best of condition. Vehicles could and had turned over. Whenever this happened, Burham, Wouldham and Eccles became cut off from the rest of the road network.
- (23) Mr Dalton (Tonbridge and Malling BC) asked Members to note a pending traffic calming scheme along Bull Lane to cope with its current traffic problems. This would be jointly funded by KCC and Tonbridge and Malling at a cost of £40k.
- (24) A resident from Bull Lane said that this road was not suitable even for the limited amount of traffic that used it at present. Only the previous week, a bus had digressed from the road onto the path. The proposed development represented a major construction for today's world. It needed to be served by a more modern road such as the dual carriageway that served Ham Hill. In the past, Bull Lane had been a cart track. Now it was being asked to cater for enormous vehicles without any significant improvements having ever been undertaken. This would only get worse as ever more houses were built, producing ever more sludge. He also believed that the stench from the development would represent a health hazard for the entire village. An alternative site needed to be found.

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

- (25) Another local resident questioned whether it would be feasible to maintain a code of conduct. She did not believe that it would be possible to stop HGVs mounting the kerb, as the drivers would simply not care whether they did so or not. She said that as the HGV drivers currently disobeyed the law by using mobile phones whilst driving, it was unlikely that they would conform to a code of conduct.
- (26) Mr Rowe (Local Member) said that no less than half a million people visited the Friars each year. The figure for HGV movements along Bull Lane could be found by reading through the report on the SCA application in 2004.
- (27) Mr Rowe went on to say that the local residents were concerned that the road infrastructure was not suitable for an increase in large tanker movements of up to 126 per day. This would equate to 5 per hour throughout the day if these movements were over 24 hours. If there was an 8 hour day, this figure would rise to 15 per hour (11 per hour if the movements were contained within the 7am to 6pm hours of operation). All in all, this would amount to 1 movement every 5 minutes. Such an increase would destroy the quality of life for Eccles residents and would also make Bull Lane unsafe. It would be impossible in places for one of these tankers to pass other vehicles (particularly large ones such as double decker busses. There was evidence, reported by residents that vehicles already had to mount kerbs and overrun the verges.
- (28) Mr Rowe then said that the people of Eccles were concerned that a tunnel under Bull Lane would not be able to sustain continuous use by HGV vehicles over a protracted period. There was a similar concern over a similar weakness at the western side of the entrance to Bull Lane/Rochester Road. These concerns would need to be investigated by the Planners.
- (29) Mr Rowe then turned to the question of odour emissions. He said that these were already intolerable at times and would be compounded by this extended operation. The extent of putrescent odour was such that people often had to leave their gardens and go inside. If approval was granted, odour nuisance would not only affect Burham and Eccles residents, it would also affect other areas over whichever routes the lorries took. Whilst he accepted that improved odour management measures might be brought in, this would need to be measured against greater productivity. He noted the views of the Borough Planners that there could be a health effect on the residents of Corporation Cottages due to reduction of air quality.
- (30) Mr Rowe also said that there were concerns about the robustness of nature conservation initiatives and added that the Borough Council had stressed the need to protect slow worms.

## Item C1

### **Expansion and improvement of Sludge Recycling Centre including improvements to the site access and access road at Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works, Bull Lane, Aylesford – TM/05/4134**

---

- (31) Mr Rowe concluded by saying that many of the local residents would like the opportunity to bring their local experiences to the attention of Members of the Planning Applications Committee and would like a public meeting in order to do so.
- (32) Mr Kent said that although the sludge dryer was not going to be changed (as was the case at Ashford), the application represented an opportunity to produce an odour management plan.
- (33) Mrs Ellis said that the application contained the introduction of a significant odour control system.
- (34) The Chairman thanked everyone for taking part in the meeting. The notes would be appended to the Head of Planning Application Group's report to the determining Committee meeting.

**Item C2****Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

A report by Head of Planning Applications Group to Planning Applications Committee on 12 September 2006.

TH/06/729 - Application by MPL Recycling for a waste recycling centre (retrospective) at Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate.

Recommendation: Permission be granted subject to conditions

Local Member: Mr. C. Hart and Mr. C. Wells

Unrestricted

**Site description**

1. The Westwood Industrial Estate is located east of Ramsgate Road (A254), approximately 2km south of central Margate, 3.2km west of Broadstairs, and 4km north west of Ramsgate. The A254 forms the main route between Ramsgate and Margate, linking in with the primary transport network serving the Isle of Thanet. Entry to the site is via the main access onto the industrial estate off Ramsgate Road, via Enterprise Road, and then along Channel Road, which services a number of units on the industrial estate.
2. The application site is located within a leased industrial unit that occupies part of a steel framed building on the southern boundary of the Westwood Industrial Estate. The existing building has a designated industrial land use as part of the estate. The application site consists of a unit and external space within the yard adjoining the building to the south east.
3. The nearest residential properties are located adjacent to the yard area, immediate beyond the south east boundary of the site, on Gordon Road. The façade of the nearest properties are located approximately 25 metres from the boundary of the yard. Please see attached site location plan.

**Background**

4. MPL Recycling began operating from the address in December 2004. An application to regularise the use of the site as a recycling centre/ transfer station was originally received by the Planning Applications Group in August 2005. However, there was insufficient information included within the application to allow the proposals to be formally considered. After further revisions the current application was received in May 2006 and forms a retrospective application for the use of the site.
5. The operator is registered with the Environment Agency as a waste carrier.

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---



**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

**The Proposal**

6. Planning permission is being sought for the regularisation of use of an industrial unit as a waste recycling centre and transfer station, with the continued use of the facility for a further 3 years. The operation consists of the collection, manual segregation, compaction and baling of inert waste (including cardboard and paper, glass, plastics, aluminium and steel cans) for bulk collection by waste carriers for reprocessing/recycling.
7. The application site is located on the Westwood Industrial Estate and includes a unit housed within a metal-framed building and part of the external yard space adjoining the building; the site area totals 694 m<sup>2</sup>. The external yard area is surfaced with unbroken tarmac with drainage to the estates sewage system. No new construction work would be required as part of the application.
8. The operation involves the collection of waste materials from businesses in the Thanet District by the operator, and the delivery of material to the site by members of the public. It is proposed that an average of 1,200 tonnes of material would be accepted at the site for processing per annum.
9. Access to the site is gained through the industrial estate from the A254 via Enterprise Road and Channel Road. The applicant estimates that there is an average of 140 vehicle movements into and out of the site per week. This equates to an average of 20 movements per day. The majority of these movements consist of private motor vehicles delivering waste. The applicant also operates a vehicle and trailer to collect waste from businesses around Thanet District. The application confirms that, in any one week, there is on average 2 Heavy Goods Vehicle movements to collect the baled material for transportation in bulk for recycling. These bulk collection vehicles have an approximate capacity of 25 tonnes, and collect individual types of material.
10. As the waste is received on site the material is deposited for segregation, compaction and baling within the building. Once processed and/or baled the material is then stored within the yard area for collection. The bales of material are stacked adjacent to the boundary fencing to a maximum height of 3.2 metres. The yard often contains storage cages and a large skip to store materials pending collection. The machinery used during the operation consists of a baler within the building and a forklift truck for movement of bulky materials into and out of the building.
11. The hours of operation proposed/ currently operated are 0730 to 2100 7 days a week for the segregation and processing of materials, and 0830 to 1700 weekdays, 0830 to 1300 on weekends and Public holidays for public access and collection. All bulk collections occur on weekdays between the hours of 0830 and 1700.

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

**Planning Policy & Other Material Planning Considerations**

12. **National Planning Policy** – the most relevant National Planning Policies are set out in PPS1, PPS10 and Waste Strategy 2000.

13. **Regional Planning Policy** – the most relevant Regional Planning Policies are set out in RPG9.

14. **Kent and Medway Structure Plan (2006)** – the most relevant Structure Plan Policies include:

- Policy SP1 - Conservation and Enhancing Kent's Environment
- Policy NR1 - Development and the Prudent Use of Resources
- Policy NR5 - Pollution Impacts
- Policy NR8 - Water Quality
- Policy WM1 - Integrated Waste Management
- Policy WM2 - Assessment Criteria for Waste Proposals
- Policy WM3 - Securing Waste Reduction

15. **Kent Waste Local Plan (1998)** – the most relevant plan policies include:

- Policy W1 - Provision for Waste Processing
- Policy W2 - Protecting Environmental Resources
- Policy W3 - Locational Criteria
- Policy W9 - Waste Separation and Transfer
- Policy W18 - Environmental Control
- Policy W19 - Protection of Surface and Groundwater
- Policy W22 - Road Traffic and Access
- Policy W26 - Hours of Working

16. **Isle of Thanet Local Plan (1998)** – Proposals Map. – the most relevant Local Plan Policies include:

- Policy SG7 - Renewable Energy and Recycling

17. **Thanet District Local Plan: Revised Deposit Draft (2003)** – Proposals Map – the most relevant Draft Local Plan Policies include:

- Policy EC11 - Retention of Employment Sites
- Policy EP1 - Potentially Polluting Development
- Policy EP6 - General Noise Control
- Policy EP13 - Groundwater Protection

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

**Consultations**

18. **Thanet District Council** – No comments received to date.

19. **Environment Agency** – No objection. Offers the following advise:

- The site overlies a major aquifer in terms of the Policy and Practice for the Protection of groundwater. Care should be taken to ensure that all fuels, oils and any other potentially contaminating materials should be stored so as to prevent accidental/unauthorised discharge to ground.
- All locations where waste is to be stored (including in skips, containers, etc.) or sorted should be sited on hard standing, impermeable areas that drain to foul sewer. All hard standing should be regularly maintained.

20. **Divisional Transportation Manager** – No objection. Comments as follows:

- Whilst the red line area is the subject of the application a significant part of the remainder of the yard area is used by the applicant and other traders to turn and manoeuvre vehicles. There is adequate room within the overall yard for this to take place. However, the outside storage is somewhat extensive and has the potential to grow and if not closely controlled might prevent large vehicles from turning.
- The traffic generation figures provided give no cause for concern.
- The current operation does not appear to be interfering with the public highway and is not causing any identified problems.

21. **Jacobs (Noise)** – No objection. Comments as follows:

- A noise survey was included as part of the application, this does not assess the impacts on nearest noise sensitive properties, but fulfils the employer's requirement under the Noise at Work Regulations 2005. For such a small-scale operation however, I do not think such a survey is entirely necessary. The site could work without affecting the amenity of the nearby residential properties with conditions in place to control noise emanating from the site.
- Should you wish to grant planning permission, I would like to see conditions attached to any permission granted that would:
  - Not allow evening working – or ensure the doors are kept closed during these hours;
  - Not allow work on Sundays or weekday night times;
  - Restrict times for vehicles arriving to collect/deliver waste; and
  - Restrict bottle recycling to undercover.

22. **Kent County Councils Waste Management Unit** – No objection. Comments as follows:

- 'The Waste Disposal Authority has a Statutory duty to seek provision for domestic waste disposal arising in Kent though clearly also has an interest in the provision by others for suitable facilities able to accommodate the local requirements of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs). These organisations contribute a key component to of the Kent waste stream and the provision of a more integrated infrastructure able

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

to accommodate their requirements is clearly required.

In principle therefore, the Waste Disposal Authority would welcome any additional handling or processing capacity for this category of waste, that would provide an increased choice, together with operational flexibility, a reduction in waste haulage in Kent, and the export of waste from Kent.'

**Representations**

23. The application has been publicised by a site notice and newspaper advertisement. 24 neighbouring properties were notified. A petition including approximately 22 signatures has been received. The objections raised relate to the following issues:-

- The proximity of the site to residential properties;
- The noise generated by the site, including vehicle movements and the smashing of glass;
- The timing of operations on site;
- Concern that the storage of paper on site will encourage vermin;
- The need for the site, given the area already has existing recycling facilities at the local Civic Amenity site, and three local recycling centres within the car parks of local B&Q, Tesco and Sainsbury stores.
- The retrospective nature of the application;

**Local Members**

24. The local County Members for Margate & Cliftonville Mr. C. Hart and Mr. C. Wells were notified of the application on 12 June 2006.

**Discussion**

25. In considering this proposal regard must be had to National guidance and the Development Plan, the most relevant policies are outlined in paragraphs 12 - 17 above. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act states that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Therefore, this proposal needs to be considered in the context of the Development Plan Policies, Government Guidance and other material planning considerations arising from consultation and publicity.

26. Prior to the publication of PPS 10 'Planning for Sustainable Waste Management' and associated changes to Waste Strategy 2000 in July 2005, Government advice (PPG10) required planning authorities to consider whether waste management proposals constituted the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO). The approach was designed to assist in establishing the optimum and most sustainable form of waste management for any given waste stream. PPS10 no longer requires such assessments and, instead, relies on locations and criteria included in Waste Development Frameworks being subjected to sustainability appraisals. However, since the existing Kent Waste Local Plan was not subject to a sustainability appraisal, I am of the opinion that consideration is still required as to whether applications for waste management development accord with the principles of BPEO

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

27. The guiding principles of BPEO are the concept of the waste hierarchy, the proximity principle and the objective of self-sufficiency. In addition, BPEO seeks the right form and scale of waste management for the given waste stream at the right time and location. Although the BPEO concept as it applies to strategic policy development is supported by guidance and is relatively well understood, its role in the assessment of specific locations for waste management facilities is less clear and is open to debate.
28. Recent case law (i.e. Derbyshire Waste Ltd) has established that a proposal does not have to be the BPEO (i.e. BPEO is not an overriding factor), however, whether or not the proposal is the BPEO has to be given “substantial weight” or be regarded as an “important consideration” in the decision-making process. The relative “weight” or “importance” to be attached will depend on the nature of other considerations.
29. Accordance with Development Plan policy and demonstration of BPEO can be assessed in relation to the following issues: need for the facilities; sources of waste and proximity principle; location; environmental and amenity impacts; access and routing; and the scale and intensity of the proposed development; amongst other matters.

**Need for the Facilities**

30. The comments set out in the views of the County’s Waste Management Unit above, recognise the impact of SMEs as waste producers, and their impact on the local waste streams. Whilst not responsible for the processing of waste materials produced commercially, the Waste Management Unit acknowledges the need to provide operations that are able to assist in the management of local waste streams produced by businesses. The operation accords with the principles of the waste hierarchy, actively encouraging the recycling of material.
31. The objections received from local residents, set out above, raise the question of the need for such a facility in the locality given the provision offered by the local Civic Amenity site and other various local collection points. I would advise that the primary operation proposed at the site is for the recycling and transfer of material collected from local business, a facility not offered by the Civic Amenity site. In my view the operation offers additional processing capacity for this category of waste, which would provide an increased choice, together with operational flexibility, and a reduction in waste haulage in this part of Kent.

**Sources of Waste and Proximity Principle**

32. The principle of recycling material receives strong support at national, regional and local levels as this allows the reuse of material that would otherwise take up capacity in landfill sites. Recycling material also reduces the pressure for the supply of new materials, in accordance with a sustainable approach to waste management. The practice of locally collecting and sorting waste for transfer to recycling facilities accords with the waste hierarchy and assists towards the objective of regional self-sufficiency.
33. The application documentation confirms that waste imported to the site is collected from local businesses, the majority of which are Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs), the recyclable waste being intercepted at the point where the material would potentially be sent to landfill. The waste sources handled by the application site are all collected from Thanet District, within a 6-mile radius of the facility, or delivered to the site by the

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

general public. The location of the Westwood Industrial Estate on the A254 centrally between Margate and Ramsgate means the distance travelled to the site is kept to a minimum. The bulk collections that occur, as required on a weekly basis, transfer the segregated materials to the appropriate recycling facility, the majority of which being located within the County. As such, in principle, I would advise that in my opinion the proposal accords with the objectives of the proximity principle, catering for local waste, and in doing so reducing the mileage traveled per tonne of material. Subject to consideration of location; environmental and amenity impacts; access and transport; scale and intensity below, I would advise the proposal accords with Kent Structure Plan Policies WM1 and WM2, and Kent Waste Local Plan Policy W1.

**Location**

34. Where recycling and waste transfer operations are proposed to be located in an urban area careful consideration of the proximity of any site to other uses needs to be considered. The Development Plan policies seek to protect the local environment from any potential adverse impacts of a use or development. The Kent Waste Local Plan Policies W3 and W9 set out that proposals which involve waste transfer at locations outside those identified on the proposals map will not be permitted unless they can gain ready access to primary and secondary access routes, and are either, located within an existing waste management facility or within an area of industrial use.
35. The application site is designated in the Thanet District Local Plan Deposit Draft (2003) Proposal Map as land allocated for employment uses. The proposal being located within an existing industrial estate, utilising an existing building and the infrastructure in place to service the estate. There are no other land designations in association with the site.
36. The location is bounded by residential properties, with the rear gardens of property on Gordon Road located directly adjacent to the south east boundary of the industrial estate, please see attached plan. Consequently careful consideration needs to be given to the activity proposed, within the context of the existing industrial uses at the site, to ensure that appropriate protection is afforded to the amenities of nearby residential property and other land uses. The key environmental and amenity points are considered below in paragraphs 38 to 57.
37. Although the site is designated for employment uses in the Thanet Local Plan, I would advise that I consider the proposed use accords with provisions of the Draft Thanet Local Policy EC11 in retaining an employment use on the site. Given that the site is located within an urban area on an existing industrial site and is not subject to any specific land designations, nor is it proximate to any sites of natural or historic interest, in principle, the use would not be considered inappropriate. Therefore, subject to the consideration of environmental and amenity impacts, access, scale and intensity below, I would advise the use proposed would accord with Kent Structure Plan Policy SP1, Kent Waste Local Plan Policies W2, W3, W9, and Draft Thanet Local Plan Policy EC11.

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

**Environmental and Amenity Impacts (noise, dust, odour and visual impact)****Noise**

38. The key consideration in relation to the use of the site as a waste transfer station would appear to be its proximity to neighbouring property and the potential for the use to impact of local amenities through noise, dust, odour and visual impact. Kent Structure Plan Policy NR5, Kent Waste Local Plan Policy W18, and Draft Thanet Local Plan Policies EP1 and EP6 seek to safeguard neighbouring land uses and amenity from potential environmental impacts, including noise.
39. Currently the site is operated under fairly lengthy hours of operation with segregation and baling activity taking place inside the building between the hours of 0730 and 2100 seven days a week. I would advise that carefully weighted consideration will need to be given to this issue, balancing, the noise generated by the proposed use in the context of the site, the surrounding uses comprise residential and light industrial, including a transportation company.
40. I would draw members attention to the objections raised by nearby residents on noise grounds detailed above, along with the comments from the County Councils noise consultants. The nearby residents raise concern over the noise generated day and night, specifically referencing lorry movements and shattering glass as potentially impacting on residential amenity.
41. Whilst it should be accepted that the noise of glass breaking is likely to be solely associated with the proposed waste transfer use. I would advise that the movement of lorries allied with the proposal is unlikely to cause a concern to nearby residents, given that the operation only generates on average 2 heavy goods vehicle movements per week, with these collections occurring between the hours of 0830 and 1700 weekdays only. The application details an average of 20 vehicle movements into/ out of the yard area per day. The majority of these are attributed to members of the public delivering materials to the site in private motor vehicles. Public access to the site for this purpose is restricted to 0830 to 1700 weekdays and 0830 to 1300 at the weekends.
42. Given the figures set out above, I would advise that the lorry movements referenced by residents are more likely to be in association with the adjoining land uses, and in particular a transportation company that occupies an adjacent industrial unit and parks vehicles in the yard. I would advise that this use comes under the authority of Thanet District Council, as the Local Planning Authority, and as such is beyond the scope of this proposal.
43. The application details the machinery used in association with the proposed activities as being an Orwak Baler used to compact segregated materials into bales 1200x900x800 mm in size within the industrial unit, and a forklift truck to move the bales into the yard for storage. Beyond this machinery and the vehicles accessing the site all other segregation is carried out by hand.
44. The County Councils noise consultants have advised on the potential impact of the operation on noise grounds given the scale and type of activity (please see comments above). They are advising that subject to conditions, including the control of operating hours, vehicle movements, and the operation of glass recycling on site, due to the small



**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

scale of the operation the site could continue to function without affecting the amenity of the nearby residential properties.

45. Overall I can appreciate the concerns raised by local residents in relation to the noise generated by the site, particularly with regard to the handling of glass. However, I would advise that the location forms part of an established industrial estate that generates a certain level of noise irrespective of the outcome of this application, and that were the proposal to be refused and the waste transfer operation removed from the site, there would be no restriction on the land owner to operate an appropriate industrial use in its place.
46. The baling machinery operated from within the industrial unit does not generate sufficient noise to cause concern to residential property. It would appear that it is the operations within the yard area and the movement of vehicles that have the most potential to cause concern. Given the comments of the County Councils noise consultants, I would recommend that conditions placing tighter operational controls on the site would safeguard against unacceptable noise levels.
47. Kent Waste Local Plan Policy W26 sets out standard hours of operation for waste management facilities, being between 0700 to 1800 Monday to Friday and 0700 to 1300 on Saturdays, advising that work outside these hours will be considered where operation factors justify greater flexibility.
48. The application sets out proposed hours of operation for collection and deposit of material as 0830 to 1700 weekdays and 0830 to 1300 on the weekend. In order to manage the level of material processed on site with the resources available the application proposes segregation activities are carried out between 0730 to 2100 weekdays and weekends as appropriate.
49. I would recommend that were the Committee minded to approve the scheme that the hours of operation for deliveries, collections and all work within the external yard space be restricted to 0830 to 1800 Monday to Friday and 0830 to 1300 on weekends. With operations to segregate materials outside the above hours, between 0730 to 0830 and 1800 to 2100 Monday to Friday and 1300 to 1800 on Saturday, continued within the industrial unit with the roller doors closed to insulate any noise generated by this activity, with no additional working on Sunday beyond the hours 0830 to 1300 referenced above. I acknowledge the comments set out by our noise consultants, however, in my opinion given the scale of operations at the site, Sunday operation between 0830 to 1300 is not likely to have an unacceptable impact on local amenities.
50. In addition to the above, I would advise the restriction of the delivery and all segregation of material, including material brought on site by the members of the public, to within the industrial unit. Glass segregation should be required to occur within the building as far from the doors as possible.

**Dust and Litter**

51. Dust can arise from stockpiles of materials, traffic movements and from the handling of waste. Being located within part of an industrial estate that cumulatively involves a large number of vehicle movements and activity, a certain amount of background dust and atmosphere emissions is to be expected. However, due to the nature of the materials

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

received on site and the type of processing undertaken, the proposed activities would not give rise to any additional dust generation beyond that to be expected in association with the use of the site as part of the industrial estate.

52. The proposed use has the potential to generate litter as a result of operations on site. The application documentation proposes the control of this through the use of enclosed cages and through regular house keeping. Whilst there is the potential to generate some litter in association with the use, I would advise that with careful site management it is not anticipated that this would be a problem.

**Odour**

53. The petition received pursuant to the application states a concern that the proposed operation has the potential to attract vermin to the area. Given that the only material accepted onto the site is semi inert including cardboard and paper, glass, plastics, aluminium and steel cans, I would advise that the proposal is unlikely to generate a problem in terms of odour generated or the attraction of vermin. No evidence of a problem was apparent during various officer visits to the site. This issue can be managed through the control of materials accepted on to the site to those detailed in the application. The materials being stored are not anticipated to give rise to an odour problem.

**Visual Impact**

54. The application proposes a change of use of an existing building within the Westwood Industrial Estate; the building at present is afforded planning permission for industrial use as part of the estate. No additional development work is being applied for as part of the application.
55. Material imported on to the site for processing is stored within the building. The only potential visual impact of the proposed use over the permitted industrial use of the site is the storage of processed materials in the yard pending collection. The application includes the provision of a container and cages for waste storage, along with the stacking of baled materials within the yard. The proposal states that this would not exceed 3.2 metres in height and is subject to continual through flow as the site is not of sufficient scale to allow the long term storage of materials.
56. The proposed use results in material being stored directly to the rear of the gardens of property on Gordon Road. However, I would advise that the boundary between the industrial estate and the residential property is substantial enough to screen the majority of the material.
57. As observed on various officer visits to the site, the material stored, has, at various times appeared to spread and build up. However, this I am sure is as a result of seasonal variations in the level of waste received and could be controlled through careful management and operation of the site. Should the Committee be minded to grant planning approval for the proposed use the operation of the outdoor space included in the application could be carefully controlled through conditions limiting type and height of operations taking place to the area specified in the application. I consider that given the existing industrial use of the site and the boundary treatment the potential for the proposal to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity in visual terms is limited.

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

**Access and Routing**

58. The proposed site enjoys access to the primary transport network via the A254, and is located within an industrial estate. The Divisional Transportation Manager has raised no objection to the scheme (please see the comments received above). The Divisional Transportation Manager advises that the traffic figures generated by the proposed use are not a cause for concern and that the operation does not appear to interfere with the use of the public highway.

59. The objections raised by nearby residents would appear to be in association with the potential noise generated by vehicle movements rather than the numbers associated with the use. I would therefore advise that the vehicle movements proposed are not considered to be significant, and that subject to the restriction of vehicle movements to the hours specified above I would not raise objection to this aspect of the proposal.

**Scale and Intensity**

60. The proposed use as a waste transfer station is on a relatively small scale, the average through put per annum being estimated at 1200 tonnes. The scale of operations at the site is controlled by the size of industrial unit and external space available. I would advise that whilst I do not consider the scale or intensity of use proposed to be out of keeping with the existing uses or the location, subject to the various conditions as advised, I would suggest the limitation of the overall through put for the site to prevent activities from exceeding capacity and potentially causing undue amenity impact.

**Protection of Water Resources**

61. The site over lies a major aquifer and as such the Environment Agency has advised that care should be taken to prevent accidental/ unauthorised discharge to ground. As advised by the Agency, I would confirm that the site is located on an existing hard standing drained to the estates foul sewer. Only semi inert waste is processed on site and there are no liquids, or other potential ground contaminates stored on site. Therefore, I would not raise an objection to this element of the proposed use.

**Conclusion**

62. The proposal is consistent with the strategy set out in the Kent Waste Local Plan under which land used or allocated for industrial purposes is a preferred location for waste transfer activities. The proposed use would provide increased local capacity for the processing of waste streams, being in accordance with the provisions of the waste hierarchy and the proximity principle. The continued use of the site as a waste transfer station is not considered to give rise to an unacceptable impact on residential property, subject to tighter controls on operations at the site. The use proposed is for a temporary period allowing the opportunity to review the situation over time. I am satisfied that, on balance, the application accords with National Waste Policies and the relevant Local Development Plan policies referred to in paragraphs 13 to 17 above. On this basis, and for the reasons set out above, I consider that the application represents the best practicable environmental option (BPEO) in this case, within the qualifications laid down within paragraphs 25 to 28.

**Retrospective application for a Recycling Centre. Unit J1C, Channel Road, Westwood Industrial Estate, Margate – TH/06/729**

---

63. I therefore consider that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions controlling operations on site, the sustainable benefits from the use outweigh any detrimental impacts the proposal may have and that planning permission should be granted.

**Recommendation**

64. I RECOMMEND that, SUBJECT TO any material and adverse comments received from Thanet District Council prior to the Committee meeting, PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO the imposition of conditions including: temporary change of use for a period of 3 years, the use being carried out in accordance with the submitted documents and plans, hours of operation, limitation of waste delivery and segregation to inside the industrial unit, no operations within the externally marked areas for storage and the roller doors to be closed outside specified hours, limitation of annual through put, limitation of the storage and height of waste within the redlined area, type of materials accepted, removal of all machinery and stored waste on the cessation of use.

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| Case Officer: James Bickle |
|----------------------------|

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| Tel. no. 01622 221068 |
|-----------------------|

|  |
|--|
| Background Documents: see section heading. |
|--|



This page is intentionally left blank

SECTION D  
DEVELOPMENT TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Background Documents - the deposited documents, views and representations received as referred to in the reports and included in the development proposal dossier for each case and also as might be additionally indicated.

## **Item D1**

### **Conversion and extension of redundant caretakers house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford– AS/06/1270**

A report by Head of Planning Applications Group to Planning Applications Committee on 12 September 2006.

Application submitted by Kent County Council Children, Families and Education & The Governors of The Towers School for the conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Faversham Road, Ashford. (Ref:AS/06/1270)

Recommendation: Permission be granted subject to conditions.

**Local Member(s): Mr C. Findlay**

**Classification: Unrestricted**

#### **Site**

1. The Towers School is located off Faversham Road, in northwest Ashford, to the north of the M20. Facing residential properties are located to the south of Faversham Road, and open fields bound the remainder of the site. The main school buildings are located towards the centre of the site and are a mix of mainly 1960's buildings, which are now outdated and in need of replacement or repair. Both pedestrians and vehicular traffic primarily access the Towers School off the Faversham Road. The site is virtually level, with car parking fronting the Faversham Road boundary. A Special Landscape Area is located to the east of the site. A site plan is attached.

#### **Proposal**

2. This application proposes the conversion and extension of the redundant caretaker's house at The Towers School, Ashford. The house has not been used as a caretaker's house for several years and has stood empty, being used only for storage. The extension to the caretaker's house is just one of many projects proposed to improve the schools facilities and bring them up to the standards required today. The proposed conversion and extension to the caretaker's house is to provide accommodation to house an Early Years nursery for use by both staff and the community as a whole. It is also intended that the facility would be used as a learning facility for sixth form students who are studying relevant courses on site.
3. Due to the fact that the building is not currently used, and that there is a lack of funding available to the school, alternative locations for the nursery were not considered. However, the location of the existing building provides an excellent position for a nursery as it is located away from the main school buildings, but in close proximity to vehicular access and car parking. The proposal includes the construction of four new playrooms for various year groups, two baby development rooms, a baby change facility, disabled WC, male and female WC's and a general office.

**Item D1**

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---



## **Item D1**

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---

**Item D1**

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---

### Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270

---

4. The proposed extension wraps itself around three sides of the existing two storey 1960's building. The extension would be single storey, constructed from a timber frame and clad in vertical timber boarding, with a flat roof. The applicant also intends to refurbish the internal decoration of the existing building, including new fire doors and electrics. This would bring the building up to the current required health and safety standards.
5. The Towers School and the 'Old Caretakers House' has, in recent years, had funding for replacement UPVC double glazing, and the applicant proposes to also use these windows in the new extension. The external appearance of the extension is proposed to match the existing house, and other buildings on the school site. The windows would be white, and the timber cladding stained to match. The house also benefits from its own contained garden, which would be modified to provide an area for safe supervised play during fine weather.
6. With regards to sustainable design, the applicant advises that the new extension would utilise timber framing and cladding, along with high levels of insulation, thereby minimising carbon emissions. High quality double-glazing would be incorporated in an effort to reduce solar gain and provide thermal insulation. Wherever possible, natural lighting and ventilation would be made use of. In addition, the proposed design has been produced in line with BS8300 and the applicant has worked closely with Kent County Council's Access Officer to ensure that the existing building and extension would be accessible to all.
7. The applicant advises that there would be a maximum of six members of staff employed by the nursery, which includes a nursery manager. The number of children attending the nursery would determine how many of the six staff would be required for each session. There would be three session times, which the applicant currently anticipates to be 8am to 12pm, 1pm to 6pm and an all day session between 8am and 6pm. The applicant advises that these times have been chosen in order to avoid the drop off and pick up times of the Towers School, which are 8.30-9am and 3.15-3.45pm. The nursery would be registered for 6 babies, 8 toddlers and 16 three to five year olds. The applicant states that the School has ample parking on site and that the School would, with the aid of signage, reserve 5 existing parking bays adjacent to the nursery for the use by parents for pick-up and drop-off.

*Reduced copies of the submitted drawings showing the site layout, elevations, and access are attached.*

### Planning Policy

8. The Development Plan Policies summarised below are relevant to the consideration of the application:
  - (i) The Adopted 2006 **Kent & Medway Structure Plan**:
    - Policy SP1** - Conserving and enhancing Kent's environment and ensuring a sustainable pattern of development.
    - Policy QL1** – Seeks to conserve and enhance the environment through the quality of development and design.

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---

**Policy E5** - The primary objective of Special Landscape Areas will be the long term protection and enhancement of the quality of the landscape whilst having regard to their economic and social well being.

**Policy QL12** -Community Services, including schools and education provision, will be provided as long as there is a demonstrable need for them.

**Policy TP19** - Development proposals must comply with the respective vehicle parking policies and standards adopted by Kent County Council and Medway Council.

(ii) The adopted 2000 **Ashford Borough Local Plan**:

**Policy DP1** - Requires development to be well thought out in design terms in relation to their scale, density, height, massing, landscape, access and detailing.

**Policy DP2** - New development must be designed in a way which respects the character and appearance of the area around it, particularly where this has a special character, and respect the ability of neighbours to enjoy reasonable levels of privacy, peace and quiet and natural light. The local transport system must be capable of properly serving the development proposed.

**Policy CF15** -Proposals to provide for an increased range of community uses will be permitted subject to meeting the criteria in Policy DP2.

**Policy CF20** -Proposals for nurseries, in either new or converted buildings, will be permitted if there would be no significant effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, there would be no significant traffic flow or highway safety problems arising as a result of vehicle movements to and from the site, and adequate parking is provided for staff, and the property is within a town or village, or at an existing school.

**Policy EN2** - Development proposals in or close to residential areas which are likely to damage significantly people's enjoyment of their homes will not be permitted.

**Policy EN27** -Long term protection will be given to Special Landscape Areas and other important landscape features.

**Policy TP11**- Parking for vehicles should be provided in accordance with Kent County Council's Vehicle Parking Standards and with regard to specific factors including the needs of people with disabilities and those with children.

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---

**Consultations**

9. **Ashford Borough Council:** raises no objection subject to the imposition of conditions covering the standard time limit for works to commence and to ensure that the proposed materials match those of the existing building.

**The Divisional Transport Manager:** raises no objection to the proposal.

**Local Member**

10. The local County Member, Mr C. Findlay, was notified of the application on the 11 July 2006.

**Publicity**

11. The application was publicised by the posting of a site notice and the individual notification of 5 nearby properties.

**Representations**

12. 2 letters of representation have been received to date. The main comments/points of concern and objection can be summarised as follows:
- The proposal would result in an increase in traffic movement on an already congested road, especially at peak times.
  - There are insufficient car parking spaces on site already, and the site access is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass.
  - New housing developments in the area will also add to the traffic on Faversham Road.
  - Where are parents of the nursery children going to park whilst they are dropping off their children?
  - A local bus route has been changed and now runs along Faversham Road, causing even more congestion.

**Discussion**

13. In considering this proposal regard must be had to the Development Plan policies outlined in paragraph (8) above. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act states that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Therefore, this proposal needs to be considered in the context of the Development Plan Policies, Government Guidance and other material planning considerations arising from consultation and publicity. The issue of particular relevance in this instance is whether or not this proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the local highway network.

Siting and Design

14. The design of the building must be considered in conjunction with its scale, massing and siting. The proposed extension wraps itself around three sides of an existing two-storey 1960's caretakers house. The new extension would be single storey, with a flat roof, and its external appearance would match that of the existing building in terms of design and external materials. The original house would also be refurbished internally in order to bring the structure up to the current required health and safety standards. The extension

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---

has been designed in order to minimise solar gain, maximise thermal insulation and wherever possible use natural lighting and ventilation. The extension would be constructed using timber framing and cladding, along with high levels of insulation, thereby minimising carbon emissions. In addition, by using an existing building, which is currently empty and used only for storage, the impact upon the local environment is minimised.

15. The applicant states that the location of the existing building provides an excellent position for the nursery as it is located away from the main school buildings but within close proximity to vehicular access and parking. The siting of the proposed extension does not impact upon facing properties in Faversham Road, or the frontage of the school, and is considered the most appropriate given the context of the site and the provision of an existing vacant property. In addition, the proposed extension has been designed to visually fit with the existing buildings without being a simple pastiche. Therefore, I consider that the siting, design and massing of the extension are acceptable and conform with the general thrust of Local Development Plan Policies.

#### Highways

16. Traffic generation and impact upon the local highway network are the primary concerns expressed by local residents. First, concern is raised over the width of the school access road. Local residents state that the access is too narrow which means that cars entering the site have to wait for cars exiting the site to clear the entrance, leading to queues on the main road. Kent Highways raise no objection to this proposal, and state that the proposed use is appropriate as an ancillary usage within the curtilage of the school. The applicant states that the access into the school is 4.8 metres in width, which is more than adequate for 2 vehicles to pass with ease. In addition to this, the session times for the nursery have been deliberately chosen so as not to clash with the peak traffic times associated with the school. This will further mitigate any impact that the nursery may have on local traffic congestion.
17. Concern has been expressed by neighbouring residents that there is insufficient car parking available on site. The applicant states that the nursery would be situated between two car parks, but significantly far away from either to prevent safety concerns or congestion issues. The nursery would be accessed throughout the day by parents dropping off or picking up their children as necessary, who would be able to park in one of the many spaces already available in the car parks either side of the nursery. In addition, 5 existing car parking bays would be reserved for the sole purpose of pick up and drop off associated with the nursery. A maximum of 6 members of staff would be employed by the nursery, all of which could park within the school grounds.
18. Local residents also express concern over an increase in traffic on Faversham Road, as a result of not only this application, but by housing developments which have been granted planning permission by Ashford Borough Council. However, Kent Highways advise that Faversham Road can accommodate the increase in traffic associated with this development. In addition, the granting of planning permission for other developments in the locality is beyond the remit of this planning application and therefore can not be considered in the determination of this application. Concern is also expressed over the Ulley Road/Grosvenor Road crossroads, which a local resident states is extremely dangerous. The applicant states that the crossroads are 90 metres away from the school access point and, although it is recognised that this crossroads is difficult to exit from due to the acute angle that the side roads approach Faversham Road, the design of an existing junction is again beyond the remit of this planning application.

**Conversion and extension of redundant caretaker's house to nursery at The Towers School, Ashford – AS/06/1270**

---

19. This proposal would generate additional traffic due to an intensification of use of the Towers School site. However, Kent Highways raise no objection to this application, and the applicant has confidently stated that there is sufficient car parking on site to accommodate staff and visitors associated with the nursery. Therefore, I am of the opinion that this application would not have a significantly adverse impact upon the local highway network. In addition, should Members be minded to permit, conditions would be imposed to ensure that construction traffic would not access/egress the site at peak school times, and that mud and debris would not be deposited on the local highway.

**Conclusion**

20. In summary, I consider that the siting and design of the proposed extension would not have a significant detrimental effect on the amenity of local residents, and that the local highway network can accommodate any increase in traffic generated as a result of this application. Subject to the imposition of conditions, I am of the opinion that the proposed development would not give rise to any material harm and is otherwise in accordance with the relevant Development Plan Policies. Therefore, I recommend that permission be granted subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

**Recommendation**

21. I RECOMMEND that PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO conditions, including conditions covering:

- the standard time limit,
- the development to be carried out in accordance with the permitted details,
- external materials to be submitted for approval,
- hours of working during construction,
- prevention of mud being deposited on the highway,

|                           |              |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Case officer – Mary Green | 01622 221066 |
|---------------------------|--------------|

|  |
|--|
| Background documents - See section heading |
|--|

This page is intentionally left blank



**Item D2****Retrospective amendment to re-location of playground at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury.**

A report by Head of Planning Applications Group to Planning Applications Committee on 12 September 2006.

Application by Kent County Council Children Families and Education and the Governors of Pilgrims Way Primary School for retrospective amendment to the relocation of playground at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Pilgrims Way, Canterbury. (Ref: CA/06/554)

Recommendation: Permission be granted subject to conditions.

Local Member(s): Mr Michael Northey

Classification: Unrestricted

**Site**

1. Pilgrims Way Primary School is located to the east of Canterbury City centre, on Pilgrims Way, a residential road. The site is accessed through a narrow entrance between two residential dwellings, which leads to a car parking area. The main school building is located to the north east of the site, a playground to the west, with playing fields extending to the south behind the school buildings. Planning permission was granted on the 28 June 2006 for the erection of a nursery upon the existing playground, and the relocation of the playground to the south of the school buildings onto an area of school playing field. The site is bound by residential properties to the north, east and south, with private allotment gardens adjoining the western boundary. A site plan is attached.

**Background**

2. Planning permission has been granted for the erection of a nursery on an existing area of playground to the front of the school site. Due to the loss of playground space, it is proposed to create additional playground to the south of the site, upon the existing playing fields. When the application was originally submitted, the relocated playground was proposed to the west of the playing fields, adjacent to the private allotment gardens. As this location did not impact upon neighbouring properties, neighbouring residents were not notified at this time. This proposed location met with objection from Sport England as the playground was proposed upon an existing sports pitch. The applicant amended the positioning of the playground to ensure that the sports pitch would be unaffected. An amended plan was sent to consultation with Sport England only, who subsequently removed their objection. Planning permission was granted under delegated powers on the 28 June 2006.

**Proposal**

3. This amendment has been submitted by Kent County Council Education & Libraries and the Governors of Pilgrims Way Primary School and proposes a retrospective amendment to the relocation of the playground at Pilgrims Way School, Canterbury. When planning permission was granted, the positioning of the relocated playground was at the centre of the playing field, running in a strip from north to south, extending to the rear boundary of the school. This essentially cut the remaining playing field into two and, in addition, was not an ideal location operationally, as it was not in close proximity to existing outdoor hard play areas.

**Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at  
Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

**Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at  
Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

**Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

4. When works commenced on site the playground was constructed to the south-eastern boundary of the school site. The applicant advises that both the locations previously considered for the relocated playground, including that as approved, impacted upon playing field provision, and impeded the carrying out of activities on the school field. In addition, the position as now proposed relates well to the adjacent existing playground to the rear of the school, thus facilitating ease of access and effective supervision by staff.
5. In determining the best alternative site for the playground, all of the above factors were taken into account. In addition, the applicant states that they considered the location of the playground in relation to properties on Mount Road. First, there is a level difference between the back gardens of those properties and the school of approximately 1.5 metres. The applicant states that the boundary treatment also provides solidity, in that there is a 1.8 metre high close-boarded fence along parts of the boundary with properties of Mount Road. This affords a level of security, and both physical and visual separation, which is considered by the applicant to be acceptable. The bank between the playground and the boundary of gardens on Mount Road is also heavily vegetated, aiding in screening the proposed playground.
6. Although regrettable that this amendment was made retrospectively, the School has stated that operationally they would not be able to run without the new playground and, therefore, works must be completed by the start of the Autumn Term in September. The existing junior play area is to be lost as the approved nursery is to be built upon this site and, therefore, alternative playground must be provided. The School states that it would not be safe to have heavy machinery on site when pupils return in September. Lunchtimes at the school are already staggered due to a lack of play space and concern is expressed that, should the playground not be completed by the 6 September, the school would have to remain closed awaiting its completion.

*Reduced copies of the submitted drawings showing the site layout, elevations and floor plans are attached.*

**Planning Policy**

7. The Development Plan Policies summarised below are relevant to the consideration of the application:
  - (i) **The Kent & Medway Structure Plan: Adopted 2006:**
    - Policy SP1** - Conserving and enhancing Kent's environment and ensuring a sustainable pattern of development.
    - Policy QL1** – Seeks to conserve and enhance the environment through the quality of development and design.
    - Policy QL12**- Community Services, including schools and education provision, will be provided as long as there is a demonstrable need for them.

**Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

(ii) The adopted (1998) **Canterbury District Local Plan:**

**Policy D1** - The City Council will permit development of high standard of design which:

- a) is sympathetic to the appearance and character of the surrounding area and appropriate in scale, density, mass, appearance, materials layout and siting, having regard to the adjoining buildings, spaces and views;
  - b) avoids the loss of important open areas, and natural and built features which it is considered desirable to retain
  - c) has a safe means of access and adequate car parking;
  - d) avoids placing an undue burden on existing infrastructure, services and the local road network;
  - e) avoids unduly interfering, disturbing or conflicting with adjoining uses
- [.....]

**Policy D39** - Proposals for development which would result in the loss, in whole or in part, of playing fields will only be permitted if:

- a) there is an overriding need for the proposed development which outweighs the loss of the playing fields; or,
  - b) sports and recreation facilities can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; and,
  - c) an alternative open space is provided of an equivalent amenity and leisure standard in the locality;
- [.....]

**Policy D58** - The City Council will only give permission for development proposals where it is satisfied that any necessary transport improvements, arising wholly or substantially from that development, are in place or guaranteed to be provided, whether on or off-site.

(iii) First review deposit draft (2001-2011) **Canterbury District Local Plan**

**Policy BE1** – The City Council will permit proposals of high quality design. When considering any application for development the Council will have regard to the following considerations:

- a) The environmental, sustainability and visual impact;
- [.....]
- e) The local townscape character
  - f) The form of the development: the efficient use of land, layout, landscape, density and mix, scale, materials and architectural details
  - g) Safety and security
  - h) The privacy and amenity of the existing environment
  - i) The compatibility of the use with adjacent uses
  - j) The need to keep the building in use and fit for purpose

**Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

**Policy C21** - Proposals for development which would result in the loss, in whole or in part, of playing fields will only be permitted if:

- a) the site has first been considered for other recreational/amenity uses in the wider community, particularly where the site provides strong visual amenity,
  - b) there is an overriding need for the proposed development which outweighs the loss of the playing fields; or,
  - c) sports and recreation facilities can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; and,
  - d) an alternative open space is provided of an equivalent amenity and leisure standard in the locality;
- [.....]

**Consultations**

8. **Canterbury City Council:** comments as follows:

‘The playground has been constructed against the south eastern boundary of the school, to the immediate rear of properties in Mount Road, in a location which is potentially liable to result in a significant increase in noise and nuisance to those neighbouring residents.

I would suggest that if that location is to be retained it should be on the basis that measures are taken to minimise cross boundary noise and disturbance and that presumably means constructing some kind of noise attenuative feature such as a wall close to the noise source, with landscaping to the boundary to screen the wall. Landscaping on its own will not be adequate to ameliorate noise. As the noise source will now be 45m closer to the houses in Churchill Road perhaps you would also like to think about improving noise screening in that direction as well.’

**Local Member**

9. The local County Member, Mr M. Northey, was notified of the original application on the 18 April 2006.

**Publicity**

10. The amendment was publicised by the individual notification of 7 nearby properties.

**Representations**

11. To date 5 letters of representation have been received from neighbouring properties. The main comments/points of concern and objection can be summarised as follows:

- The day after the school broke up for the summer, contractors moved in and dug up a large area of the green playing field. This was before planning permission had been granted.
- Local residents were unaware that this was going to happen and, therefore, were unable to make comments. Residents had not been informed of any development at Pilgrims Way School.
- The school will lose a large area of green playing field, used for various outdoor sporting activities.
- A large area of playground will be located in close proximity to residential properties.

## **Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

- Habitable rooms will overlook this area.
- Can the playground not be constructed to the right hand side of the playing field, away from residential properties, or in a more considered position?
- Residents will now be bombarded with children's activities winter and summer, creating noise, disturbance, loss of privacy and nuisance.
- The school and its grounds are regularly used for out of school hours activities, and youths often access the site illegally to play football.
- Large trees and a pond are located within close proximity of the playground areas, posing safety risks.
- Children play on the bank at the moment, this situation will now worsen.
- Open views from the rear of properties will be lost.
- Maintenance of the boundary/bank has only been carried out at the request of neighbouring residents.
- A neighbour was concerned that a building was to be erected on this site and objected on these grounds.
- Residents state that they could not view the plans at Canterbury City Council Offices.
- It is requested that a site meeting be held to discuss the application.

### **Discussion**

12. In considering this proposal regard must be had to the Development Plan policies outlined in paragraph (7) above. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act states that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Therefore, this proposal needs to be considered in the context of the Development Plan Policies, Government Guidance and other material planning considerations arising from consultation and publicity. Issues of particular relevance include impact upon residential and local amenity, and possible effects on the local environment, particularly the loss of playing field.

### **Siting**

13. It has been suggested that the site chosen for the development is not appropriate and that other sites within the school grounds would be more suitable. However, the applicant has advised that this is the only site available which meets the School's requirement to have the proposed playground located in close proximity to existing hard play areas. The linking of the existing and relocated play areas not only works operationally, but facilitates the effective management of the pupils by staff during break/lunch times. The existing playground could not be extended to the northwest due to changes in site levels, and the fact that a number of trees would need to have been removed to accommodate the playground. Therefore, the location the playground has been relocated to, to the south of the existing playground, is the most appropriate site with regards to proximity to existing hard play areas.
14. In addition, the applicant advises that the site upon which the playground has been constructed is the only site that does not impact significantly upon playing field provision. The original proposed location met with objection from Sport England on the grounds that it would have affected the provision of the football pitch. Although the approved positioning did not meet with objection from Sport England, it would effectively cut the playing field into two sections. This would impede the use of the field for other sporting activities, and would have led to a large section of the field becoming redundant. By

## **Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

relocating the playground to the southeastern boundary of the school most of the usable playing field remains unaffected.

15. The proposed siting of the relocated playground is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its proximity to existing hard play areas, and its impact upon playing field provision. However, the siting of the play ground, along the south eastern boundary of the school, does impact upon neighbouring properties in Mount Road and, to a lesser degree, properties in Churchill Road. Therefore, the impact of this retrospective amendment on residential amenity needs to be considered in the determination of this amendment.

### **Residential Amenity**

16. Concern is raised over the proximity of the playground to the boundary, and the impact this would have on residential amenity including overlooking, loss of privacy and the generation of noise. The playground would be sited on an area of open playing field, already used as an outdoor recreational space. However, by providing a hard surface the area could also be used in inclement weather and, therefore, the intensity of use of this area of the school site would increase. Use would still be limited to school hours, and more specifically to lunch and break times, meaning that any impacts upon neighbouring properties would be concentrated to a limited number of hours per day.
17. However, outdoor play, by its very nature, generates noise. Although the playground would be located adjacent to an existing playground, and on an area of existing playing field, noise levels would increase as a result of the playground relocation. As stated by the applicant, there is an approximate 1.5 metre fall from the boundary at the rear of properties in Mount Road and the playground level, aiding in the mitigation of additional noise. In addition, the boundary is heavily vegetated, again mitigating the impacts of the development. The applicant has stated that additional planting on the embankment would be provided as a result of the playground extension, and should Members be minded to permit, a landscaping scheme would be required under condition. Additional planting would also be required to the south of the playground in an effort to break up the visual impact of the development from properties in Churchill Road. However, Canterbury City Council requests that, should this location be retained, it should be on the basis that measures are taken to minimise cross boundary noise and disturbance and that presumably means constructing some kind of noise attenuative feature, such as a wall, close to the noise source, with landscaping to the boundary to screen the wall.
18. The provision of a close-boarded fence, or a wall, between the boundary of the properties in Mount Road and the playground has been considered by both the applicant and myself. However, residents do not only express concern over the generation of noise, but also the loss of views over the open playing fields. Therefore, should a wall or close-boarded fence be erected, objection may be raised from some neighbouring residents. The applicant has written directly to the residents who have made representations over this retrospective amendment, and has offered to erect a close boarded fence at the rear of the properties which request that work to be done, at the cost of the applicant. I feel that this is an adequate compromise, which would meet the requirements of all neighbours, and is therefore the most appropriate form of action to take in this instance.
19. In addition to this, the applicant has agreed to reduce the area of the playground, which in turn facilitates the removal of a strip of playground that would have run parallel to the boundary with properties in Mount Road. This reduction would move the playground a



**Erection of Nursery and Creation of External Play Area at Pilgrims Way Primary School, Canterbury**

---

further 2 metres away from the boundary, increasing the distance between the boundary of the closest residential property and the edge of the playground to over 11 metres. I therefore consider, by virtue of the distance from the boundary, the provision of existing and additional planting, and the erection of fencing where required, that the relocation of the playground to this site would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon residential amenity in terms of noise generation.

20. However, concern is expressed that pupils would climb the bank and look into neighbouring gardens, impacting upon the privacy of neighbouring residents. This issue is an existing cause of nuisance and concern for neighbouring residents, and it is vital that these existing problems are not exacerbated by the relocation of the playground. In an effort to address this issue, the applicant has proposed to erect a low-level wooden paling fence around the playground, which would prevent pupils from accessing the bank. The fencing would also restrict access to the school pond, alleviating the safety concerns raised by local residents. A gate would be located within this fence to allow access for maintenance personnel only. The provision of a low-level fence would effectively control access to the embankment, which, in essence, would improve the current situation as at present access to the embankment is not restricted. Therefore, subject to a condition requiring the provision of a low-level wooden fence to the perimeter of the playground, I am satisfied that the retrospective relocation of the playground would not impact upon the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents.

21. The applicant has considered the issues raised in response to consultation on this retrospective amendment, and has made an effort to address them all. The impact upon amenity of local residents has been reduced, and issues of overlooking, loss of privacy and the generation of noise have all been addressed. The need for this development has been detailed in paragraph 6 of this report and, although regrettable that the amendment was submitted retrospectively, reasoning for this has been given.

**Conclusion**

22. Overall, I consider that this proposal would not have a significantly detrimental effect on the amenity of local residents, should Members be minded to permit, subject to the conditions outlined below. In my view it would not give rise to any significant material harm and is in accordance with the general thrust of relevant Development Plan Policies. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that the conclusion should be made otherwise. However, I recommend that various conditions be placed on any planning permission, including those outlined below.

**Recommendation**

23. I RECOMMEND that PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO conditions, including conditions covering:

- the standard time limit,
- the development to be carried out in accordance with the permitted details,
- a scheme of landscaping, its implementation and maintenance, to include the provision of boundary fencing where required by neighbouring properties, to be submitted,
- the provision of low level timber fencing to the perimeter of the playground,
- hours of working during construction,

|                           |              |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Case officer – Mary Green | 01622 221066 |
|---------------------------|--------------|

|  |
|--|
| Background documents - See section heading |
|--|

This page is intentionally left blank

**E1 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS AND DETAILS PURSUANT PERMITTED/APPROVED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS - MEMBERS' INFORMATION**

Since the last meeting of the Committee, the following matters have been determined by me under delegated powers:-

**Background Documents** - The deposited documents.

- DO/06/419 Use of former refuse destructor shed by Dover District Council for the bulking up of dry recyclable material collected by kerbside collection. County Council, Household Waste and Recycling Centre, Richborough, Ramsgate Road, Sandwich.
- AS/01/677/MR7/R12B Variation of condition (12) of planning permission AS/01/677 to allow a temporary variation of working hours until 31 August 2006. Crundale Lime Works, Crundale, Canterbury, Kent.
- SW/05/353/R2, 4 & 10 Details pursuant to details 2, 4 and 10 of planning permission SW/05/353 being landscaping details (Condition 2), details of external lighting (Condition 4) and sewerage details (Condition 10). Plot D9 (3), Symmonds Drive, Eurolink, Sittingbourne, Kent.
- TM/04/2028/R10 Reserved matters – Drainage details pursuant to Condition (10) of planning permission TM/04/2028. Workhouse Quarry, Workhouse Road, Ryarsh, West Malling.
- MA/87/114/R11 & R32 Reserved matters – Request for modifications to working and restoration scheme and progressive restoration pursuant to Conditions 4 and 11 and additional proposals in respect of archaeology pursuant to Condition 32 of Planning Permission MA/87/114 – Shepherds Farm Quarry, Lenham Heath.
- CA/06/523 Certificate of lawful use or development - The sorting, separation and re-use of inert and semi-inert waste materials with associated storage, plant machinery and parking. Land at Kemberland, Fox Hill, Sturry.
- TH/06/730 Application for the storage, sorting, processing and transfer of waste. Manston Road Depot, Manston Road, Margate.
- DO/06/636 Underground sewer modification (retention tank) to provide storm flow storage to prevent flooding; modification of ground levels following sewer modification and removal of existing sewer; sub surface connecting sewer pipes and vent pipe; above ground air vent for sewer tank. Including temporary construction compound and topsoil mounds. Flood Relief Detention Tank, Open Land off Burgess Road, Aylesham

**E2 CONSULTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED BY DISTRICT COUNCILS OR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS DEALT WITH UNDERDELEGATED POWERS - MEMBERS' INFORMATION**

Since the last meeting of the Committee, I have considered the following applications and - decided not to submit any strategic planning objections:-

**Background Documents** - The deposited documents.

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| TH/06/732  | Erection and display of small, post mounted advertisement hoardings to roundabouts.<br>Staner Hill/Manston Park Columbus Avenue (North & South) and, Westwood Cross Roundabouts, Haine Road, Ramsgate.  |
| MA/06/1285 | Outline application for residential development (restricted to affordable housing) with all matters reserved for future consideration as shown on the site location plan MBC/CS/1 received on 06/07/06 (resubmission of application MA/05/2058).<br>Land at Church Street, Maidstone. |
| TH/06/750  | Adventure Playground Development.<br>Putting course and land adj, Ethelbert Crescent, Margate.  |
| SW/06/792  | Outline application for two 3 bedroom dwellings with integral garages.<br>Halfway Cemetary Lodge, Western Avenue, Halfway, Sheerness, Kent.   |
| TW/06/1995 | 2 No. 2 storey 3 bedroom houses.<br>32 Wickham Gardens, Rusthall, Royal Tunbridge Wells.  |
| TH/06/800  | Outline application for the erection of a detached dwelling.<br>Land between 77-79 Fairfield Road, Ramsgate.  |
| TH/06/878  | Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to Library (use Class D1)<br>(Marks & Spencer) 53-55 High Street, Margate.   |
| DA/06/820  | Environmental improvements to River Darent riverside to include erection of lighting scheme, new boundary treatments, improvements to fridge and landscaping scheme.<br>River Darent, Overy Street, Dartford, Kent.   |
| DO/06/819  | Environmental improvements to include erection of lighting scheme, street furniture, new boundary treatments and improvement to bridge.<br>Bulls Head Yard, Dartford.   |

**COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND  
DETAILS PURSUANT PERMITTED/APPROVED UNDER  
DELEGATED POWERS MEMBERS' INFORMATION**

Since the last meeting of the Committee, the following matters have been determined by me under delegated powers:-

**Background Documents** - The deposited documents.

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| DA/05/1166/R7  | Amended details of external lighting – School Extension. Wilmington Primary School, Common Lane, Wilmington, Dartford   |
| TM/04/3357/R   | Building amendments. Malling School, Beech Road, East Malling   |
| TM/04/3340/R13 | Details of tree methodology statement. Aylesford School, Teapot Lane, Aylesford   |
| TM/04/3340/R12 | Details of proposed landscaping scheme. Aylesford School, Teapot Lane, Aylesford  |
| TM/05/2171/R   | Amendments to Sports Hall proposals. Malling School, Beech Road, East Malling   |
| SE/04/1542/R3  | Reserved Details of external materials. Extension, alterations and refurbishment to existing library. Sevenoaks Library, Buckhurst Lane, Sevenoaks            |
| TH/04/1266/RB  | Amended details – Building Design Amendments. Replacement Ellington School for Girls, Land off Pysons Road, Ramsgate  |
| TW/04/3174/R2  | Details of minor amendments to plan and elevation of classroom extension pursuant to condition (2). Speldhurst Primary School, Langton Road, Speldhurst       |
| GR/05/496/R6   | Details pursuant to condition (6) of planning permission GR/05/496 – Scheme of Landscape Works. Ifield School, Cedar Avenue, Gravesend                        |
| GR/05/496/R7   | Details pursuant to condition (7) of planning permission GR/05/496 – Details of construction access and site compound. Ifield School, Cedar Avenue, Gravesend |
| DA/06/618      | Re-instatement of a fire damaged school. Woodview Campus, Main Road, Longfield  |
| DO/06/702      | Siting of 3 bay mobile classroom. Sibertswold C E Primary School, Coldred Road, Shepherdswell, Dover  |
| MA/06/42       | Erection of a single storey sports hall with associated changing, storage, fitness suite and classroom. The Maplesden Noakes School, Buckland Road, Maidstone |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| CA/06/790     | Proposed replacement existing windows with new cladding panels at high level to the drama block. St. Anselms Catholic School, Old Dover Road, Canterbury  |
| CA/06/789     | On wall mounted canopy. Blean Primary School, Whitstable Road, Blean, Canterbury  |
| CA/06/647     | The installation of a 5 bay temporary building to provide IT suite and special needs teaching area. Hampton Primary School, Fitzgerald Avenue, Herne Bay  |
| TW/06/1764    | Construction of a training wall and installation of 4 no. temporary mobile classrooms. Tunbridge Wells Grammar School for Boys, St. Johns Road, Tunbridge Wells   |
| TM/04/3357/R4 | Reserved Details – Details of archaeological and historic landscape features. Malling School, Beech Road, East Malling  |
| CA/04/539/R7  | Details of external lighting pursuant to condition 7 of permission CA/04/539. The Community College Whitstable, Bellevue Road, Whitstable   |
| AS/05/1329/R3 | Details relating to landscaping and boundary treatment. The North School, Essella Road, Ashford   |
| SE/05/2119/RA | Amended details of proposed external materials pursuant to planning reference SE/05/2119. Swanley School, St. Mary's Road, Swanley  |
| AS/05/1112/R7 | Reserved Matters – Details pursuant to condition (7) of planning permission reference AS/05/1112 being details of an amended landscaping scheme. Oak Tree Primary School, Oak Tree Road, Ashford  |
| CA/05/15/R    | Amendments to playground and fencing on the junior school site. St. Stephens Infant and Junior School, Hales Drive, Canterbury  |
| DA/06/528     | Provision of temporary mobile and WC accommodation for adult education facilities during demolition of existing building and refurbishment of former Westgate Primary School, Adult Education Centre, Dartford Campus, Heath Lane, Dartford |
| CA/06/661     | Construction of a new disabled childrens resource centre and respite house. Campfield, Reynolds Close, Herne Bay  |
| TH/06/722     | Extension to existing administration area of school. St. Nicholas at Wade C E Primary School, Down Barton Road, St. Nicholas at Wade, Birchington   |
| SH/06/703     | Change of use from offices (Class B1A) to education (Class D1). Site A, Barton House, 69 Sandgate Road, Folkestone  |
| DA/05/450     | Erection of two storey building to provide Childrens Centre facilities. Oakfield Infants and Primary School, Oakfield Lane, Dartford  |
| TW/06/1868    | Outdoor covered curriculum area – 3 Bespoke Qube Structures. St. Paul's C of E Infant School, Burdett Road, Rusthall, Tunbridge Wells   |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| TH/05/1341/R5 | Reserved Details of a scheme of landscaping and tree planting. Sports Hall and climbing wall. Ursuline College, 255 Canterbury Road, Westgate-on-Sea  |
| MA/06/160/R   | Amended Details – Amendments to approved plans to include the continuation of a pathway, addition of a sweet chestnut enclosure and the removal of a tree - Single storey extension. Oakwood House, Oakwood Park, Maidstone |
| SW/06/605     | Extension to existing 2-storey classroom block to create a 2-storey classroom block including a music and performing arts facility. Highsted Grammar School, Highsted Road, Sittingbourne                                   |
| DO/06/731     | Replacement of existing temporary building with a 6-bay mobile building. St. Margarets-at-Cliffe C.E. Primary School, Sea Street, St. Margarets-at-Cliffe, Dover  |
| DO/05/729/R5  | Details of foul and surface water drainage pursuant to condition (5). Business Resource Centre. St Edmunds Catholic School, Dover   |
| SW/06/351/R1  | Details pursuant to condition (1) – of planning permission SW/06/351 – Scheme of landscaping works. Minster in Sheppey Primary School, Brecon Chase, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness  |
| DO/06/647     | Siting of 3-bay mobile classroom. Guston C of E Primary School, Burgoyne Heights, Guston, Dover   |
| DO/05/1256/R4 | Reserved Details – Details of information regarding level of vertical illuminance from proposed floodlighting. Castle Community College, Mill Road, Deal  |
| DO/05/1256/R3 | Further information on parking arrangements at the School. Castle Community College, Mill Road, Deal  |
| GR/05/563/R2  | Details of external materials – Wrotham Road Junior School, Wrotham Road, Gravesend   |
| TW/05/3023/R2 | Details pursuant – Landscaping details for car park extension. Claremont Primary School, Banner Farm Road, Tunbridge Wells  |
| TH/06/753     | Temporary installation of portakabin building to act as a conference/meeting room. St. George’s C of E Foundation School, Westwood Road, Broadstairs  |
| SW/06/544A    | Proposed provision of access ramps for the disabled to main entrance and infant and junior blocks of the school – Ospringe C of E Primary School, Water Lane, Ospringe, Faversham   |
| SW/06/544B    | Proposed disabled access ramp and steps to the front elevation at the school from emergency exit. Ospringe C of E Primary School, Water Lane, Ospringe  |
| GR/06/525     | Proposed single storey reception area extension incorporating a new canopy over the existing entrance. Shorne C.E. Primary School, Cob Drive, Shorne, Gravesend   |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| MA/05/2023/R3     | Reserved Matters – External materials. Single Storey Extension. Madginford Park Junior School, Egremont Road, Bearsted, Maidstone  |
| AS/06/480/R3      | Reserved Matters – Details of materials for canopy. Bethersden Primary School, School Road, Bethersden, Ashford  |
| AS/06/435/R2 & R4 | Amended Details – Amendment to colour of fascias - New Primary School. The John Wesley Primary School, off Cuckoo Lane, Singleton, Ashford   |
| AS/06/435/R10     | Reserved Details – Details of parking for site personnel - New Primary School. The John Wesley Primary School, Off Cuckoo Lane, Singleton, Ashford   |
| SE/06/1666        | Timber framed detached building at the rear of the School to provide shelter and storage. Penshurst C of E Primary School, High Street, Penshurst  |
| TH/06/718         | Extension of library at ground floor level and unit lounge at first floor level. Stone Bay Special Needs School, Stone Road, Broadstairs   |
| SE/05/1871/R3     | Details of external materials. Milestone School, Ash Green, New Ash Green, Longfield   |
| TW/05/1397/R5     | Details of Herpetofauna Survey. Tunbridge Wells Grammar School for Girls, Southfield Road, Tunbridge Wells   |
| SH/05/1096/R3     | Reserved Details of all materials to be used externally – School Extension. Sandgate Primary School, Cooling Lane, Folkestone  |
| GR/06/550         | Erection of a stand-alone conservatory. Northfleet Nursery School, 140 London Road, Northfleet   |
| SW/06/846         | Provision of 3 no. mobile classrooms. The Westlands School, Westlands Avenue, Sittingbourne  |
| TW/06/2051        | Refurbishment of the window to the school's main hall. Tunbridge Wells Grammar School for Girls, Southfield Road, Tunbridge Wells  |
| SW/05/1449/R3     | Reserved Matters – Landscaping details - Single Storey side extension. Sheldwich Primary School, Lees Court Road, Sheldwich, Faversham   |
| MA/05/964/R3      | Reserved Details – Details of all materials to be used externally and amended details – Amendments to approved scheme including erection of a chestnut fence in lieu of a wall. New dining hall and kitchen. Hollingbourne C.E. Primary School, Eythorne Street, Hollingbourne |
| SW/05/1356/R3     | Reserved details of a scheme of landscaping works – Provision of new playing field. Land adjacent to Village Hall, Tunstall, Sittingbourne   |



|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| DA/06/330/R       | Amended details – Minor amendments to approved plans, including reduction in floor space and minor modifications to windows and doors. New teaching block and infill of existing second floor with 2 classrooms. The Grammar School for Girls, Wilmington Grange, Parsons Lane, Dartford                         |
| DA/05/1166/R3     | Reserved Details – External materials. Single storey extension. Wilmington Primary School, Common Lane, Wilmington   |
| SE/05/1871/R4,5,6 | Reserved Details – Details of parking, landscaping and location of adventure playground. Milestone School, Ash Road, New Ash Green, Longfield  |
| CA/04/1089/R3A    | Amendment to details pursuant to condition (3) – External materials – Herne Bay Junior School, Kings Road, Herne Bay   |
| CA/04/1089/R6     | Reserved Details – Details of School Travel Plan pursuant to condition (6) – Herne Bay Junior School, Kings Road, Herne Bay  |
| AS/05/1525/Rvar   | Reserved Details – Details of landscaping and boundary treatment (condition 3), external materials (condition 4), proposed sound insulation (condition 7), vehicle turning area (condition 9) and construction works (condition 10). The North School, Essella Road, Ashford                                     |
| SE/06/1753        | Build a timber shed. Horton Kirby C of E Primary School, Horton Road, Horton Kirby   |
| SH/05/1242/R2     | Reserved Details – Archaeological watching brief - External lift to science block. Harvey Grammar School, Cheriton Road, Folkestone  |
| TH/06/809         | Material change to elevations including provision of fire escape, new windows and door openings, provision of covered material storage bays, renewal of curtain walling and windows. Units 1 & 2 Enterprise Road, Westwood industrial Estate, Margate  |
| AS/06/1046        | Provision of new buildings for School and other facilities with demolition of existing school buildings, and new fencing and gates separating school site from Swinford Manor. Goldwyn Community Special School, Great Chart, Ashford  |
| DA/06/231         | Reserved matters application for siting design, external appearance, landscaping and boundary treatment, including details to discharge conditions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 & 22 pursuant to outline planning permission DA/05/60.<br>Proposed Leigh City Academy, Green Street Green Road, Dartford. |
| CA/06/922         | Temporary vehicular access way into Victoria Recreation Ground. Land adjacent to Victoria Recreation Ground, South of Rheims Way, Canterbury.  |
| MA/06/1106        | Formation of revised pedestrian access from West Street to install new (localised) kerb line, dot type barrier and form new access ramp and steps.<br>Hunton CE Primary School, Bishops Lane, Hunton, Maidstone.   |

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| TW/06/1180/R3        | Reserved details of external materials.<br>Sports Education Building - Angley School, Angley Road, Cranbrook.  |
| SW/06/661/R3         | Details pursuant – Amendment to elevation drawings and details of materials. New lift and enclosure to existing school to provide a means of access for disabled persons including new ramped access and handrails.<br>Highsted School for Girls, Highsted Road, Sittingbourne         |
| CA/06/554/R9         | Reserved details – Details of proposed access, parking and turning, and details of pick up/drop off facilities.<br>Nursery Building, Pilgrims Way Primary School, Pilgrims Way, Canterbury.  |
| CA/06/554/R4/R5 & R6 | Reserved details – Details of temporary site hoarding (Pursuant to condition 4), details of external lighting (pursuant to Condition 5) and details of a scheme of landscaping (pursuant to Condition 6).<br>Nursery Building - Pilgrims Way Primary School, Pilgrims Way, Canterbury. |
| TH/06/827            | Erection of two mild steel canopies.<br>St Crispin's Community Primary School, St Crispin's Road, Westgate-on-Sea.   |
| SW/06/847            | Erection of a covered external reception area and cycle shed.<br>Eastling Primary School, Kettle Hill Road, Eastling.  |
| CA/06/554/R3         | Reserved details of all materials to be used externally.<br>Nursery Building - Pilgrims Way Primary School, Pilgrims Way, Canterbury.  |
| TH/05/1341/R3        | Reserved details of all materials to be used externally - Sports Hall and climbing wall.<br>Ursuline College, 255 Canterbury Road, Westgate-on-Sea.  |
| SH/05/37/R           | Amended details – Alternations and amendments to the front façade of first floor IT Suite - First floor extension.<br>Folkestone All Souls Church of England Primary School, Stanley Road, Folkestone.   |
| SH/05/1163/R         | Reserved details of external materials - School extensions.<br>Hythe Community School, Cinque Ports Avenue, Hythe.   |
| SE/06/1844           | Proposed first floor extension to accommodate administration department.<br>The Bradbourne School for Girls, Bradbourne Vale Road, Sevenoaks.  |
| TW/06/635/R3         | Reserved details of external materials - Multi-purpose hall and first floor classroom.<br>Mascalls School, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood, Tonbridge.  |
| DA/06/347/R          | Amendment to approved plans involving the adaptation of the roof shape and elevational changes - Vocational/Business Enterprise Building.<br>Wilmington Hall School, Common Lane, Dartford.  |

DA/06/347/R3

Reserved details of all materials to be used externally -  
Vocational/Business Enterprise Building.  
Wilmington Hall School, Common Lane, Dartford.

**E4**

**DETAILED SUBMISSIONS UNDER CHANNEL TUNNEL  
RAIL LINK ACT 1996**

Since the last meeting of the Committee, the following matters have been determined/responded to by me under delegated powers:-

**Background Documents** - The deposited documents.

None

**E5 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 1999 - SCREENING OPINIONS ADOPTED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

**Background Documents -**

- *The deposited documents.*
- *Town and County Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999.*
- *DETR Circular 02/99 – Environmental Impact Assessment.*

(a) since the last meeting of the Committee the following screening opinions have been adopted under delegated powers that the proposed development does not constitute EIA development and the development proposal does not need to be accompanied by an environmental statement:-

DC29/06/SE/0001 Refurbishment works at Chiddingstone Hoath Wastewater Treatment Works, Chiddingstone Hoath.

DC29/06/SE/0002 Refurbishment works at Chiddingstone Castle Wastewater Treatment Works, Chiddingstone

DA/06/TEMP/0042 Kent Thameside Fastrack, Everard's Link Phase 2, being the provision of a bus priority route linking the recently constructed bus/rail interchange with the new development at Ingress Park, including associated landscaping works, which will form part of the Kent Thameside Fastrack major Scheme. Land immediately north of the railway line between Station Road and The Avenue, Greenhithe, Kent.

DC29/06/SE/0003 Installation of a pumping station, foul water sewer and rising main to connect Chartwell House to the public sewer. This is to be carried out by Southern Water and Mouchel Parkman at a location near Chartwell House, Westerham.

(b) since the last meeting of the Committee the following screening opinions have been adopted under delegated powers that the proposed development does not constitute EIA development and the development proposal does need to be accompanied by an environmental statement:-

None

**E6 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 1999 - SCREENING OPINIONS ADOPTED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

- (b) Since the last meeting of the Committee the following screening opinions have been adopted under delegated powers that the proposed development does not constitute EIA development and the development proposal does not need to be accompanied by an environmental statement:-

**Background Documents** -

- The deposited documents.
- Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999.
- DETR Circular 02/99 - Environmental Impact Assessment.

None