

CHILHAM PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS 12/00051/AS AND 12/00052/AS

1. TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Due to the lack of current traffic assessment information, a traffic survey was conducted by Chilham Parish Council on 29th and 30th March ([link to survey results](#)) in order to better understand the current traffic movements around Bagham Junction during peak hours. As a result the following conclusions have been drawn:-

1.1 Total traffic volumes had increased since 2007

1.2 The increase in traffic between Challock and Canterbury was supported by local anecdotal evidence and suggested a significant change in traffic movements

1.3 The reduction in traffic from Ashford could have been caused by the temporary traffic lights at Bilting

1.4 The survey was conducted immediately before the school easter holiday and traffic volumes may have been reduced due to commuters taking holidays

1.5 A speed monitoring team from Chilham PACT had reported higher volumes of traffic using Branch Road (96/hr and 184/hr)

1.6 The survey suggested traffic movements had altered significantly since 2007 and that this warranted an official survey. It suggested an increase in overall traffic volumes and a significant increase in traffic travelling between Challock and Canterbury contributing to increased queues on the southern approach from Ashford that needed to be understood before designing safe access into and out of the proposed developments.

Chilham Parish Council therefore ask ABC to consider these conclusions and explain why no official survey has been requested to better understand traffic movements around Bagham Junction and address the safety concerns raised.

2. ROAD SAFETY AND ACCESS AND RAT RUNS

Chilham Parish Council request that ABC consider the arguments listed below and respond with answers to the questions raised.

2.1 Safe walking access was required between site and Chilham village - this would be a route used by mothers and school children – why does the new footpath terminate at Bagham Lane and not extend into the village?

2.2 Why has a central reservation and ghost island not been considered as proposed in a previous planning application for industrial use ([link to ghost island plan](#))? – this would increase safety for vehicles entering the site.

2.3 Why have traffic lights at the junction not been considered to improve safety for motorists at a well documented accident black spot?

2.4 Will the pedestrian crossing be well lit at all times?

How will a pedestrian refuge be fitted within the proposed pedestrian crossing to provide adequate safety?

2.5 How will a pedestrian refuge be fitted within the proposed pedestrian crossing to provide adequate safety?

2.6 What is the width of the access road into the site and what evidence is there that this is sufficient for the size and use of the site given it will be on a busy 40mph stretch of road close to a dangerous junction?

2.7 How close to minimum requirements are the lines of sight each side of the exit from the site onto the A28?

3. PARKING PROVISION

Chilham Parish Council request that ABC consider the arguments listed below and respond with answers to the questions raised.

3.1 Clarification is required regarding the connection between the 2 applications – how can the Sawmills application include increased housing be considered when it is dependent on the Station Approach application to provide 15 parking spaces?

3.2 It is noted that KHS had commented that the parking provision within the Sawmills development was not in accordance with the Residential Parking SPD – what will be done to address this issue?

3.3 We support concerns raised by Kent Police that proposed Sawmills site parking did not follow the principles of Secured by Design or Crime Prevention through Environmental Designs – what will be done to address this issue and ensure residential parking does not spill over into Station Approach?

4. SCHOOL PLACES AND DOCTORS SURGERY

Chilham Parish Council request that ABC consider the arguments listed below and respond with answers to the questions raised.

4.1 We accept that a school role forecast had been done but ask how the 10 extra primary places forecast could be provided given limited scope for extending Chilham School? (the school intake for 2012 is already oversubscribed with all places offered to local children)

4.2 We also question whether the extra capacity required from Chilham Surgery had been properly considered – has the surgery been consulted and if not, why not?

5. SPEED LIMIT SIGNS

Chilham Parish Council request that ABC to consider the arguments listed below and respond with answers to the questions raised.

5.1 Please provide more details of the suggested signing as it is not reasonable to ask for comments without this information?

5.2 Could Kent Highways comment on the following proposal from local people:

- 1) Extend 50mph restriction all the way on A28 from Godmersham to Chilham
- 2) First 40mph sign on A28 from Ashford just before the Beaches site to slow traffic before bend approaching Branch Lane turning
- 3) 40mph interactive repeater sign on A28 from Ashford between Branch Road and Bagham Lane
- 4) First 40mph on A28 from Canterbury between Shalmsford Bridge and Shalmsford Road with interactive repeater just before the dangerous Pilgrims Lane junction.
- 5) First 40mph on A252 from Challock just before Soleshill Road with interactive repeater before New Cut junction.

5.3 Will the proposed interactive repeater signs be permanent?

6. DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF THE SITE

Chilham Parish Council request that ABC consider the arguments listed below and respond with answers to the questions raised.

6.1 We support concerns raised by Kent Police regarding poor siting of parking and play area – what will be done to address this issue?

6.2 Why is the play area designed for older children who are likely to be old enough to make their own way to recreation facilities in the village rather than younger children who would need to be accompanied by an adult and be at increased risk crossing the A28?

6.3 We are aware of issues raised by ABC Cultural Services regarding space allowed for play area – how will this issue be addressed?

6.4 What has been done to ensure there are suitable sewage processing facilities for the new site?

6.5 Southern Water have reported that there are no public surface water sewers so alternative means of draining surface water is required to comply with Environment Agency requirement of no direct drainage to ground water – how will this issue be addressed ?

6.6 Why is a proposal for 40 houses packed closely together and the space issues this causes being considered when the original plan for 30 allowed sufficient space to properly address play area and parking requirements?

6.7 What is the reasoning behind the ABC requirement for active frontage for properties on the A28 and why is this considered more important than the noise and safety issue for residents of these properties?

6.8 The final decision on materials that will be visible after construction is important – what will be done to ensure the decision is sympathetic and appropriate for the area in which the development is situated?

7. DEVELOPERS CONTRIBUTION

Chilham Parish Council objects to 5.15 of the Planning, Design and Access Statement – the use of the developers contribution is a decision that should be made following a consultation with the parish.