

Canterbury & Herne Bay Ambulance Stations- Note of Meeting

18.11.14

Attendees

David Campbell- Canterbury City Council (DC)

Colin Smith- Maddox Associates (CS)

1. Initial comments;
  - CS set out and explained the MRC strategy and the need to dispose of the sites.
  - DC advised that the emerging Local Plan was likely to be adopted before the end of 2015.
  - CIL adoption is still some way off.
  
2. Canterbury Ambulance Station;
  - Drawing no. 1406-SK-02 was discussed.
  - Flatted development in principle acceptable;
  - In design terms, beneficial to pick up design and appearance from building to the north;
  - Need to reflect the transition from the larger building of greater scale to the north to the open land to the south (school playing fields);
  - Block should be moved forward in the site in order to address Military Road. This is also the lower part of the site and will reduce the potential dominance of the proposal;
  - Twelve flats likely to be too many for the site, given the need for parking and suitable amenity space;
  - Maximum likely to be 8 (two floors) or 10 (with accommodation in the roofspace);
  - Access best placed to the northern part of the site;
  - Potential to design the building to have an “active” frontage turning the corner to the public footpath to the southern part of the site;
  - 1 or 2 bed units better rather than 3 bed family units;
  - Minimum size standards for units included in the emerging plan (1b2p = 50 sqm, 2b3p = 61 sqm, 2b4p = 70 sqm);
  - Access should be from Military Road;
  - Longer views of the cathedral should be protected;
  - Emerging affordable housing policy requires 30% on site provision for 7 or more units, financial contribution for below 7 units;
  
3. Herne Bay Ambulance Station;

This site is within the current Strategic Housing Land Allocation Assessment (SHLAA) as site SHLAA/114, but is not allocated in the draft emerging plan.

Drawing 1407- SK- 001 P1;

- Front terrace should be closer to the main road to reflect relationship of properties to the east;
- Rear terrace to run parallel with parking area between the two blocks of dwellings;
- Need to protect amenities of no.183;
- Access road to be to western side of site to minimise noise and disturbance to 183;
- Need to maintain 21m between front and rear walls of dwellings;
- Overlooking to no. 183 to be considered;
- Need to consider noise from railway to rear- report and acoustic barrier may be needed;
- 2/3 bed units appropriate- minimum sizes in emerging plan (2b4p = 83 sqm, 3b4p = 87 sqm, 3b5p = 96 sqm);
- Likely 8/9 units maximum;
- Remove rear pedestrian access;
- Dwellings preferred rather than flatted development;
- Emerging affordable housing policy requires 30% on site provision for 7 or more units, financial contribution for below 7 units.

Drawing 1407- SK002 P1;

- 3 storeys too big in terms of scale and massing;
- Block should be brought forward closer to main road;
- Need to consider noise from railway to rear- report and acoustic barrier may be needed;
- Current layout as shown has adverse impact on no.183 by way of overlooking and overbearance;
- Opportunities for landscaping especially to frontage should be taken;
- Outlook of flats to be considered- avoid looking towards industrial units to the west;
- Maximum likely to be 8 (two floors) or 10 (with accommodation in the roofspace).

DC advised that if part of a wider allocated site, then need to consider links to other part of site. Could be an issue in relation to prematurity. (CS subsequently reviewed emerging plan and SHLAA. Site is not allocated but part of a wider site identified in the SHLAA).