

## **Views of the Parish Council – items to be considered**

---

Whilst the Parish Council is not unsupportive of the concept of change of use from commercial to residential for some of the areas on Kings Hill, it strongly objects to many aspects of the proposal put forward under this application.

### **1. Overview and General comments**

- 1.1. Does KHPC support the concept of change of use from commercial to residential?
- 1.2. LPT has not included Sportsman Cottages, Lords Walk or Kate Reed Wood in their analysis of existing housing at Kings Hill
- 1.3. This is an application for outline consent and not detailed consent. Therefore, it could be argued that the details of the dwellings shown in this application are fairly irrelevant as detailed consent will flesh out the details. However, detailed consent is based on the outline consent so please be aware.
- 1.4. Also consider putting in a request that TMBC have a site visit by mini bus to view the whole area included in the proposal to ensure they understand the relationship with existing development. Suggest they try it at rush hour?!!

### **2. Transportation**

#### **2.1. Within Kings Hill**

- 2.1.1. Congestion at peak times – effect of new houses on existing infrastructure?
- 2.1.2. Loss of Kings Hill Avenue originally to bypass residential areas

#### **2.2. Public transport**

- 2.2.1. Trains – better service to London?
- 2.2.2. Buses – complaints re: limited service in evenings and weekends
- 2.2.3. School buses – already overcrowded without further school children

#### **2.3. Wider Transportation**

- 2.3.1. A228 South bound – a regular cause of congestion – no improvements under previous Section 106 agreements
- 2.3.2. Air quality
- 2.3.3. Other

#### **2.4. LPT Statement in Design and access statement**

- 2.4.1. “The change of use from commercial to residential will create less traffic movements than originally envisaged”.
- 2.4.2. Commercial traffic was likely to come from north i.e. M20/Ashton Way which is why this was improved under Phase 2 S106.
- 2.4.3. Use of roads / time of use could be different if use is residential rather than commercial

### **3. Parking**

#### **3.1. Residential**

- 3.1.1. Consider if sufficient parking per dwelling?
- 3.1.2. Indicative plans do not clearly show parking provision. Limited information on parking provision is included in the design and access statement.
- 3.1.3. Consider preference for parking i.e. individual drives next to houses rather than areas behind properties?
- 3.1.4. Use of garages rather than car barns?

#### **3.2. Central Area**

- 3.2.1. No further parking planned for 975 homes / 2600+ residents – views?
- 3.2.2. More residents and more visitors for potential petrol station and third school
- 3.2.3. Removal of overflow car park in Market Square
- 3.2.4. Removal of informal parking area by Kings Hill School
- 3.2.5. No provision for additional parking at the community centre despite 975 more homes

### **4. Overall housing density**

#### **4.1.General**

- 4.1.1. There is no indication within the design and access statement of how many houses constitute any of the densities described

#### **4.2.Housing Density**

- 4.2.1. High, medium and low density are used throughout the design and access statement but not defined anywhere.

### **5. Primary Education**

#### **5.1.Provision of third school**

- 5.1.1. Views?

#### **5.2.Location**

- 5.2.1. Concern that the school is not located within the community it is supposed to serve i.e. area 304/5/6 (main bulk of housing)
- 5.2.2. Concern about the community which it is supposed to serve will have to cross Tower View – a major road on KH therefore a danger to pedestrians and further exacerbating traffic congestion at peak times?
- 5.2.3. Concern that it is going to cause congestion at peak times as it will combine with commercial traffic and existing school traffic on a problematic road (Gibson Drive)
- 5.2.4. Concern that use of the road between Tower View and Gibson Drive used as a rat run and school parking could cause problems for the residential care home?
- 5.2.5. Concern about the proximity between the residential care home and the school and associated noise / nuisance issues

#### **5.3.Size**

- 5.3.1. Initially planned as a 2FE school with 2.67 hectares of land. Requirement for a minimum of 2 hectares of land for a 2FE
- 5.3.2. Expansion room up to a 3FE school

### **6. Secondary Education**

- 6.1. No provision for a secondary school – views?

### **7. Affordable Housing**

- 7.1. Concern over 40%
- 7.2. Key worker & shared equity v rented – views on ratio?
- 7.3. Currently in set areas rather than pepper-potted around the development – views?
- 7.4. No idea where affordable housing is expected to go?

### **8. Retail**

- 8.1. No provision for additional retail space – views?

### **9. Petrol Station**

#### **9.1.Location**

- 9.1.1. Need – is there a need for this facility on Kings Hill? Questionnaires show that 22% of responses from questionnaire think that a petrol station is essential on KH, 56% think a petrol station is not needed on KH.
- 9.1.2. Location – various issues to consider see item 15.9 for more detail

#### **9.2.Traffic**

- 9.2.1. Congestion likely with queues affecting traffic into and out of Asda
- 9.2.2. Congestion likely to push people into driving the wrong way down the one way street (Gibson Drive) to avoid the traffic jam?

### **10. Residential Care Home**

#### **10.1. Location**

- 10.1.1. Distance from Central area and doctors?
- 10.1.2. Secluded from other residential areas – target for crime?
- 10.1.3. Next to primary school – noise? Traffic congestion?

#### **10.2. Design**

- 10.2.1. 4 storey building – views?

### **11. Youth Provision & play areas**

**11.1. Play areas – LAPS and LEAPS**

- 11.1.1. There are no plans to put formal play areas within the linear park – views?
- 11.1.2. No other play areas planned within the phase 3 development in these plans but would be subject to the S106 negotiated. Not many open spaces in plan?
- 11.1.3. Effect of extra residents on central area playground particularly in light of the location of the third school? No provision for expansion of playground proposed

**11.2. Youth provision – general**

- 11.2.1. No skate park
- 11.2.2. No youth pods
- 11.2.3. No adventure playground for older children
- 11.2.4. No scout hut / multi-purpose youth hut?
- 11.2.5. No youth café

**12. Community Space**

**12.1. Church / Burial Ground**

- 12.1.1. No provision for building? Or as part of school?
- 12.1.2. Concerns from local parish churches about burial space – growing community at KH will need burial space?

**12.2. Community Centre – see 15.8 area 308/9**

- 12.2.1. No expansion of community centre envisaged?
- 12.2.2. Parking – loss from Market Square
- 12.2.3. Parking – no additional parking added
- 12.2.4. Parish office – expansion?
- 12.2.5. Pre-school – expansion? Move elsewhere?

**13. Green / Open spaces**

**13.1. Linear Park – see 15.6.8 area 306 for more detail**

- 13.1.1. No play equip provision – LPT want to provide “exciting and naturalistic play environments that are well integrated with their surroundings. The concept of natural play is preferred above equipped play.” I.e. sensory planting, sculptural mounding, play logs, paths, boulders and sculptural objects.
- 13.1.2. Not wide open space such as Pippin Way – views?
- 13.1.3. Likely crime/ASB issues?

**13.2. Other open spaces**

- 13.2.1. Design & Access statement states “a strong network of open spaces, streetscape, planting belts and pedestrian links will create a green framework and provide locations for different activities across the site, enriching and enlivening the public realm.”
- 13.2.2. The strategic public open spaces and landscape for phase 3 comprises the linear park, Northern Square (in Area 305), market green and greenway (connecting existing greenways to new areas).

**14. Heritage**

**14.1. Historic landscape**

- 14.1.1. LPT seek to “protect and enhance ancient woodland present on, and adjacent to, the application site” apart from woodland in area 301.
- 14.1.2. TMBC has indicated that “it may be possible to adopt an alternative approach in which part of the less valuable woodland is lost to low density residential housing.”

**14.2. Rights of way**

- 14.2.1. Consideration of the “potential to reinstate the rights of way which were effaced during the mid twentieth century which would enhance the intelligibility of the historic landscape” within the development proposal.

**14.3. Schedules monuments**

- 14.3.1. Pickett Hamilton Fort in area 306. Not shown/unclear on indicative plans for proposed development of the area.
- 14.3.2. Design and access statement states that "the potential impact of the proposed development on the scheduled monument within area 306 will be considered and managed through the design process."

## **15. Planning Application areas**

### **15.1. Area 301 – Forest Way – character area 5**

- 15.1.1. The loss of ancient woodland
- 15.1.2. Sustainability – This is another woodland area lost
- 15.1.3. Access onto Forest Way and Discovery Drive – safety
- 15.1.4. One plan shows 5 houses in this site, another shows 10
- 15.1.5. Eco homes

### **15.2. Area 302 – Tower View jct Alexander Grove – character area 3**

- 15.2.1. Housing density - medium-high specified in design & access statement
- 15.2.2. Housing type 2,3 & 4 bedroom houses plus apartments
- 15.2.3. Residential buildings up to 3 storeys (up to 13m)
- 15.2.4. Width of roads in high density areas – "a series of lanes, squares and mews"
- 15.2.5. On and off street parking issues as on Phase 2
- 15.2.6. To consider access – could this become a through road from Gibson Drive to Tower View?

### **15.3. Area 303 – Hazen Road jct Tower View – character area 3**

- 15.3.1. Vehicular access onto Tower View– Asda, commercial traffic into buildings nearby and rush hour traffic considerable?
- 15.3.2. Housing density - medium-high specified in design & access statement
- 15.3.3. Housing type 2,3 & 4 bedroom houses plus apartments
- 15.3.4. Residential buildings up to 3 storeys (up to 13m)
- 15.3.5. Mainly terraced houses
- 15.3.6. Density of housing as above – nearby Hazen Road area very densely populated
- 15.3.7. Affordable housing – High number of affordable homes in this area
- 15.3.8. Width of roads in high density areas – "a series of lanes, squares and mews"
- 15.3.9. Parking – not specified within the design and access statement. Limited or non-existent parking shown in indicative plans
- 15.3.10. Sustainability - Area of open space on Hazen Road being removed. An established well-used space for informal play being built on.

### **15.4. Area 304 – Beacon Avenue jct Glenton Ave – character area 3**

- 15.4.1. To consider vehicular access onto a bus route
- 15.4.2. Housing density - medium-high specified in design & access statement
- 15.4.3. Housing type 2,3 & 4 bedroom houses plus apartments
- 15.4.4. Residential buildings up to 3 storeys (up to 13m)
- 15.4.5. Mix of terraced, semis and detached houses
- 15.4.6. Width of roads in high density areas – "a series of lanes, squares and mews"
- 15.4.7. Parking – not specified within the design and access statement. Limited or non-existent parking shown in indicative plans
- 15.4.8. Small open space shown on indicative plan

### **15.5. Area 305 – Tower View jct Jubilee Way – character area 1**

- 15.5.1. Access to site via Jubilee Way shared with commercial traffic
- 15.5.2. Traffic – onto main arterial road at major junction
- 15.5.3. Two areas “main village” (terraced and semis) and “edge area” (detached villas)
- 15.5.4. Width of roads in high density areas?
- 15.5.5. Parking – stated as integral parking either side of homes in “edge area”
- 15.5.6. Parking – no parking mentioned or shown in plans for “main village”
- 15.5.7. On and off street parking – Are all garages, parking areas on plot?
- 15.5.8. Furthest away from third primary school which is supposed to serve this development
- 15.5.9. Open spaces – “green square” in centre of plot

**15.6. Area 306 – Main Development - Linear Park Area – character areas 2 & 3**

- 15.6.1. Character area 2 – larger houses (4&5 bedrooms) detached and semis on northern side and slightly smaller (3,4 &5 beds) on southern side
- 15.6.2. Character area 3 medium-high density areas – These areas abut already highly dense developments with no buffer zone included in plans
- 15.6.3. Commercial building adjacent to this area and area 303
- 15.6.4. Public transport – Can Public Transport sustain this growth?
- 15.6.5. Traffic – Junction of Tower View, growth of traffic for the rush hour with commercial and school traffic combined
- 15.6.6. Traffic – Bottle neck for commuter traffic?
- 15.6.7. Parking – indicative plans show a mix of drive, courtyard and street parking but not very clear
- 15.6.8. Sustainability Open space/play areas – The new linear park will not have purpose built play areas for children. “Opportunities for incorporating informal and natural play will be pursued to promote a dynamic and multi-use space with a unique and relevant sense of place”. Not sure what this actually means?!

**15.7. Area 307 – Proposed School/ Care Village Site – character area 4**

- 15.7.1. More contemporary design of dwellings
- 15.7.2. Scale of dwellings – up to 4 storeys / 17m
- 15.7.3. School – single storey / contemporary style
- 15.7.4. Access Road – Would this cause more traffic chaos from Gibson Drive to Tower View?
- 15.7.5. High density residential area
- 15.7.6. Traffic – cut through from Gibson Drive to Tower View for school drop off. Effect on residential care home and surrounding roads, businesses etc?
- 15.7.7. Traffic – Should this be one way?
- 15.7.8. Parking – very small area allocated to care home, not able to detect parking for other residential in this area. Combination of residential street parking and peak school hours drop off and pick up could be a nightmare?

**15.8. Area 308 & 309 – Market Square & Play Area sites**

- 15.8.1. Parking – Loss of amenity value for the community – markets, fairs, over flow parking for major events etc?

- 15.8.2. Parking – removes flexibility for over flow parking especially if new school site is approved?
- 15.8.3. Expansion – No plans to expand either the Community Centre or pre-school or associated parking
- 15.8.4. No provision for additional leisure facilities?
- 15.8.5. Removal of small information parking area currently used by Kings Hill School? Concern expressed by parents.
- 15.8.6. Design and access statement says “as a public open space it is lacking in function, partly inaccessible and therefore considered wholly underused at present.”

**15.9. Area 310 – Petrol Station**

- 15.9.1. Traffic access – could lead to congestion with Asda and spitfire parking entrances adjacent
- 15.9.2. Traffic – possible increase in traffic from offsite Kings Hill?
- 15.9.3. Street scene – next to market square, community centre and leisure/open space on Gibson Drive?
- 15.9.4. Road safety – near walking route for KH School and “indicative proposed strategic footpath cycle link” to new school and likely levels of children using this bit of roadway. Between Asda and the Spitfire on busy roundabout
- 15.9.5. Proximity to garden of Spitfire? Smoking area? Noisy?