29 January 2021

Observations from Burham Parish Council

TM/20/02988/OA Land Northwest of Bell Lane Burham Rochester Kent.

Burham Parish Council objects to this plan because it is considered that the impact of the extra traffic generated by this development will be severe.

Particular concern is raised for Bell Lane with the expected addition of further double yellow lines causing more problems for on-street parking. The entrance to Bell Lane is 200 yards from the entrance of the school and would be very dangerous with the use of site traffic. The junction with Bell Crescent is even closer, therefore the access to the development is considered not acceptable and should be moved.

In addition, the poor condition of Church Street prohibits any additional traffic without major problems for the residents. Any additional traffic would exacerbate the fact. Church Street was designed for horses and carts.

If the application is approved, then for access to the Bell Lane Development for construction and vehicular access for new residents of the development MUST be off New Court Rd.

All highways issues raised need to be endorsed by Kent County Council Highways department with suitable mitigation measures recommended or the application refused.

In addition to traffic concerns in these areas of poor road infrastructure, there is also a loss of landscape amenity for both the residents of Bell Lane opposite the proposed development and the residents of Church Street adjacent to the proposed car park. Additional landscaping should be provided in both areas to mitigate to intrusion of the development. The proposed new Car Park in Church Street should be the smaller option with improved access, additional landscaping and low level lighting.

Further details: Inadequate infrastructure

Trenport states the impact will be slight? Yet no KCC agreement or report to confirm this.

They also state NO adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Totally unrealistic!

Opportunities for non- car users?

No access to direct routes and no bus stops on New Court Road. They state that traffic has been robustly assessed? Where is the data?

The structural integrity of the local roads is insufficient. For need of HGV and site machinery, roads will be able to facilitate 40 tonne vehicles as with many older villages road surfaces are neither maintained or up kept to allow/permit such weighted vehicles safely or for prolonged periods of time/use

We have in fact lost our faith in KCC highways for prolonged periods on false promises and as such now find our roads are wholly inadequate for the quiet traffic of lockdown!

To enable this development to proceed, all roads within the village envelope will need to be repaired or resurfaced prior to development and probably post development.

KCC highways also need to be forth coming with the acknowledgment that New Court Road cannot be used as a site entry point (as we suggest) as it is too heavily used and not the safe road they continue to say it is.

Trenport’s TIA (vG) needs to be approved or given clarity by a KCC highways report.

Church street is definitely unsuitable for any HGV access due to it deterioration, with many front doors open on to the street and there are no front gardens. This road dates back to the early 1900s and urgently needs sorting.

Parking inadequate:

After checking KCC design guide and checking parking some newly developed sites have issues regarding parking despite being a good transport linked area.

Rural settings have more cars per household as lack of transportation requires it.

Concerns of Church Street car park to become over spill of Bell Lane housing development.

Another area affected currently used for parking is Baker Street cars from this area (4/6) will be displaced.

Concerns that Church Street will become a pub car park and not alleviate Church Street parking at all.

Safety aspects of site:

Access to site is wholly inadequate for size of HGV, turning etc and would need to be elsewhere for safety of resident’s school children and other road users.

Many pupils of school outside the village requiring being picked up and dropped off?  How? Where? (Safely during development)

Piecemeal development:

The square of land now longer within the development needs to addressed.

An agreement/go ahead with the 58 houses will have an impact as a relatively small development and as such can be adapted in the village envelope with disruption to numerous neighbours. However the currently empty piece could cause further and wide spread disruption disturbance and distress should it be later developed adding more concerns and stretching more pressure on the inadequate infrastructure, more parking problems, disruption to school education and the local environment including the children’s centre in Bell Lane.

School issues:

Whilst the school may benefit from S106 agreement, the needs of the pupils need to be addressed re pollution/disturbance and disruption.

Due to the unprecedented times many children’s education has and continues to suffer and this development would further impede on this

Trenport were asked in the report if Dbs checks would be done on builders, they said this was not down to them, however in such close proximity to a school as a caring developer they should be ensuring this happens and KCC should be ensuring it happens too.

Affordable housing:

In the application, the figure of affordable housing has been put in. Will this again be another Peters Village where this was not meet (40%)?

Trenport state it will free up houses, yet it is still unknown what houses they intend to put there and what the mix will be

Points also to consider

Consideration should be given to local families to keep them within the community.

If landscaping appears behind Rochester road houses where blank space is and along back of school.