

Main issues raised at the open meeting the Chilham Sawmill and Station Approach developments held at Chilham Village Hall on the 23rd February 2012.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Cllr Derrick Kennett summarised the background to the proposed developments and introduced the David Stewart and Nick Lee Evans from Lee Evans Design who would be presenting the plans to the meeting and answering questions from the 40 members of the public attending including Kent County Councillor Andrew Wickham and Boro Cllr Doug Marriott.

2. Presentation

- 2.1 David Stewart presented the plans for both sites. The main points are summarised below.
- 2.2 Key Features: 40 dwellings comprising 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Mix based upon recent survey of potential developers including 14 affordable housing units. Uncontrolled pedestrian crossing of A28. Gradual progression within site from highway to courtyard road surfaces.
- 2.3 Site Access: Entrance between Bagham junction and Mill Lane opposite Cedar Croft. The only location with the required visibility in both directions. As the A28 is a major route, Kent Highways are not in favour of breaks (eg signals or crossings) that prevent traffic flow. Pedestrian access to Chilham village across A28 with central refuge designed to accommodate cyclists and footpath as far as Bagham Lane. Other pedestrian access to Mill Lane and shared footpath and cycleway to Bagham Junction and the station.
- 2.4 Layout: Active frontage required by ABC (ie dwellings face A28). Traditional distinctive design. Amenity space for people to sit and older children to play. Younger children to use existing play park at the recreation ground. Boundaries range from masonry walls to palisade fencing. Trees interspersed along A28.
- 2.5 Design: Reproduce "Chilham" elements, chimneys, mixture of walls, clay tiled roofs with traditional pitches, "Chilham" fencing.
- 2.6 Station Approach: 15 car parking spaces on top of existing provision. Car park owned, managed and maintained by Stour Valley Estates. Free of charge provided ABC agree to zero business rate. Barrier control if misused. These spaces would otherwise have been on Sawmills site. This is a better location and has released space on Sawmills site for more dwellings explaining the increase to 40.

3. Questions and Answers

- 3.1 Traffic Control during peak times: Vehicles entering or leaving the site would need to wait for a gap in traffic. There would be speed limit reduction to 40mph through Bagham Junction together with electronic speed warning signs on A252 and A28 from Canterbury and anti skid surfaces.
- 3.2 Pedestrian footway towards Branch Road: Outside the scope of this development.
- 3.3 Open Meeting in the Church held during the day: This was required to allow officers from Kent Highways to attend to address important highways issues.
- 3.4 Sheltered Accomodation: This was not provided and was probably not appropriate for this site. The government was funding domiciliary care brought to your home. There would be Affordable Housing handled by ABC.
- 3.5 Developers contribution for leisure facilities: The use of this fund was a parish decision. The developer needed to propose something to prevent the money going to ABC.
- 3.6 Pedestrian footway on north side of A28 towards Bagham Junction: Difficult to justify need as a result of this development. There was a pathway to Bagham Junction from the north of the site.

- 3.7 Number of residents in long term: This was expected to be between 80 and 120. KCC have vetted the development for lack of school spaces within 2 miles. If there is a shortfall KCC will fund the provision of extra spaces.
- 3.8 Traffic Issues: Kent Highways consider the development acceptable with respect to traffic movements. The need for traffic signals is not justified by their transport assessment.
- 3.9 School Children: There was concern that children on the development would not get a place at the local school.
- 3.10 Sports Hall: The developers contribution could go towards multi-functional facilities for a wider age group.
- 3.11 Legal Agreement: A legal agreement between the developer and ABC was required to ensure the car parking spaces are provided.
- 3.12 Brown field site: ABC originally rejected residential development on the site preferring an industrial development. A change of government policy now allows a residential development. Any new residential development would be better placed the other side of the A28.
- 3.13 Articulated lorries in Station Approach: There was concern that large lorries would not be able to use Station Approach because cars tend to park on both sides.
- 3.14 Use of industrial units: ABC had some control over this. For example, large retail use would not be allowed.
- 3.15 Lighting on residential site: This would be included in the detailed design and would need to meet highway requirements.

4. Closure

- 4.1 Cllr Alistair Ralph thanked members of the public for attending and sharing their views, David Stewart and Nick Lee Evans for presenting their plans and answering questions. He noted that the discussion had focussed more on traffic issues than houses.