

BIRMINGHAM
BRISTOL
CAMBRIDGE
CARDIFF
EBBSFLEET
EDINBURGH
GLASGOW
LEEDS
LONDON
MANCHESTER
NEWCASTLE
READING
SOUTHAMPTON

**BARTON
WILLMORE**

bartonwillmore.co.uk
The Observatory
Southfleet Road
Ebbsfleet
Dartford
Kent
DA10 0DF
T/ 01322 374 660

Robert Allan
Planning Department
Shepway District Council
Civic Centre
Castle Hill Avenue
Folkestone
Kent
CT20 2QY

VIA EMAIL

24983/A3/KH/cg

21 December 2018

Dear Robert

**RESERVED MATTERS FOR PHASE 2 DEVELOPMENT- AMENDED PLANS
LAND ADJACENT TO THE SURGERY, SELLINDGE**

The Reserved Matters application for the Phase 2 development at Sellindge was submitted on 23 March 2018 following extensive pre-application discussions with the Council. Since this time, and following receipt of consultation comments, the design team has been undertaking discussions with Folkestone and Hythe District Council (FHDC) to address the comments raised.

The discussions with FHDC have resulted in a number of changes to the original proposals, a significant number of which were addressed in the August 2018 re-submission and detailed within my cover letter dated 13 August 2018.

Taylor Wimpey met with FHDC on 25 September 2018 to discuss the outstanding elements which I address in turn below.

Parking

KCC Highways have previously raised concerns in respect of the overall quantum and location of visitor parking. Extensive negotiations have been undertaken with KCC Highways and FHDC to remedy the concerns. This has included 2no. meetings with the Council (04 December and 11 December).

As a result of the negotiations, the parking layout has been amended to ensure a sufficient amount of parking has been provided in appropriate locations. These spaces have been tracked and it has been demonstrated that there would be no impedance of the refuse vehicle or fire tender. It is now understood that the parking arrangement is acceptable to KCC Highways and FHDC.



FS 29637

Registered in England
Number: 0C342692

Barton Willmore LLP
Registered Office:
The Blade
Abbey Square
Reading
RG1 3BE
F/ +44 (0)118 943 0001

Highways

Two additional highway points were raised in the email from KCC Highways of 16 November 2018 as below:

Comment	Response
The gate opening onto the highway adjacent to the picnic area is still present.	This has now been amended.
No solution has been offered for service vehicles for the mixed use local centre.	Details of parking for the mixed use Local Centre have been circulated to KCC Highways (including discussions with adoptions team). These drawings illustrate a parking bay adjacent to the mixed use local centre, in the approved car parking area. We have also provided details of tracking to demonstrate how a vehicle may turn, or alternatively exit the site through the existing car parking area. The parking to the local centre is included in Phase 1, but we are happy to continue to look at this separately.

Layout and Design

Comment	Response
Concern in respect of sense of enclosure to footpath running west to east to the western side of the Site.	PROW running along rear of plots 145-159 has been pulled away from the proposed boundary fences to create more of a landscaped corridor which can be enhanced through additional landscaping. The landscape proposals include low level shrubs, which grow up to a maximum height of 1m. This will help soften the appearance of the adjacent built form and boundaries, but without increasing the sense of enclosure along the footpath. We have retained the native hedge to the southern side of the PROW to provide a suitable buffer to the existing properties as previously proposed. Although the corridor remains the same width the sense of openness has increased through the centralisation of the pathway and inclusion of verges on either side. Setting the footpath away from the boundary, the orientation of the majority of dwellings along the footpath route with rear windows facing onto the PROW, and inclusion of side windows in the PA34 units at plots 145 and 157 allow a better opportunity for overlooking. Boundary treatments to the parking court have been updated to post and rail fencing to the boundary of the parking court and to the rear of

Comment	Response
	the parking spaces to plot 145 so as to allow views in/out of the PROW.
Comments from Piran Cooper in respect of fencing and walling across the site – marked up plan circulated.	Closed board fencing has been replaced with brick walls where appropriate and reflective of the approved enclosure strategy at Phase 1. Larch lap fencing has been retained between gardens, which is a standard treatment between gardens; however, the fencing is not clearly visible from the public realm and would therefore have a limited impact upon overall design quality.
Details of interior of car bars requested.	Now provided.

Apartment Block

Comment	Response
Entrances to rear not overly prominent.	Entrances to front and rear elevations enlarged and porch canopies amended to provide more prominence and significance to the building entrances.
Request for design variation to rear elevation of buildings including larger windows and changes to porches.	Rear elevation has been amended to include gable feature (consistent with proportions and design of front elevation) to add more visual interest to the rear elevation of the building.
Review of link between blocks to provide more of a visual distinction between the buildings and the bike/bin store.	Materials to cycle store have been amended to provide a contrast with the main building materials. This allows the two 'wings' of the apartment block to appear as standalone elements with the cycle store featuring as a subservient link between the two.

Mixed Use Local Centre

Comment	Response
Cills over windows previously shown but now removed - is there a reason why/inconsistency in drawings?	Cills have been removed from elevations to provide for consistency.
Concern over inconsistency of window sizes on A20 elevation.	Unfortunately we have been unable to increase window sizes where these windows are not evenly sized (e.g. Ashford Road elevation above Parish Offices) due to these windows serving bathrooms and the location of bathroom furniture underneath the windows.
Inconsistency in sizes of windows between floor plan and elevation drawings.	This has now been updated.

Comment	Response
Flat roof valley between the gables fronting the A20 has increased. Could height of gables be increased to reduce valley width.	Roof valley to Ashford Road elevation (above café/shop) has been amended to significantly reduce the valley feature which has a positive impact upon the overall design.
Concern that entrance door to A20 elevation is smaller than the windows above.	We have looked to see if the size of the opening could be amended to better reflect the proportion of windows above; however, this is not possible due to the location of the stairs behind. We did consider the use of a fixed panel; however, we consider that the use of the proposed brickwork would be more attractive and honest in design terms.

Landscape

Comment	Response
Previous comments ref maintenance of hedging, couldn't find a response to the size to which the hedging is going to be maintained.	Native hedges within the POS will be maintained at a minimum of 2m high as set out within section 5.5 the LEMP.
Who is responsible for the residential planting areas? How long?	Residential planting (front gardens) will be maintained by Management Company as per the Maintenance Plan (submitted in accordance with condition 19).
I have a few reservations (as always) over the planting of trees in the car parking area close to the village hall (where the current site office compound is). My concerns are twofold. Firstly, how wide, realistically, is the strip the trees (Pyrus chaticleer) are going to be planted in to once kerb haunchings are in place? Secondly, I would rather not see Acer (in this case Campestre 'Streetwise') planted adjacent to car parks due to the associated issues of honey dew etc. I don't really have an issue with the Pyrus, but would like to know how wide the space will be. If its anything less than a metres after the kerb haunchings are installed then I would advise that they don't bother with trees and stick to low level shrubs.	Acer camp Streetwise changed to include Pyrus calleryana 'Chaticleer'. The Pyrus are planted in a 2m (total width) wide strip between car parking spaces 64-70, and 1.5m (total width) behind spaces 51-58, so even with kerb haunching should achieve over the 1m min. requested.

I trust the above now addresses all of the outstanding concerns associated with the development at Phase 2 and will allow the Council to progress to positive determination of the application.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information at this point.

Yours sincerely



KATE HOLLAND
Associate

enc. Drawing schedule
Amended Plans

cc. David Bradley : Taylor Wimpey.