

---

<b>Trottscliffe Downs</b>	<b>564135 159977</b>	<b>27.05.2005</b>	<b>TM/05/01678/FL</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

Proposal:	Picket fence around front garden (retrospective)
Location:	Rose Farm Cottage Addington Lane Trottscliffe West Malling Kent ME19 5DW
Applicant:	M Lineham

---

## **1. Description:**

- 1.1 This retrospective application relates to a front boundary fence which has been erected around 3 sides of the front garden of a listed cottage, abutting the carriageway of Addington Lane near the village green. There are two vehicular accesses on each side of the site.
- 1.2 The fence comprises white painted timber rails and vertical pointed timber palisades. Its height is a maximum of 1.1m above the level of the carriageway on the northern side (the height of the corner post) and is a maximum of 1.4m above the level of the carriageway on the southern side (the height of the corner post).
- 1.3 The agent has submitted a supporting statement, summarised as follows:
  - My client feels this fence provides a more fitting image to the cottage and reflects the original appearance shown on old photographs taken before the asphalt road was formed through the village.
  - Only a very small corner of the fence on the right hand side of the garden infringes the 2m splay.
  - Vision is not hindered as the driveway rises sharply from the road and Addington Road also rises away from the entrance.
  - The fence is open in design, reducing the risk of impaired vision.

## **2. The Site:**

- 2.1 The site is a Grade II listed cottage which has recently undergone extensive renovations including extensions to the flank and rear.
- 2.2 It is on the eastern side of Trottscliffe village green, in the centre of the Conservation Area.
- 2.3 It directly abuts the carriageway.

**3. Planning History (relevant):**

- 3.1 TM/05/00114/LB Approved 01.04.2005  
Listed Building Application: Two storey flank and rear extensions, renovations and replacement of windows.
- 3.2 TM/05/00595/ORM Approved 30.03.2005  
Additional side porch and revised front porch (revision to planning permission TM/04/00980/FL [two storey flank and rear extensions and detached car port]).
- 3.3 TM/04/00982/LB Approved 27.08.2004  
Listed Building Application: Two storey flank and rear extensions, renovations and replacement of windows.
- 3.4 TM/04/00980/FL Approved 27.08.2004  
Two storey flank and rear extensions and detached car port.

**4. Consultees:**

- 4.1 PC: Objects: The new fence is different to the previous fence which was lower, unpainted and approx. 1m from the lane. The new fence is virtually on the road and impairs visibility at a point where the road narrows to one lane. It is white which makes it much harder to see through. The fence is not sympathetic to neighbouring properties and changes the open nature of that part of the village green.
- 4.2 KCC (Highways): The fence does not impede forward vision for vehicles emerging from the driveway and therefore no objections.
- 4.3 Private Reps + LB/CA Press + Site Notice (5/2R/0X/0S). Two objections have been received which state that the fence spoils the harmony of this part of Trottiscliffe and crowds the house onto the narrow road. The fence is likely to be knocked down by traffic. Concern for the safety of traffic and pedestrians as the road narrows outside the cottage. One objector is under the impression the verge on which it is built may be Council verge.

**5. Determining Issues:**

- 5.1 One issue is whether the fence is appropriate to the setting of this listed building and whether it conserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 5.2 The agent has submitted an old photograph which shows a previous front fence (unpainted diamond trellis) albeit set back from the kerb line. I am of the opinion that the white painted timber palisade fence now erected is suitably vernacular and domestic in scale and has a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building. I therefore find no fundamental conflict with policies P4/ 1 and P4/4 of the TMBLP.

- 5.3 The second issue is highway safety. The main planning permission for the extensions to the Cottage required vision splays to the driveway of 2m by 2m with no obstruction over 0.6m in height.
- 5.4 The fence breaches this condition because at each corner, the fence is between 1m and 1.4m above the level of the carriageway (the maximum heights being the corner posts).
- 5.5 Members will note that KCC (Highways) does not object to the proposal and I concur with their view because both driveways rise up from the level of the carriageway that has the effect of reducing the actual obstruction of vision.
- 5.6 Therefore, approaching vehicles or pedestrians can see cars or other vehicles positioned on the elevated driveways. Similarly, drivers in such vehicles are adequately raised up so that they can see approaching pedestrians or vehicles from both directions along Addington Lane.
- 5.7 On the individual merits of this case, I consider that there is no justification for refusal on highway safety grounds.
- 5.8 The applicant has submitted a title plan that shows Title extending to the edge of the carriageway, that is, the fence is not sited on highway land.
- 6. Recommendation:**
- 6.1 **Grant Planning Permission** as detailed by letter/photographs dated 27.05.2005 and drawing 3A.

Contact: Marion Geary