

Annex A

Responses to Public Consultation Representations on Iwade Development Briefs June 2009

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Principle of Further Development at Iwade | | | |
| <p>Jo Kirkham (1) Steve Dunnett (2) Miss Williams (4) Caroline Farthing (8) Steve Carnt (13) Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) Mrs Paine (18) AR Cook (23) Janet Hill (25) Liz Green (26) Mark Butler (33) Mr & Mrs Lammas (35) Mark Pugh (38) Phil Proudman (40) J Exley (47)</p> | <p>Object to any further development at Iwade.</p> <p>Iwade is a small village – not a town .</p> <p>Enough development already. More will cause further damage to countryside and ecology.</p> <p>Council should protect Iwade from further housing development.</p> <p>No demand for housing at this time.</p> <p>Area is becoming over populated.</p> <p>Scale of development inappropriate and encroaching on open countryside and negative impact on quality of life during and after construction.</p> <p>Accepts the need for new development and employment that it brings, but concerned about scale and pace of increase in Iwade in last few years – infrastructure hasn't kept pace.</p> <p>New development should be on old industrial land in Sittingbourne, not green belt land.</p> | <p>Policy AAP9 of the 2008 Swale Borough Local Plan allocates land for approximately 400 further dwellings at Iwade. A total of 417 dwellings are proposed across the two development briefs, which is in accordance with the development plan policy.</p> <p>The land which is the subject of these development briefs was first identified as part of an Iwade Area Action Plan in the Deposit Draft of the Swale Borough Local Plan First Review in March 2004. Policy AAP12 at that time identified land on the Proposals map for up to 400 additional dwellings.</p> <p>The principle and quantum of development at this location was subject to extensive discussion on all of the main planning issues at the Local Plan public inquiry (2006-2007). The suitability of the location for this development was confirmed by the Inspector in his binding report. The allocation was therefore confirmed in the Swale Borough Local Plan, adopted in February 2008.</p> <p>Sittingbourne and the vacant brownfield (old industrial and other previously developed land) is the main focus of housing land allocations over the next 15 –</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>20 years (over 3000 in and around Sittingbourne Town Centre) However, the housing numbers which Government have allocated to Swale through the South East Plan cannot be met entirely on brownfield sites; and a number of these are dependent on major road infrastructure being in place before they can come forward. Some green field release is therefore unavoidable. None of the London Green Belt (which has special national restraint policy on it) falls within the Swale Borough area.</p> <p>The focus of the development briefs and the purpose of the public consultation on them at this point is therefore to look into the design, layout, site context issues. Provision for essential amenities and facilities and the treatment of ecology and open space have been key issues for the briefs.</p> <p>Market conditions fluctuate over time - local planning authorities are required to illustrate at least a five year supply of immediately available housing land at all times; and through their development plans illustrate how they will meet the housing requirement for their area set out in the South East Plan.</p> | |
| Mark Butler (33) | Coleshall Farm, is a Grade II listed building that has always stood in open countryside. This adjacent development of mixed housing | The purpose of the development brief is to explore how all the complementary uses for the site, and issues around design, layout, landscaping, open space; access and ecology | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | and employment use will change the character of the area forever. In particular, this change will adversely affect the siting of Coleshall Farm by transforming it from rural to semi-urban. Local Plan allocation inadequate as impact of development on Listed Building can only be properly assessed at planning application stage. Issues with overlooking and landscaping. | <p>come together. The aim is to establish the key principles for a good scheme which works with the site and its context. This includes the setting of the Listed Building and this will be a key issue as planning applications are brought forward. The importance of Coleshall is acknowledged at section 2.0 of the Hillreed brief and the existing tree and landscape screening to the site is noted and reinforcement of boundary planting to the development site itself is illustrated at Figure 31 and in section 3.4 where the Coleshall Farm boundary is specifically mentioned.</p> <p>The finer details of the appearance and layout of individual buildings are matters for the planning application stage and matters such as overlooking can only be dealt with once this level of detail is reached.</p> <p>Once adopted, the development brief will be used to determine planning applications and any which are not in accordance with it are unlikely to be approved.</p> | |
| Price of Housing | | | |
| Miss William (4) | New housing will be too expensive for local people to buy | 28% of all the new housing in Iwade will be affordable – a proportion of this will be shared ownership, which offers the opportunity for local people to buy in. | |
| Mel Smith (6) Smokey (e-mail) (14) | <p>Additional housing will reduce value of existing properties in current market. Compensation ?</p> <p>Lots of houses for sale in Iwade.</p> | Not a planning consideration. Developers are unlikely to start on site until market conditions improve and are confident of a ready market for their products. | |
| Provision of Community Facilities | | | |
| Steve Dunnett (2) Mel Smith (6) Steve Carnt (12) Smokey (e-mail) (14) Paula Robb (46) Mrs Paine (18) | <p>Schools are full, local children may have to attend school elsewhere.</p> <p>Local school reception class has only 60 places</p> <p>Local nurseries have waiting lists</p> | At Local Plan Inquiry, the Inspector concluded that a “sustainable community would result from this development. KCC Education Authority and all other service providers were consulted both on the Local Plan and have been consulted on these development briefs | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|---|--|
| Liz Green (26) Nicola Mckenzie(29) Mr & Mrs Lammas (35) D Chapman (36) Mark Pugh (38) Gemma Coleman (41) Iwade Parish Council (45 Ward / Barratts) | Local secondary schools likely to become oversubscribed due to new housing in the area. Local health centre overloaded Insufficient facilities. Should be a new community building. Refurbish existing village hall and church. | and have raised no objection. Developers will be required to make contributions to enhance local school capacity and other community facilities if that capacity is exceeded as a result of this development. Planning permissions can be conditioned to ensure that essential infrastructure is in place before capacity is exceeded. Both development briefs list the issues for developer contributions. Dependent on need being linked to the new development funds for village facilities could form part of the S.106 developer contribution for Community Projects. | |
| Steve Dunnett (2) Mel Smith (6) Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) Liz Green (26) | No internet access | Both sets of developers have confirmed that at the time of laying services, internet providers will be invited to lay the appropriate cabling for broadband access to the proposed dwellings. | |
| Design and Layout Matters | | | |
| Iwade Parish Council (49 Hillreed) | Revised brief is bland, lacking in detail; and does not take on board earlier IPC comments | The purpose of the development brief is to explore how all the complementary uses for the site, and issues around design, layout, landscaping, open space; access and ecology come together. The aim is to establish the key principles for a good scheme which works with the site and its context; and makes best use of it, rather than to provide detail which is then inflexible. | |
| Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) | Object to fact that the two briefs together result in more than the 400 dwellings allocated at the Iwade sites in the Swale Borough Local Plan. | Policy AAP9 of the Local Plan refers to “approximately 400 additional dwellings” and it is not reasonable to apply the limit rigidly. However there is a national and regional target that development sites should generally not be at densities of less than 40 dwellings per hectare. | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The purpose of the development brief is to explore how all the complementary uses for the site, and issues around design, layout, landscaping, open space; access and ecology come together. The aim is to establish the key principles for a good scheme which works with the site and its context; and makes best use of it, rather than sticking rigidly to a specific average density which delivers a particular number of dwellings.</p> | |
| Steve Carnt (12) | <p>To build more houses on the fields that surround the playing field in School lane would alter the overall look for many people and restrict the lovely views and the feeling of space.</p> | <p>The Hillreed brief does not currently deal with landscaping within the site in the vicinity of the recreation ground other than to note the retention of the low hedge. Given that the brief is proposing higher density development (and up to 3 storeys) along the central spine and to the south and south east of the recreation ground, this point is well made.</p> <p>The brief could do more in design terms to mention the use of landscaping including , for example tree planting along boundaries between neighbourhoods and use of specimen trees along the new distributor road to create a sense of space and character within the new development, as well as adding to its biodiversity potential.</p> | <p>The Hillreed brief needs to clarify the use of boundary planting between the recreation ground and the new development; and between the existing development on the southern edge of the village and the new development; and along the new distributor road. The latter is mentioned at page 30 and could be restated within the landscaping and masterplan sections.</p> <p>The masterplan at Fig 31 needs a key to assist with understanding of the structural landscaping themes and other uses, which are described in earlier sections (eg Fig 23).</p> |
| Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) Janet Hill (24) Liz Green (26) | <p>Current residence is a bungalow situated in a dip and concerned that surrounding new housing should be single storey only to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy.</p> | <p>The precise siting, design and type of dwelling that about this residence will be a matter for careful consideration at detailed planning application stage. The Hillreed brief notes at page 36 that the scheme should respect the surrounding scale and massing of development and allows for some single storey development. Overlooking and loss of privacy is a material planning consideration, but there may be other design and layout solutions to this than</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| <p>Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) Janet Gregory (16) Iwade Parish Council (45 Wards/ Barratt)</p> | <p>There are few single storey dwellings proposed , which makes the development less attractive to full cross section of purchasers especially elderly people. Human rights issue.</p> | <p>constraining development to a particular type of dwelling.</p> <p>The Hillreed brief notes at page 36 that there will be some 1 storey development. However, bungalow style development is not a particularly efficient use of land and meeting housing requirements in this way would necessitate the release of more land and the resulting housing becomes extremely expensive to the purchaser.</p> <p>There are other types of suitable homes for the elderly such as by introducing Lifetime Homes standards and other specialist accommodation. A mix of type and sizes of unit will be required in this development to meet all sectors of the community including affordable provision.</p> | |
| <p>Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15)</p> | <p>Do not consider that the road cannot be considered in isolation from remainder of development layout. Proposed developments on this scale cannot be treated piecemeal, particularly with Hillreed declaring so many reserved matters. The proposal and its implications need to be assessed in its entirety and not by the individual elements in isolation.</p> | <p>The purpose of the development brief is to establish the principles of design, layout , key constraints and locations of uses. This is precisely to avoid piecemeal development proposals coming forward Once the briefs are adopted by the Borough Council , they will be used as a basis for determining detailed planning applications. Any which depart from the overall scheme set out on the brief are unlikely to achieve permission.</p> <p>The access arrangement is being considered at outline application level but layout including the precise alignment for the road will be a reserved matter. This will need to work with the whole scheme as envisaged in the brief, as well as the surrounding area, to the satisfaction of Kent Highways Services.</p> | |
| <p>Mrs Paine (18)</p> | <p>Construction of houses in front of house will obscure view of Bobbing and devalue property.</p> | <p>Unfortunately, loss of view from a private dwelling is not a material planning consideration.</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|---|--|
| Gemma Coleman (41) | Architecture and style of new houses should respect the existing character of the village. | Both Development Briefs address this issue. The process of determining planning applications gives Swale Borough Council full control of this matter | |
| Iwade Parish Council (45) Wards / Barratt | Density too high - could be reduced by not building on the orchard area. 3 –storey blocks too high and not in keeping with rest of village . | National standard of 40 dwellings per hectare is considered appropriate for this site - further land take would be necessary to accommodate lower densities. Carefully designed and located three storey dwellings can be used to create some interest and focal points in what could otherwise be a bland estate. | |
| Iwade Parish Council (45) Wards / Barratt | Phase I has not delivered any shelter belts or tree copses. Planting is either in private gardens, sometimes unwanted ; others have enlarged their gardens to appropriate it; or it is in public open space. Important in this phase to ensure that boundary planting is properly provided and managed when development complete. | The Development Brief addresses this on page 36. Provision for management of the space will be controlled through the planning application. | |
| Julian Watt (48) | Hillreed brief - large buffer zone of planting will be required to rear of existing properties. Important to ensure that boundary planting is properly provided and managed when development complete. | The Development Brief mentions maintenance of public open space at page 31. Provision for management of the space will be controlled through the planning application. | |
| Julian Watt (48) | Density of housing has become too high in recent years - could be reduced to give more garden and parking space. | National standard of 40 dwellings per hectare is considered appropriate for this site - further land take would be necessary to accommodate lower densities. | |
| Employment Area | | | |
| Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) Mark Butler (33) | A second access onto Sheppey Way solely for the Employment Area is not necessary. Improvement to the track to Coleshall Farm could serve this area; increase employment area and allow for better screening to Sheppey Way (to screen large warehouse situated at gateway to village. The position | Residential farm track is unlikely to be suitable for employment area traffic even if expanded and would mean all access to residential area east of Iwade stream would have to come off school Lane having gone through the centre of the village. Kent Highways will need to approve the nature and layout of the access at planning application stage. | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>of the recycling area is potentially hazardous.</p> <p>Concern about the nature and appearance of employment uses proposed (B1 and B2) for the Hillreed site and resulting noise and disturbance.</p> | <p>Policy AAP 9 and B14 of the Local Plan allow for 3000 square metre of employment floorspace at this location. The supporting text to Policy B14 states that Use Class B1 (which is office and light industry and must be compatible with residential areas) would be appropriate. The employment development is not therefore a large warehouse and the design and layout of the units to be provided there will be subject to the same scrutiny as the rest of the development at planning application stage. Issues around noise, fumes, dust, traffic generation, hours of operation and external lighting can be controlled via conditions on planning permissions.</p> | |
| Public Open Space | | | |
| Iwade Parish Council (45) Wards / Barratt | Page 10 – disagree with statement that Wards provision of formal play space meets the requirement for formal sports pitch provision. | Additional formal play space is proposed at Sheppey Way; and the upgrading of facilities at the recreation ground in accordance with the local planning authority’s current standard should allow for more intensive use. | |
| Iwade Parish Council (49 Hillreed) | <p>The IPC has never concurred with the proposal that the present recreation ground should be treated as a formal sports field, members consider that its current mixed use with Parish Council play equipment should be retained. Local Plan Policy C1 states: <i>The Borough Council will not permit proposals that involve the loss, or change of use of a local community facility.....</i> The recreation Ground should be brought into public ownership as suggested in DB 2.9. In any case the proposed enlargement of the ground by 1,100 sq metres is not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of Policy C3.2.</p> | <p>The Council seeks appropriate open space levels from both developments. The Council Greenspace Services Team has advised that the open space provision within the two sites should take the form of formal sports provision and informal space, which also allows for flood risk and biodiversity considerations. The Development Briefs have responded accordingly</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| <p>Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) Janet Gregory (16) Amanda Hurrell (28) Nicola Mckenzie(29) Mark Pugh (38) Iwade Parish Council (45) Wards / Barratt Iwade Parish Council (49 Hillreed)</p> | <p>Hillreed have renegued on their previous commitment to provide allotments and disregarded the Councils legal obligation for them to be provided. Waiting list of 60 for allotments. No mention of negotiations to provide allotments outside the development area within the brief.</p> | <p>The Council seeks appropriate open space levels from both developments. The Council Greenspace Services Team has advised that the open space provision within the two sites should take the form of formal sports provision and informal space, which also allows for flood risk and biodiversity considerations. The Development Briefs have responded accordingly. However, discussions are ongoing to provide an allotment site outside the area of the briefs as an addition to the basic requirement of public open space which is provided within the scheme. These discussions could lead to formal agreement for such provision</p> | |
| <p>AR Cook (23) Amanda Hurrell (28)</p> | <p>Will Old Orchard and expansion of Village Park be open to non Iwade residents and what parking provision will be made for them other than Woodpecker Drive.</p> <p>Use Old Orchard - development will lead to its destruction and damage wildlife there.</p> | <p>The old orchard will be retained and Village Park will be available for general public access. It is a local scale initiative aimed at local people, the majority of whom should be able to walk there. Additional compensatory wildlife habitat is being provided through the Wards ./ Barratt brief.</p> | |
| <p>AR Cook (23)</p> | <p>Further enhancement needed to the recreation ground and playspace provision off School Lane or the open space facility at the Village Park will be overwhelmed.</p> | <p>The Hillreed brief includes a small extension to the recreation ground, the laying out of two football pitches, a changing pavilion, car parking and play area, as well as a new area for formal play at Sheppey Way.</p> | |
| <p>John Feetam Sport England (39)</p> | <p>Re-iterates current standards set out in <i>Planning for Sport and Active Recreation: Objectives and Opportunities</i> (2005</p> | <p>The requirement for public open space as set out in the Swale Borough Local Plan (2008) has been met within the site with a combination of additional informal open space and</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>Welcomes principle of improvement to current recreation ground set out in Hillreed brief, but concerned at lack of clarity regarding any expansion of recreation ground between pages 34 and 42 of the brief and whether the facilities being provided are additional.</p> <p>The phasing of the recreation ground improvement is not specified.</p> <p>Pavilion / carparking encroachment onto recreation ground should be minimised – Sport England expect to be consulted at application stage.</p> <p>Concern that no developer contribution has been sought for indoor sport provision such as swimming or sports hall.</p> | <p>improvements to the recreation ground. Additional allotment space is likely to be provided beyond the development site. The sites are difficult to develop due to flood risk areas and valuable ecological areas, so much of the additional public open space has been provided as informal, with the agreement of the Borough Council's Green Spaces Service.</p> <p>}The timing of provision will be for detailed } }planning application stage. } } }</p> <p>There is no policy context for seeking this contribution in Iwade, since the Borough Council is not proposing to build any further facilities in this location.</p> | |
| Sustainability Issues | | | |
| Environment Agency (43) | <p>The Agency are supportive of the environmental measures outlined in the Sustainability Appraisal and revised development briefs.</p> <p>Water conservation techniques should be incorporated into the design of all new developments .</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Development Briefs acknowledge the importance of this and seek Code Level 3 which incorporates water efficiency measures. The detail will be secured at planning application stage.</p> | |
| Protect Kent (44) | <p>Design brief appear reasonable, but would like to see new homes achieving at least Level 4 for the Code for Sustainable Homes, in line with moving the construction industry towards the Government target of "Zero Carbon Homes" by</p> | <p>No local policy basis for seeking Code Level 4 for this development at the current time, but delivery of development will have to meet national building standards which will increase the Code level requirement over time.</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|--|--|--|
| | 2016. Seek to reduce carbon emissions inline with national indicators. | Briefs seek to encourage walking and cycling and Code Level 3 homes will contribute to this target. | |
| David Sims Southern Water (30 Hillreed) | Supports Code 3 at Section 2.6 Hillreed brief as ensures water efficiency measures. | Noted | |
| David Sims Southern Water (31 Wards / Barratt) | Page Supports Level 3 of Code for Sustainable Homes as ensures water efficiency measures. | Noted | |
| Drainage and Flooding Issues | | | |
| Iwade Parish Council (45 Wards / Barratt) | Development east of Woodpecker Drive will have minimal impact on Iwade Stream | Noted | |
| Iwade Parish Council (49) Hillreed | Not satisfied that the current Hillreed proposals will satisfy Policy AAP9. Lack of clarity about drainage at northern end of the site . | The Environment Agency agree with the content of the Development Briefs. Surface water management details agreed under the planning applications will prevent unacceptable impacts resulting from th new development. | |
| Mel Smith (6) Steve Carnt(13) Smokey (e-mail) (14) Mark Pugh (38) | Stream often overflows due to lack of drainage. Drainage in village centre overflows into stream. | The land east of Woodpecker Drive does not place additional pressure on the culverts taking the Iwade Stream through the village. Previous instances of flooding have been found to be due to blockage of these culverts, some of which are undersized. Management of them has now been taken over by the Environment Agency and as a result of discussions on the preparation of these briefs a trash screen has been relocated and will assist in improving water flow and reduce the risk of flooding. Both briefs refer to the need for run –off attenuation schemes which means that development will | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | not worsen the current risk. Development itself is located away from the highest risk areas. | |
| David Ruse (21) | Concern that both briefs propose the use of a residents' management company to manage surface water attenuation schemes. Experience with these in earlier developments at Iwade have proved problematic and there is concern that the schemes are not being properly maintained. | Covenants between potential housebuyers and developers are essentially a private matter. However, the concerns are noted and arrangements will need to be sufficient to satisfy the LMIDB that the attenuation measure will endure for the long term. | |
| Environment Agency (43) | <p>In accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25, the Government's guidance on Development and Flood Risk, a Flood Risk Assessment incorporating a Drainage Strategy should accompany any application for developments which are more than 1ha in area. Whilst the majority of the site is classified as a low risk flood zone, an assessment should be carried out with respect to the proposed drainage of the site to ensure that the site will not be subject to fluvial flooding. We will be in a position to provide more feedback on receipt of a Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Support for Sustainable Drainage Systems. Runoff rates should be attenuated to that of the Greenfield runoff rate, which in this area is typically 7 litres per second per hectare. The 100 year plus 20% rainfall event should be taken into account in designing the system.</p> <p>Iwade Stream fall within the jurisdiction of the Environment Agency and any works carried out within 8 metres of the top of the bank must meet with EA approval.</p> | <p>This will be dealt with at planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted. Both Development Briefs refer to SUDS; details will be secured at planning application stage</p> <p>Noted in Hillreed brief.</p> | |
| Mike Watson (12) Lower Medway | The Board requires anyone discharging surface water into a local ditch to attenuate | Both Development Briefs address this important issue and refer to sustainable | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|---|--|
| Internal Drainage Board Iwade Parish Council (49 Hillreed) | <p>flows to the equivalent green-field run-off rates of 7 litres/sec/hectare for the 1:100 year return storm. This is the figure used for every other developer in the Swale area and in particular Iwade.</p> <p>S106 details needs to include maintenance of drainage attenuation measures.</p> | <p>urban drainage systems.</p> <p>Both briefs mentions the need for this and propose the use of a management or utility company to do this.</p> | |
| Protect Kent (44) | <p>Concern over whether moving a trash screen over culverts will be sufficient to mitigate flood risk.</p> <p>Lack of clarity on Drainage from School Lane end of Hillreed site</p> | <p>Both the Environment Agency and LMIDB have made specific comments on the calibre of the drainage attenuation system required for this development. Southern Water has commented in detail on sewerage capacity and requirements. None of these key bodies has objected to the development in principle</p> | |
| David Sims Southern Water (30 Hillreed) | <p>Southern Water is supportive of the objectives of SUDS provided arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of them, so that their effectiveness is maintained in perpetuity.</p> | <p>Both briefs mentions the need for this and propose the use of a management or utility company to do this.</p> | |
| David Sims Southern Water (31 Wards / Barratt) | <p>Southern Water is supportive of the objectives of SUDS provided arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of them, so that their effectiveness is maintained in perpetuity.</p> | <p>Both briefs mentions the need for this and propose the use of a management or utility company to do this.</p> | |
| David Sims Southern Water (30 Hillreed) | <p>Seek to ensure that new foul sewerage infrastructure is located outside of the areas susceptible to flooding or that this infrastructure is sealed to ensure that there is no ingress of flood water into the foul sewerage system.</p> | <p>Noted - a matter for detailed planning application stage, but an explanatory sentence in the brief would assist clarity on this matter.</p> | <p>Hillreed brief - add an explanatory paragraph on utilities provision.</p> |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|--|---|
| David Sims Southern Water (31 Wards / Barratt) | Page 10 New drainage infrastructure has not provided capacity for the additional development proposed in the updated Development Brief. Off site sewerage improvements are required to avoid flooding of downstream properties. | Works will need to be appropriately conditioned/made subject of a Legal Agreement (sewer requisition) at planning application stage | |
| Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) | Overall flood protection would be better achieved by relocating the public open closer to the Iwade Stream space, at an overall reduced or negative cost. At odds with planning principles which state that covering areas with non porous material increases the rate of run off / absorption. | As required by AAP9 the relationship with the Iwade Stream and potential flooding is addressed in the Brief, with built development kept away from the identified flood risk area closest to the stream. The principle of use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems throughout this development will involve the use of porous materials and the use of measures to control runoff. This issue does not necessitate the relocation of the public open space. | |
| Utilities | | | |
| David Sims Southern Water (30 Hillreed) | Section 2.13 No capacity in existing local sewers to accommodate the whole development. Hillreed have initiated a sewer requisition to serve the development, but development should not be occupied until additional capacity has been provided . | Works will need to be appropriately conditioned/made subject of a Legal Agreement (sewer requisition) at planning application stage. | |
| David Sims Southern Water (31 Wards / Barratt) | Drainage Strategy - page 33: Investigations show that there is currently no spare capacity in the existing local sewers to accommodate any additional wastewater flows arising from the proposed development. Propose new para for this section: <i>There is insufficient capacity in the existing local</i> | Works will need to be appropriately conditioned/made subject of a Legal Agreement (sewer requisition) at planning application stage | Wards brief needs an extra sentence to assist understanding of provision. |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|--|---|
| | <p><i>sewer to serve the development proposed in this Development Brief. The developer must therefore requisition a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as defined by Southern Water. Development cannot be occupied until the necessary additional capacity has been provided.</i></p> | | |
| <p>David Sims Southern Water (30 Hillreed)</p> | <p>With regard to water distribution, investigations show that there is currently no capacity to serve all of the proposed development. Southern Water is providing Trunk Main improvements to serve the town of Sittingbourne, which are programmed for completion in Autumn 2011. Until these improvements are complete Southern Water has agreed to the occupation of 150 dwellings on the Hillreed site.</p> | <p>Works will need to be appropriately conditioned/made subject of a Legal Agreement at planning application stage</p> | <p>Hillreed brief needs an extra sentence to assist understanding of provision.</p> |
| <p>David Sims Southern Water (31 Wards / Barratt)</p> | <p>Omission – Water Supply: Investigations show that there is currently no spare capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Southern Water is providing Trunk Main improvements to serve the town of Sittingbourne, which are programmed for completion in Autumn 2011.</p> <p>We propose insertion of the following text, titled Water Supply, in section 6.0 Land Use and Development Proposals:</p> <p><i>Water Supply There is insufficient capacity in the existing local water distribution network to serve the</i></p> | <p>Works will need to be appropriately conditioned/made subject of a Legal Agreement at planning application stage</p> | <p>Wards brief needs an extra sentence to assist understanding of provision.</p> |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <i>development proposed in this Development Brief. The developer must therefore requisition a connection to the network at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as defined by Southern Water. Development cannot be occupied until the necessary additional capacity has been provided</i> | | |
| David Sims Southern Water (31 Wards / Barratt) | Delivery of Development - page 35 : We support that the provision of highways, drainage and utilities will be undertaken in advance of development. | Noted | |
| Traffic and Car Parking | | | |
| Steve Dunnett (2) Mel Smith (6) "Smokey" (e-mail) (14) Liz Green (26) Amanda Hurrell (28) Mr & Mrs Lammas (35) D Chapman (36) Mark Pugh (38) J Exley (47) | <p>Parking and number of vehicles in Iwade near breaking point.</p> <p>Village already used as a cut through. Roads not suitable for more houses.</p> <p>Village centre congested and hazardous - cannot cope with traffic from 400 more houses. Insufficient parking at the centre especially for school.</p> | <p>Kent Highways Services have been consulted during the preparation of both the Local Plan and these development briefs and have not raised any objection in principle.</p> <p>Development will be required to provide car parking to current Kent Vehicle Parking Standards.</p> <p>The design and layout of the new development is such that walking and cycling from the new development to the village facilities (other than the recreation ground) is no more than 400 metres.</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Mr & Mrs Miller (3) Mel Smith (6) Brian Mc Court (9) Julian and Christine East (17) AR Cook (23) Amanda Hurrell (28) JC White (32) Lisa O'Flynn (34) Gemma Coleman (41) Paul Tipler (42) Iwade Parish Council (45 Wards / Barratt)</p> | <p>New access road should be provided to access the Wards site reducing the amount of traffic in the centre of the village especially during construction phase. 400 new dwellings will result in 1000 extra vehicles in the area.</p> <p>Query route of construction traffic and route for residents to access the proposed new Wards development. No construction vehicles to be using Woodpecker Drive. Parish council considers that the haul route is essential to avoid previous disruption and mud on roads. Wheel washing facility</p> | <p>The proposed access was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Inspector considered the access from HTC and Woodpecker Drive to be appropriate. Subject to consideration of detailed design by Kent Highway Services no additional harm should be experienced by existing residents.</p> <p>The access to the proposed masterplan accompanying the Wards development brief indicates that permanent access to the land east of Woodpecker Drive and Helen Thompson Close will be off the above named roads. However these will be designed to serve residential areas, not as "through roads" and the introduction of a key feature where the two intersect, which would also serve to slow and control traffic. The new development is still in effect an extension of the culs de sac.</p> <p>There are no legal covenants or ransom strips which prevent this. Opening the cul de sac is not a ground for Blight as set out in planning law.</p> <p>It is envisaged that construction traffic will not be routed along the estate roads. A temporary route could be provided from Grovehurst Road which would go to the east of the existing estates – this will be subject of a temporary planning application and the route would be removed post-</p> | <p>Wards / Baratt development brief could include an extra section on design of estate roads for traffic calming to max 20 mph and expand on design to be used at intersection of Woodpecker Drive / Helen Thompson Close.</p> <p>Ward / Barratt brief needs to be updated for consistency on provision of haul road.</p> |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>essential .</p> <p>Status of temporary access road direct from Grovehurst Road for construction traffic? Object to Helen Thompson Close being linked up with Woodpecker Drive for vehicular traffic – during and post construction.</p> <p>Purchased property in cul de sac - does not wish to live on through road. Additional traffic will be hazardous and detrimental to amenity. Will blight properties in HTC.</p> <p>Object to vehicular access via Helen Thompson Close - informed that this would be via Woodpecker Drive.</p> <p>Verbal assurance that Helen Thompson Close would remain a close by sales office personnel is binding in law. Contractual obligation to maintain the area which will now be opened for access.</p> | <p>construction. This arrangement is envisaged in the Barratt development brief; but there is no planning justification for insisting on it. Page 35 identifies it as “an option under consideration”, but page 37 confirms a separate temporary planning application for this. Conditions on planning permissions can be used to ensure provision of a wheel washing facility for construction vehicles.</p> <p>There are no realistic alternatives to taking permanent access from existing roads in the area on the Wards/Barratt development.</p> <p>Other private legal arrangements entered into between individuals and the developers are unfortunately beyond the scope of planning law.</p> | |
| <p>Miss Williams (4) Steve Carnt (12) Paula Robb (46) AR Cook (23)</p> | <p>Congestion with school parking Use of Woodpecker Drive for school parking</p> | <p>The design and layout of the new development is such that walking and cycling from the new development to the village facilities (other than the recreation ground) is no more than 400</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| J Exley (47) | | <p>metres. A walking bus scheme is in operation with the school.</p> <p>School traffic will form part of a Transport Assessment and Green Travel Plan will be required as part of any detailed planning applications and must satisfy Kent Highway Services.</p> | |
| Iwade Parish Council (49 Hillreeds) | <p>The IPC stress the importance of building a haul road, and providing wheel washing equipment at the Sheppey Way exit. Also detailed highway management issues at Chetney View layout; Sheppey Way footpath; and Featherbed Lane cycleway.</p> | <p>The developer's agent confirms "Hillreed have undertaken as part of the planning application negotiations to build nearly all the development from Sheppey Way on the basis of a condition offered saying <i>No construction access for the development hereby permitted shall be taken from School Lane other than for the purposes of completing the permitted improvement of the lane and its frontage, formation of new accesses on the lane, the construction of a maximum 30 dwellings and associated landscaping works. Other than this all construction access shall be from Sheppey Way.</i></p> <p>As you will appreciate this is an onerous task involving a very long haul road and the early construction of a bridge."</p> <p>This and the detailed highway management issues will be matters for Kent Highway Services (the draft Chetney Way design is already with them for comment) to advise on in the context of the forthcoming consideration of planning applications</p> | |
| Iwade Parish Council (49 Hillreeds) | <p>The Development Brief 1999, page 21, requires a bus stop, shelter, and information boards to be provided at the western end of School Lane 'so as to maximise accessibility from both existing and proposed dwellings , covering all</p> | <p>The draft brief itself and the masterplan layout requires a spine road designed for bus use. Land can be made available in the road layout by Hillreed Homes for the future construction of bus shelters by the bus company when it</p> | <p>A reference to provision of a bus shelter in the Hillreed brief would be useful.</p> |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <i>development within a broad 400m radius'.</i> | decides to commence a service through the development. A condition should be able to secure this on the planning application but a reference can certainly be put in the brief if desired. | |
| Derek and Eve White (11) | Increased traffic in School Lane resulting from development would be a major concern. Vehicular access from Sheppey Way would be favoured and avoid the need to drive through the middle of the village. | The Hillreed development brief deals with this issue; access will be from both School Lane and Sheppey Way. Footway and cycle links between the new development and the rest of the village are also included in the Brief. | |
| Janet Hill (24) Mark Butler (33) Julian Watt (48) | Too much emphasis on the Hillreed link road and using both ends of it as construction access would cause disruption for entire village. Main routes through the village should remain Ferry Rd and School Lane rather than trying to construct a mini ring road. Link road likely to become a rat run. The link road would be treated as a short cut to the motorway. The emphasis should be on walking and cycling at this estate. | Transport Assessment Plans and Green travel Plans will be required as part of any planning applications. The Hillreed brief states at section 3.5 that the link road must be traffic calmed to 20 mph. Footway and cycle links between the new development and the rest of the village are also included in the Brief. | |
| Kent Police Crime Reduction & Architectural Liaison Officer (10) | Carparking should be in accordance with appropriate standards. | Car parking at least to current Kent vehicle parking standards will be required and are set out in both briefs. | |
| Paula Robb (46) Mr & Mrs Lammas (35) | Bus Timetables don't link to train stations Station car parking inadequate in Sittingbourne Public transport not suitable for more development in Iwade . | Regeneration of Sittingbourne Town centre is addressing the rail commuter parking issue. Bus operators are more likely to run extra services if there is sufficient demand from new development to do so. | |
| Paula Robb (46) | Roads remain unadopted in exiting development some years after construction and road surfaces already in poor condition. | This will be referred to Kent Highways. Introduction of mobile cctv with new | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Speeding cars and antisocial behaviour at night a problem. | development may assist with this problem. (see Design and security below) | |
| AR Cook (23) | Woodpecker Drive suffers severe parking problems as it is close to village centre, playground (which is too big and lavish for the village and attracts people from elsewhere in large vehicles); business and trade vehicles parked there; workers from village centre. Village centre car parking inadequate. | Kent Highways Services have been consulted during the preparation of both the Local Plan and these development briefs and have not raised any objection in principle. Development will be required to provide car parking to current Kent Vehicle Parking Standards. The design and layout of the new development is such that walking and cycling from the new development to the village facilities (other than the recreation ground) is no more than 400 metres. A walking bus scheme is in operation with the school. The play area was designed to serve Iwade village - the Council cannot control who uses it. | |
| Nature Conservation and Ecology | | | |
| Sean Hanna Natural England(37) | <p>Comments relate to both of the development briefs and have been combined. Re-emphasise that the Iwade developers should also work together to prepare an ecological masterplan for the Iwade area to provide integrated network of wildlife corridors.</p> <p>No reference to Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards in the briefs. It is important that <i>all</i> developments incorporate multifunctional green infrastructure to provide a variety of ecosystem services such as enhancing biodiversity, providing sustainable drainage, allowing adaptation to climate change along with the health benefits it brings to local residents. Consequently, we recommend the development briefs are amended to provide further clarification on how these</p> | <p>Appropriate ecology statements will be submitted as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Agree this is important will seek to ensure quality management and longevity of open spaces to come forward with detailed planning application.</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>developments will meet the accessible natural greenspace standards.</p> <p>Given the proximity of both development brief sites to The Swale Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Site) along with the Medway Estuary and Marshes SSSI, SPA and Ramsar Site, indirect impacts upon the designated sites may result from both of these development briefs for example, increased recreation pressures. Given the potential for indirect impacts, it would be appropriate for a screening exercise to be undertaken to ascertain whether these development briefs would result in a likely significant effect upon these sites. Depending upon the results of the screening exercise, a full appropriate assessment may be required</p> | <p>The Swale Borough Local Plan (2008) was the subject of an Appropriate Assessment. As this allocation was given extensive discussion at Local Plan Inquiry and subsequently approved, it is not considered that further screening of impacts is necessary. However, further clarification on this matter is being sought from Natural England.</p> | <p>Subject to clarification with Natural England.</p> |
| <p>Environment Agency (43)</p> | <p>No objection in principle to this development, but proposed development will only be acceptable if a planning condition is imposed requiring a scheme to be agreed to ensure that any bridges across the Iwade stream are of an acceptable clear-span type to promote nature conservation.</p> <p>There must also be a buffer zone between the development and the watercourse. The buffer zone needs to be at least 8m metres wide measured from bank top for the whole extent of the site to allow for movement of wildlife along river corridor.</p> | <p>Biodiversity and bridge design will be secured by planning conditions.</p> <p>Development brief acknowledges and meets this requirement.</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| Iwade Parish Council (45) | <p>Concerns over ecology of the Old Orchard site. The Development Brief has been prepared to provide guidance on the implementation of the Local Plan to develop land east of Woodpecker Drive, Iwade, a Greenfield site allocated on the Proposals Map, to accommodate 90 homes. The Iwade Parish Council (IPC) is of the opinion that no development should be allowed on the old orchard land which has the highest quality habitat for great crested newt, smooth newt, slow-worm, grass snake, marsh frog, viviparous lizard and noble chafer beetle.</p> <p>The development conforms with recommendations made by the Local Plan Inspector that 0.85ha of an old orchard would be designated for housing following the Local Plan Inquiry held between April 2006 and January 2007. The Inspector noted the <i>'old orchard which also has nature conservation and biodiversity interest'</i>. The Peoples Trust for Endangered Species announced the discovery of noble chafer beetle larvae in the old orchard after the Local Plan Inquiry closed in 2007. The noble chafer beetle is a BAP protected species and was thought to be extinct in Kent until its rediscovery at Iwade.</p> <p>The Inspector was aware of the importance of the old orchard for biodiversity interests and in the next paragraph says that in the event of the compensatory habitat 0.99ha of arable land being unavailable</p> | <p>Further ecological advice has been sought to conform the adequacy of the Wards / Barratt Brief in respect of the orchard and compensatory habitat. This is as follows:</p> <p>Whilst the orchard provides quality habitat to support a diversity of species, partial loss of the orchard will not be detrimental to the populations present if mitigated for as per the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The results of the Noble Chafer indicate half the trees occupied by Noble Chafer and more than half the trees that are potentially occupied by Noble Chafer will be retained. Although some trees supporting/potentially supporting Noble Chafer occur in the area that is proposed for development, a detailed mitigation strategy has been prepared to more than compensate this loss. It has been devised in collaboration with the People's Trust for Endangered Species and the Wildlife Trust and includes such measures as transplanting occupied and young trees, as well as planting additional trees to create a varied age structure with the aim of providing long-term suitable habitat for generations of Noble Chafer to come.</p> <p>The results of the Great Crested Newt survey show that the population in Pond 7 has not changed since 2004 (when 22 individuals were recorded in a single site visit), with 20 individuals being recorded in a single site visit during the 2008 surveys. Mitigation proposals, which include pond restoration, pond creation and terrestrial habitat creation, will greatly enhance the newt populations in Iwade, as well</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>as other species such as reptiles, bats, small mammals and invertebrates.</p> <p>Although the arable field is currently unsuitable terrestrial habitat, we have proposed measures to accelerate the establishment of the compensatory area. As Great Crested Newts are protected under European law, a European Protected Species (EPS) licence will be required to permit development. EPS licence applications require an assessment of impacts, measures to mitigate the impacts and a means for safeguarding the population in the local area. The mitigation strategy, which will include reverting an arable field to suitable Great Crested Newt habitat, will be subject to Natural England approval. Should it be approved, it will be a legal requirement to preserve the compensatory habitats in perpetuity, thus safeguarding the population and consequently other species in the local area.</p> | |
| Derek and Eve White (11) | Welcomed the nature conservation corridor planned for the rear of Meadow Rise, but queried the boundary treatment and fencing maintenance. | The Hillreed brief shows retention of the hedgerow in this vicinity which will function as a wildlife corridor. Ownership and maintenance of any existing boundary fencing will not be a matter for the brief, but retention of the hedgerow and its relationship to any abutting residential development will need to be addressed at detailed planning application stage. | |
| Mr PB and Mrs PRA Lovelock (15) | The wildlife corridor could be markedly increased, at overall reduced or negative cost, for species that are known to exist and for other creatures by moving the public open space closer to the Iwade Stream to | Both development briefs address biodiversity issues. I note the observations of Natural England both in regard to provision for biodiversity in the new development and in terms of possible | Subject to clarification with Natural England. |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| | provide a block of space rather than just a corridor. | implications for designated sites in the wider area. The briefs may need to be amended to satisfy Natural England's requirements. | |
| Liz Green (26) Julian watt (48) | <p>Scope for decrease in density, given open space areas are quite large. Have larger nature reserves around the stream especially in vicinity of Coleshill Farm and rear of Mansfield Drive /Monins Road and reduce the amount set aside behind the medical centre.</p> <p>Landscape and character of area around Coleshill Farm and the stream should be conserved at all costs and area around stream sued as mini nature reserve.</p> <p>Concern about wildlife issues on the Hillreed site.</p> | <p>The briefs have had to work together to provide a minimum amount of public open space to serve the new development; and work around flood risk issues; and conservation or compensatory measures for wildlife habitat. The solution as presented in the brief is a reasonable balance of a number of conflicting objectives.</p> <p>The comments from Environment Agency (above) ensure that the river corridor will be conserved as a wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The Hillreed area has less ecological value than the Wards site. Nonetheless an ecology survey will need to be submitted at application stage, and be subject of further consultation with Natural England.</p> | |
| Design and Security | | | |
| Kent Police Crime Reduction & Architectural Liaison Officer (10) Smokey (e-mail) (14) | <p>Strongly recommends use of ACPO/ Home Office Secured By Design award scheme for new development .</p> <p>Liaison with Kent Police Architectural Liaison Officer essential at the earliest stages of scheme preparation.</p> <p>Concern at possibility of antisocial behaviour.</p> | Both development Briefs refer to SBD. The assessment of detailed planning applications will include consideration of this issue, including liaison with Kent Police. For the purpose of the development briefs it is sufficient to establish this as one of the key considerations in working up the detailed layout of the new development. | |
| | Narrow pathways to rear of properties should be | Noted – a matter for detailed planning | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| | avoided. Attractive links can be formed through amenity space and should be well lit and clear of hiding spaces | application stage. | |
| | Public access/ permeability - casual intrusion should be discouraged and permeability via footpath links can provide escape routes and should be taken into account in design. | Permeability is an important urban design principle in creating an interesting place with some character and reducing the need to travel by car. However the appropriate balance between making development permeable to non-car users and limiting accessibility in the interests of limiting opportunities for criminality will be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage | |
| | Defensible space: including marking the boundaries between public and private space; ensuring that there is good surveillance of public spaces from buildings; image good quality design to avoid stigma; juxtaposition of well used communal areas and residential areas . | For the purpose of the development briefs it is sufficient to establish these as one of the key considerations in working up the detailed layout of the new development. | |
| | Landscaping: Communal shrubs and hedges should be kept to no more than 1 metre height and all trees in pruned to 2.2 metres to maintain clear field of vision around all site. Mature trees shouldn't mask street light columns. | Structural landscaping is another important urban design principle in creating an attractive and interesting new neighbourhood, as well as providing some opportunity for biodiversity. The appropriate balance between achieving this and compromising the scheme in the interests of limiting opportunities for criminality will be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage | |
| | Car Parks: Secured Car Park scheme principles are strongly recommended . This includes provision for lighting; good natural surveillance and secure cycle parking. Care is need for design o fparking areas with undercroft access. | Noted – a matter for detailed planning application stage. | |
| | Recesses (entrances); Whilst pleasing aesthetically, provide shelter for crime. | The appropriate balance between achieving good and interesting design and compromising | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | the scheme in the interests of limiting opportunities for criminality will be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage | |
| | Boundaries: Walls and fences need to strike a balance between security surveillance and privacy. Lockable gates should be provided for | Ditto | |
| | CCTV: Would be useful to identify a few strategic lamp posts with the capacity to run the Hawk-eye mobile police cctv system. | Whilst the precise locations would be a matter to be resolved at detailed planning application stage, the need to do this could usefully be included in the briefs. | Include mention of the need to provide for suitable posts compatible with mobile cctv in the development briefs, when the detailed site layout is worked up. |
| | Wards Brief: Commends inclusion of Secure by design; permeability; sustainability - development not sustainable if crime is not designed out. | Points already answered above - balance to be struck in detailed planning applications on crime prevention and creating an attractive place. Sustainability is not exclusively about crime prevention. | |
| | Hillreed Brief: Commends inclusion of Secure by design; should also apply to the play area. | Noted . | |
| Issues with Consultation Process | | | |
| <p>Jo Kirkham (1) Julian and Christine East (17) AR Cook (23) Mel Smith (Brooks) (27)</p> | <p>Queried accuracy / completeness of reporting Wards Statement of Community involvement undertaken during 2008</p> <p>Wards have not adhered to promise to send out leaflets to update residents on what is happening.</p> <p>Further to my last email regarding the proposed opening up of Helen Thompson Close, Iwade into a road, it would appear that only a selected few residents actually received your letter of notification JD/AVN..</p> <p>Also, we were not informed of the meeting at the Iwade Village Hall last Friday regarding</p> | <p>Note that the respondents had an opportunity to view the advance work prepared by the developer last summer.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement developers are "advised to undertake pre-submission consultations in a form to be agreed with us". Wards/Barratts have been made aware of the concern expressed and confirm that public consultation has been carried out village-wide.</p> <p>Wards Statement of Community Involvement confirms that 500 letters were sent to near neighbours and 750 leaflets</p> | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | the proposed development. | <p>made available to residents to take away from its exhibition.</p> <p>Hillreed placed Notices in local newspapers, publicised on the village website. Letters were sent to the Parish Council, local groups and amenities and supplemented with posters and banners.</p> <p>The Borough Council has co-ordinated the public consultation on the revised development briefs which has run from May – 1 June 2009. Letters were posted on 1 May, giving a full four working weeks for comments to be submitted. Adequate consultation has now been undertaken on the development briefs. There will be further opportunities to comment on the detail of planning applications as they are brought forward.</p> <p>The Borough Council was not however involved in the meeting of representatives of the Parish Council and local residents on 22 May, which we understand was a local initiative.</p> | |
| Concerns with Existing Development | | | |
| Jo Kirkham (1) D Chapman (36) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor quality and tardy finish to existing Wards development. • Poor and damaged road surfaces. • Poor site management. • Developers will need to be closely monitored to ensure this does not arise with new development | Whilst these matters are not issues for this development brief, matters such as site management; landscaping and quality of materials can be controlled via conditions to planning permissions. Enforcement action can only be taken by the local planning authority if the terms of a planning permission are | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 – 10 commercial vehicles regularly parked in residential street, contrary to regulations. • Developers not interested in solving problems caused by them or wellbeing of the community once development is in. | <p>contravened. Building out and completion of a site may take place over a significant period depending on market conditions.</p> <p>The agent for Wards/ Barratts has nevertheless been made aware of residents concerns over poor site and customer service.</p> | |
| David Ruse (7) D Chapman (36) | <p>Existing surface water drainage built by Matthew Homes and Hillreed Homes is ineffective; and management company set up via covenants to oversee maintenance of balancing pond is not working well.</p> <p>Management company for green space also not working effectively.</p> | <p>Regrettably, the covenants are a private legal matter between the homeowners and the original developers, which are beyond the scope of the planning system.</p> <p>See comments above on flooding and drainage issues.</p> | |
| Iwade Parish Council (45 Wards / Barratt) | <p>The Iwade Parish Council has received complaints that the drainage authority Southern Water will not accept responsibility for the domestic soil pipe connections because they are said to be too small in Church Mews, The Street and Helen Thompson Close. The IPC understands that residents of 10 -11 Church Mews being at the bottom of the hill have had sewage backing up in their bathrooms and had to call out private contractors to clear the pipes. Similarly a resident at the bottom end of Helen Thompson Close had to pay hundreds of pounds to clear a sewage pipe and the resulting overflow caused by pipes deemed to be too small. Before any further houses are built on the high land above Helen Thompson Close the developers should talk to residents and rectify this problem.</p> | <p>Whilst these matters are not issues for this development brief, the agent for Wards/ Barratts has nevertheless been made aware of residents concerns over poor site and customer service.</p> | |
| Invited to Comment but declined | | | |
| Bobbing Parish Council | No comment | Noted | |
| The Coal Authority (19) | No comment | Noted | |
| CABE (20) | No comment due to lack of resources | Noted | |
| Dominic Veasey (South East England) | No comment | Noted | |

| Respondents | Summary of Comments | Swale Borough Council Analysis | Action Notes for Development Briefs |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Partnership Board) (22) | | | |