

Vistry Homes (Tenterden) Steering Committee
Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 22nd July 2024

Present:

Vistry Homes: Paul Dadswell (PD)

SEC Newgate: William Neale (WN)

Kent County Council: Cllr. Mike Hill (MH)

Ashford Borough Council: Cllr. Ken Mulholland (KM)

Tenterden Town Council: Cllr. Kayleigh Brunger-Randall (KBR) & Claire Gilbert (Deputy Town Clerk) (CG)

Tenterden Town Council Climate Action Advisory Group: John Crawford (JC)

Tenterden Community Land Trust: Mark Ellender (ME)

Tenterden & District Chamber of Commerce: Lance Hopley (LH)

Tenterden Residents Association, Tenterden Neighbourhood Plan & Tenterden Wildlife: Saggi Nepp (SN)

Limes Land Protection Group: Samantha Reed (SR)

Update from Vistry Homes

1. Trees - have been cleared at the entrance to the site under detailed consent and the approved method statement; this has been carried out under a watching brief. The current works will allow the installation of a bell mouth at the entrance; this is not the final entrance but allows the work vehicles to access the site safely.
2. Ecology – the end has nearly been reached for the trapping period, although there must be five clear days of no catches before they can end the trapping completely. At the moment, they are still trapping a lot of reptiles. As they are approaching the end of the translocation period, strimming will be taking place on site which is to reduce the grass height to 15cm initially; this is being done in consultation with the ecologists to encourage species to move towards the trapping.
3. Archaeology the trial trenching will start on 12th August 2024, however this date might need to be pushed back if the trapping has not finished. Vistry will update the Steering Committee once a definite date is known. It is likely that no more archaeological works will be required unless something is found. As soon as the trapping and archaeological works are finished, full works can start on site.
4. Drainage Infrastructure – this is being completed this week which involves putting in a new manhole along the Appledore Road. There were some issues regarding it being placed on a resident's driveway, but this misunderstanding has been resolved and the drain will be placed in the grass verge. The drain would not be connected, but the infrastructure will be in place ready for when the pavilion goes online. It was noted that there would be no changes to anyone's drainage until the development progresses further.
5. Memorial Bench & Memorial Oak Tree – these were currently located at the site entrance and will need to be relocated; it has not been decided yet where these will be relocated to.
6. Fencing - additional fencing will be installed on site as the current Heras fencing is being vandalised. For the areas that will be worked on more regularly, these will be fenced off completely.
7. Planning Application – PD reported that he had recently met with the Planning Officer Mark Davies who was currently reviewing the consultee comments. PD stated that Vistry would like to review all the consultee comments, locals' views and those of the Planning Officer before they make any changes to the submission documentation. Once the Planning

Officers comments have been received by Vistry, PD agreed to provide feedback at the relevant Steering Committee meeting.

8. Biodiversity Net Gain & LEMP documentation – PD reported that they needed to submit the LEMP which was overlooked when the Reserved Matters application was submitted. The initial high level BNG proposal which showed the schemes was submitted, but Vistry were now focusing on the finer details with the landscaping element amended if not suitable. Any resubmission to ABC would include a full report, which includes an ecological plan.

Questions

1. SR asked whether permission had been obtained for the archaeological trenches, given that KCC had raised concerns regarding works and required more information. PD reported that RPS would agree the strategy with KCC at which time they would go through the process. At the present time, the condition had not been signed off therefore works could not start. SR raised her concerns that some of the proposed trenches were near the Drove Road and was concerned that the heritage asset could be damaged. PD reported that RPS would advise on this matter if there is an issue. RPS had carried out a geophysical survey which identified the areas that would need to be targeted, however, it would be down to KCC to approve the area.
2. KBR reported that issues were raised regarding WW2 debris being on site and asked whether it had been taken into consideration, particularly the possibility of unexploded bombs due to the flight path across Tenterden during the war. PD reported that the archaeologists will liaise with UXO experts, which is what they do across all sites. If intrusive surveys were required, this would be carried out before any further works would take place. It was unclear whether Wates had already carried out these surveys, but PD would check. JC reported that from his understanding, Wates had only carried out desktop surveys.
3. SN asked how the translocation process was going. PD reported that they had not found many newts on site which was surprising, however there were lots of other reptiles including slow worms. PD stated that once the trapping is finished, Bakerwell will submit a report to ABC which will include details of all reptiles caught. PD agreed to obtain a brief update from Bakerwell of what had been caught so far.
4. SN reported that a film producer is looking to create a case study documentary from the beginning to the end of the Limes Land development with a focus on biodiversity, nature friendly, climate and sustainability interventions. It would be a series of short films of no more than five minutes each, but this is still at the developmental stage. As to whether it goes ahead would rest with Bakerwell for them to come on board.
5. SR asked when the Reserved Matters application might be determined by ABC. PD stated that Vistry would expect to have to make amendments, but they were hoping to have feedback from Mark Davies soon. Vistry would hope to submit any changes for consideration in September with October/November most likely for approval.
6. The withdrawal of the application for the substation was queried. PD reported that the Planning Officer had stated it was not a non-material amendment and should be either a minor amendment application or full application. PD reported that a noise assessment survey was requested which is unusual, however, Vistry were in the process of arranging an acoustic survey after which the application would be submitted; it is anticipated that the substation would not require being moved. SR asked whether there would be only one substation on site. PD reported that at the moment, they expect to only have one however, it is unclear at present whether one would cope due to climate mitigation expectations, i.e. EV chargers do drain the system more quickly. It was noted that air source heat pumps and solar panels would be installed to appropriate properties to

achieve building regulations, as well as EV chargers. However, PD stated that the regulations are changing almost weekly.

7. KBR raised her concern that recently some builders were on site carrying out noisy works at 7am and was this a mistake or standard practice. PD stated that working hours should be agreed with ABC and will need to be approved under the set conditions. PD agreed to review the condition however, he did state that works should take place in sociable hours.
8. JC asked when Vistry plan to submit their Construction Management Plan as currently residents do not know how to communicate to Vistry when there are issues on site. PD stated that any issues should be communicated via WN on email or be brought to the Steering Committee. PD reported that the CMP was being produced in the next couple of weeks, but they were waiting on the consultant. The works currently taking place on site are enabling works; it is not actually Vistry on site but a contractor. It was noted that there will be a Vistry Site Manager on site when the works fully get underway.

Action:

1. PD to obtain a brief from Bakerwell on what has been trapped so far.