

CHILHAM PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO EMAIL FROM CAROL RIDINGS DATED 16APRIL AND 2MAY

1. TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The great majority of traffic using Branch Road and Bagham Lane during peak hours does so because of the queues approaching Bagham Junction.

The 2007 Savell survey conducted on a Tuesday observed maximum queues of 5 during the morning and 9 during the evening peak hours. The 2012 CPC survey conducted on a Thursday observed corresponding maximum queues of 25 and 29, queues regularly backing up beyond Bagham Lane.

CPC believe the increased queues and will make it more difficult and potentially dangerous for vehicles leaving the site to turn right towards Canterbury than suggested by the 2007 survey.

The increased queues recorded in our survey support local anecdotal evidence of an increased use of Branch Road and Bagham Lane.

For these reasons, CPC believe a more realistic comparison would be achieved if traffic recorded in Branch Road and Bagham Lane is included in its 2012 totals. This comparison indicates a 5% increase during the Thursday in 2012 over the Tuesday in 2007.

Please can ABC ask Kent Highways to explain why a 5% increase in traffic, a 5 fold increase in queues in the morning and a 3 fold increase in the evening lead them to conclude the traffic situation has not changed since the 2007 survey and no extra measures are required.

The new traffic entering and leaving the proposed development during peak hours can only make the queues worse causing even more traffic to use Branch Road and Bagham Lane. The former is a narrow single track lane with a doctors surgery opening during peak hours. The latter is also virtually single track during peak hours because of the parked cars.

Please can ABC ask Kent Highways to explain why they do not require the development to address the issue of increased commuter traffic using narrow country lanes and putting local residents (many elderly) at risk as they visit the doctors surgery along a lane with no footpath.

Please can ABC ask Kent Highways to advise whether the volumes currently using Branch Road and Bagham Lane during peak hours meets required Highway safety standards.

2. ROAD SAFETY AND ACCESS

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?

We note that this has been suggested to the agent and anticipate that appropriate action will be taken. Please let us know what the agent intends to do.

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.

CPC don't believe that vehicle movement should be the deciding factor with regard to site access and related road safety (ie more than 500 movements a day required). Pedestrian and vehicle safety should be the key issue.

Please can ABC ask Kent Highways to provide the arguments to explain how vehicles will safely enter and exit the site during peak hours.

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

We note that Kent Highways do not consider traffic lights suitable in a rural area with disappointment.

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?

We note and support the widening of the A28 but comment that the refuge must be lit at all times.

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?

5m width noted

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

2.4m x 90m sight line noted

3. PARKING PROVISION

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?

Section 106 agreement noted but please can ABC confirm that this will stipulate free parking

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?

Noted that agent looking into this – please provide details when available

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?

Noted that agent looking into this – please provide details when available

4. SCHOOL PLACES AND DOCTORS SURGERY

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)

The reply re education needs is based upon 'natural readjustment'. This will provide places for children from the Sawmills site at the expense of children from Chilham Old Wives Lees and Shottenden who live further from the school. The current turnover is only 15 per year. With schools reducing their catchment areas due to the pressure on admission places, the other local schools will be in the same situation and children will have to travel further.

CPC believe this is another argument that 40 dwellings is not sustainable.

CPC also request that ABC and KCC support Chilham School by providing the extra places required.

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?

CPC will contact the Surgery regarding their ability to cope with the extra demand.

5. SPEED LIMIT SIGNS

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

Please provide these when they are available from Kent Highways

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.

With regard to the reply from Kent Highways:

In what way does the parish councils proposal not meet the requirements, for example on the A28 from Ashford ...

There are 3 bends:- snackbar layby, Bagham Lane/Mill Lane and sharp left turn at junction approach from Ashford.

There are 4 accesses:- Branch Road, Bagham Lane, Mill Lane, the Site plus around 5 accesses directly onto the A28 from residential and commercial properties

CPC will also be submitting an FOI request to Kent Highways asking how many times the bollards at Bagham Junction and the Bagham Road junction with the A252 have been hit. We are concerned and disappointed that Kent Highways are not taking the opportunity to resolve the safety issues around this junction.

5.3 Will the proposed interactive repeater signs be permanent?

We note and support that they will be permanent

6. DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF THE SITE

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?

Noted that agent looking into this – please provide details when available

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?

Noted that currently open space

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

Noted that agent looking into this – please provide amended scheme when available

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

Noted that agent looking into this – please provide amended scheme when available

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 ?

Noted that agent looking into this – please provide amended scheme when available

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?

Noted that this will be reviewed by ABC

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?

Reply noted

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?

Please confirm that we will have an opportunity to comment when the conditions on materials are being drawn up.

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.

Noted by ABC