
Plaxtol Borough Green And Long Mill	560610 153537	2 October 2007	(A) TM/07/03561/FL (B) TM/07/03562/CA
--	----------------------	-----------------------	--

Proposal: (A) Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2no. detached dwellings (resubmission of 07/01900/FL)
(B) Conservation Area Consent Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2no. detached dwellings (resubmission of 07/01902/CA)

Location: Little Mount The Street Plaxtol Sevenoaks Kent TN15 0QG

Applicant: Mr Terry Groom

1. Description:

- 1.1 Conservation Area Consent is sought for the demolition of Little Mount in The Street, Plaxtol, and planning permission is sought for two dwellings in its stead. The existing dwelling is a fire damaged, detached bungalow with a detached garage. Access is via a shared drive off The Street, which is used by Little Mount, The Rectory and Old Orchard. The Oast House to the south has separate shared access to the east with Daltons Farm.
- 1.2 The applications follow withdrawal of TM/07/01900/FL and TM/07/01902/CA earlier this year.
- 1.3 The existing dwelling is a modest low level 'L' shaped bungalow (ridge height of 5.2m). The dwelling is currently unoccupied. All living accommodation at Little Mount is at ground floor level.
- 1.4 Two dwellings are proposed each with four bedrooms (and each with en-suites), and ground floor living space. The existing access to the site off the shared drive is proposed to remain unchanged to serve both dwellings.
- 1.5 The dwelling proposed adjacent to The Rectory (Plot 1) would have a cat-slide roof detail to the west and two storey gable feature on the right of the front elevation. Brick and weatherboarding is proposed and projecting bay window details are shown. The overall height to ridge is 7.5m, though there is a large section of flat roof within the roof design.
- 1.6 The proposed dwelling to the east (Plot 2) is proposed to have a cat slide to the west roof slope and 1½ storey gable to the right hand side of the front elevation. The ridge height is proposed at 6.6m and the first floor is contained within the roof space. Brick and vertical tile hanging details are proposed.
- 1.7 Both dwellings are proposed to be set at a lower slab level than the existing bungalow by approx 0.8m.

2. The Site:

- 2.1 The site lies to the north of The Street, and to the east of the village centre of Plaxtol. The site is a back-land plot, set behind The Oast House which lies between the application site and The Street. The site is accessed via a steep shared drive and is not highly visible from the street level as there are mature boundary treatments and landscaping which limit views up into the site. The existing bungalow is further obscured due to its low ridge level and siting, which is set back from the front boundary of the application site.
- 2.2 To the west of the site lies The Rectory and to the east lies Daltons Farm and its grounds.
- 2.3 The southern third of the site lies within the built confines of Plaxtol and the northern two thirds falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The entire site lies within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a designated Conservation Area.

3. Planning History:

TM/65/10654/OLD Grant With Conditions 26 April 1965

Three detached dwellings, garages and access road.

TM/67/10652/OLD Grant With Conditions 3 February 1967

A bungalow and garage, (as amended by plan enclosed with letter dated 21st January 1967).

TM/07/01900/FL Application Withdrawn 6 September 2007

Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of two detached dwellings

TM/07/01902/CA Application Withdrawn 6 September 2007

Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of two detached dwellings

4. Consultees:

4.1 PC: Objection.

4.1.1 Plaxtol Parish Council has received 2 letters of objection from local residents.

4.1.2 This site lies on the edge of Green Belt which must be protected - please ensure that the Green Belt will not be encroached.

- 4.1.3 The bulk and scale of this proposal in the Conservation Area would neither enhance or improve the locality.
- 4.1.4 Cllrs are concerned that there is insufficient turning area for vehicles outside plot no2.
- 4.1.5 The increased vehicular movements over the drive shared with The Rectory would result in a hazard for pedestrians.
- 4.1.6 The proposal does not include provision for garaging.
- 4.1.7 Plaxtol Parish Design Statement (page 32) - 'a major challenge for the Developer is to design buildings with similar and existing qualities whilst also accommodating the car but avoiding the frontage being dominated by car parking'.
- 4.1.8 Cllrs request that should the permission be granted future development rights be removed to prevent further creeping development on the site.
- 4.1.9 The proposal is too close to neighbouring properties and will encroach on the privacy of adjacent properties.
- 4.1.10 Plaxtol Parish Councillors have requested that this proposal is presented to full planning committee for consideration.
- 4.2 KCC (Highways): No objections.
- 4.3 DHH: Comments received regarding bonfires which may cause a nuisance and a condition or informative is requested.
- 4.3.1 Housing comments have been received expecting the delivery of 40% Affordable Housing which equates to a minimum of 1 affordable unit for social rent. A condition has been requested to secure the delivery of affordable housing.
- 4.3.2 The site is not identified as a site of potential concern regarding contamination according to available historic and planning data, though a condition has been suggested relating to ground contaminants.
- 4.4 Kent Fire and Rescue Service: Additional information was requested regarding the width of the access gates and the type of driveway proposed. These details were provided and I have received no further comments from the KFRS.
- 4.5 Chief Building Control Officer: There should be vehicle access for a pump appliance within 45m of all points within the building.
- 4.6 Private Reps (15/0X/3R/0S + Site and Press Notices)

2 letters of objection received from The Oast House, 1 letter received from Old Orchard and one letter received from Dalton's Farm which are adjacent neighbours to the proposal. The following objections were raised, in summary:

- Size of the proposed units is excessive for the site in the village envelope, particularly in context with surrounding houses.
- The original permission for Little Mount was restricted to a bungalow because of the site area and the proximity to neighbours. There is also a covenant on this site which restricts development on the site.
- The proposal does not conform with the Plaxtol Plan and Design Statement, (specifically p10 of Plaxtol Plan and p32/33 of the Plaxtol Design Statement).
- Understanding that national policy allows for this type of development in principle, however they should be of an acceptable size.
- If permission is granted restrictions should be put in place to resist future applications for development such as garages and extensions.
- The proposal would redefine the building line that has been historically established.
- The development constitutes back land development, in a Conservation Area which would allow those with large gardens to build in this way.
- The proposed footprints, within this small plot can only be achieved by extending well beyond the adjoining properties. This is overdevelopment of the site and in so doing has redefined the building line.
- The height and level of the building has been improved between applications.
- The designs do not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
- Parking and impact on pedestrians visiting The Rectory.
- The position of Plot 2 is in an area totally undeveloped at present. This plot will overshadow the patio and garden area of Daltons Farm. The flank (east) first floor windows will infringe the privacy of the garden, master bedroom and bathroom of Daltons Farm.
- No objection in principle to a replacement dwelling but it should be limited to the size and scale of the original structure.

5. Determining Issues:

- 5.1 The appropriateness of demolition of the existing dwelling must be considered prior to consideration of the proposed re-development.

- 5.2 The main determining issues in the re-development proposals for the site are; the principle of the development in this location, its scale, layout and appearance, the impact of the proposal on residential and visual amenity, and highway concerns such as parking and turning provision. In addition, whether the proposed houses would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 5.3 The site lies partly (approximately the southern third) in the village envelope of Plaxtol and predominantly (the remaining northern two thirds) in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The entire site lies within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a designated Conservation Area (CA).
- 5.4 The proposed demolition of the fire damaged bungalow Little Mount must be considered against PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment. Consideration for demolition in a CA must pay "special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA in question" and "...account should be taken of the part played in the architectural or historic interest of the area for which demolition is proposed." PPG15 goes on to state that "consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable and detailed plans for any redevelopment."
- 5.5 Although Little Mount is damaged by fire, it is not beyond restoration and, as such, its current damage does not form a material consideration of its acceptability for demolition.
- 5.6 The building is a 1960's low level L-shape bungalow, which does not have any specific architectural or historic merit. Accordingly, the existing dwelling does not make a positive contribution to the character or setting of the CA. Though, in turn, if restored, it would not have a negative impact either. Therefore, although its retention would preserve the existing character of the CA, it would not enhance its appearance. It is my opinion therefore, that in principle Little Mount could be demolished in accordance with PPG15, provided there is an acceptable and detailed scheme in place for redevelopment, which would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
- 5.7 The proposed redevelopment comprises a replacement dwelling plus an infill dwelling, resulting in a net gain of one dwelling on the site. As the proposed two dwellings both lie within the built confines of Plaxtol, the principle of a replacement dwelling and infill development, is in broad policy terms acceptable and at a national level, making the best use of available land in settlement confines is supported in principle.
- 5.8 Policy CP13 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy, adopted 2007, defines Plaxtol as a rural settlement where minor development is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement. In addition, proposals for redevelopment in rural settlements must not result in a higher trip generation than the former use, unless there is some significant improvement to the appearance,

character and functioning of the settlement, or if there is an exceptional need for affordable housing.

- 5.9 The proposal would constitute “minor” development as one infill property is proposed, plus a replacement dwelling. It must therefore be considered whether the proposal is in keeping with the scale and character of Plaxtol. It is clear that an additional dwelling would result in a higher projected trip generation than the existing single dwelling. Therefore the proposal must result in a significant improvement to the appearance, character and functioning of the village.
- 5.10 The proposed dwellings are four bedroom, four en-suite houses with large living accommodation at ground floor, and as a result, large footprints and floorspace. The external dimensions of each plot are:
- Plot 1: width = 12.5m, overall depth = 16m, height to eaves = 4.9m, height to ridge = 7.5m.
- Plot 2: width = 12m (excluding side bay window), overall depth = 15.3m (excluding rear bay window), height to eaves = 3.6m at front and 4.9m to rear, height to ridge = 6.6m.
- 5.11 The proposed dwellings have different designs though the general level of accommodation proposed is similar. The dwelling proposed adjacent to The Rectory (Plot 1) would have a cat-slide roof detail to the west and two storey gable feature on the right of the front elevation. Brick and weatherboarding is proposed and a projecting bay window detail. The overall height to ridge is 7.5m, though there is a large section of flat roof within the roof design.
- 5.12 The proposed dwelling to the east (Plot 2) is proposed to have a cat slide to the west roof slope and 1 ½ storey gable to the right hand side of the front elevation. The ridge height is proposed at 6.5m and the first floor is contained within the roof space. The rear elevation shows a two storey façade. Brick and vertical tile hanging external details are proposed.
- 5.13 Both properties would have “table-top” roofs. No garages have been proposed though off street parking is provided on site for over three spaces per dwelling plus turning provision.
- 5.14 The general scale, form and height of the proposed dwellings is, in my opinion, in keeping with the immediate and wider locality, which on this eastern ribbon section of Plaxtol, is characterised by large dwellings in generous plots.
- 5.15 The footprints proposed are large for the locality, though that in itself is not a reason for refusal, unless that footprint has a negative impact, due to its proximity, on neighbouring dwellings for example. I do not consider the proposed footprints to be unduly large for the proposed plots. Indeed, although the area within the application site which can be developed (built confines) is restricted, the overall

plot for each dwelling is large, with large gardens extending north into the Green Belt. It is for this reason that I do not consider the proposal can be considered overdevelopment of the site, as the site must be viewed in its entirety.

- 5.16 The proposed two dwellings as a whole have been designed and sited to provide a comfortable spacing between the site boundaries and between the two houses. In addition, the cat-slide roofs provide further openness and separation to the proposal.
- 5.17 The detailed design, in terms of architectural merit; features gables, cat-slide roofs, weatherboarding and tile hanging which are all Kentish building features and all of which are present elsewhere in Plaxtol Village. I therefore consider the general design, in terms of external appearance, would not result in harm to visual amenity or the streetscene. I therefore consider the proposal to accord with Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy policy CP24 (2007) and Kent and Medway Structure Plan policy QL1 (2006) in this respect.
- 5.18 The scale of the proposed dwellings in terms of their bulk and massing has been significantly reduced since the earlier applications were withdrawn. The reduction in bulk and massing seeks to overcome the impact of the proposed dwellings on the adjacent neighbours, specifically The Oast House. The impact of the proposed houses is increased due to the levels of the site and surrounding land which are shown on the submitted levels and street sections.
- 5.19 The existing ground floor of Little Mount is located just below the internal first floor level of The Oast House. This significant change in levels from the application site down to road level is an important consideration in this application. A two storey house, plus roof on Plot 2 would undoubtedly result in harm to the outlook of The Oast House and have an overbearing impact on its occupants. However, the proposal has been reduced (through design and the use of levels) on Plot 2 to a 1½ storey dwelling with a 6.6m ridge, which in my opinion is sufficiently reduced, with a condensed mass and bulk at high level, to overcome previous concerns. It is my opinion therefore, that the bulk and massing of the proposal would not cause undue harm, in terms of overbearing impact and loss of outlook, on The Oast House to the south.
- 5.20 Plot 1 is proposed to be approx 3m closer to The Rectory than the existing bungalow and has been sited further back on the application site. The Rectory has first floor flank windows that overlook the application site and the proposal would, by being sited further back, allow for sufficient light and outlook to these windows. The Rectory would not, in my view, be able to unduly overlook Plot 1, as the first floor flank windows would only have views over the front garden and parking area proposed forward of Plot 1. To further reduce the possibility of loss of privacy, the first floor westernmost window on the front elevation of Plot 1 is proposed to serve an en-suite and would be obscure glazed.

- 5.21 Although Plot 1 is set further back on the site than the existing bungalow, the proposed dwelling would not result in a breach of the 45° rule. It is this and the orientation of The Rectory and Plot 1, which would, in my view ensure that there is not an undue loss of outlook from The Rectory.
- 5.22 The first floor east flank of Plot 2 shows two dormer windows to overlook Daltons Farm, the northernmost of which is proposed to serve an en-suite bathroom and would be obscure glazed. There is mature landscaping, to remain on this boundary and there is a distance of 15-16m between the flank dormer serving the bedroom and the corner of Daltons Farm. Daltons Farm is located on a large plot with many opportunities for private garden space other than on land between the application site and the house. In addition, a distance of 15m flank to flank is sufficient to overcome an undue loss of privacy to habitable rooms. I do not therefore consider that the proposed Plot 2 would have any undue impact on the residential amenity of Daltons Farm.
- 5.23 I do not therefore consider, provided that the proposal was appropriately conditioned, that the scheme would result in an undue loss of residential amenity to either The Rectory, The Oast House, or Daltons Farm. The proposal accords with policy QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006 in this respect.
- 5.24 The objection letters received and the Parish Council make reference to a defined building line, which contributors consider would be breached by the proposed dwellings. Policies do not seek to protect a given building line, but policy QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006 does make reference to proposals responding positively to the “pattern” of their local surroundings. The application site is not within an area of Plaxtol which has a defined or repetitive pattern of development. Indeed, the immediate locality on the north side of The Street is a mix of detached houses, varying distances from the road edge and a set of four terraced cottages very close to the edge of the highway. Golding Orchard, a recently constructed replacement dwelling to the west of The Rectory is set back significantly from The Street and the proposed dwellings at Little Mount would indeed be in line with the rear building line of Golding Orchard. Moreover, the Plaxtol Parish Plan states that “*The centre of the village focuses on The Street, and combines terraced and detached houses with no particular discernable pattern.*” I therefore consider that the proposal would respond positively to the pattern of development in this area of Plaxtol.
- 5.25 Objections received also raise concerns about the net gain of one house though do not object to a one-for-one replacement of Little Mount. However, although a one-for-one replacement could not be resisted, in principle on this site; the best use of land available within settlement boundaries would be better served by the addition of one unit on this site rather than one large house replacing a small bungalow. Two dwellings would also ensure that the site provides an improved mix of housing.

- 5.26 The imposition of a covenant on the site by the previous owner does not constitute a material planning consideration and cannot therefore form part of the consideration of this application.
- 5.27 Page 10 of the Plaxtol Plan, as referred to in objections received, relates to the threat of bungalows being demolished to allow for two or more houses which reduces the housing mix and specifically properties suitable for elderly persons. I understand the underlying reasons behind this from a village perspective, however, the demolition of a single dwelling on a large plot and replacement with more than one, is supported at local, strategic and national levels of policy. Although the Plaxtol Plan is adopted as a material planning consideration as a supplementary planning document, it does not override the objectives of all levels of planning policy.
- 5.28 Objectors have stated that the proposal is contrary to p32 of the Plaxtol Parish Design Statement. Paragraph 2(a) of the Principles, Guidelines and Procedures section of the Plaxtol Parish Design Statement (p32) sets out three specific criteria for new and replacement dwellings, these are:
- i) *the building line, scale and massing of the dwelling should take into consideration the lie and level of the ground, the positioning within the plot, landscaping, including boundaries, and trees should be preserved to retain the character;*
 - ii) *in the case of infill housing, new proposals should be supported by 'street scape' plans or photo montage to demonstrate how the new properties would relate to surrounding buildings in terms of height and scale;*
 - iii) *a major challenge for the Developer is to design buildings with similar and existing qualities whilst also accommodating the car but avoiding the frontage being dominated by car parking.*
- 5.29 The considerations of building line, scale and massing, levels and positioning have all been addressed above as individual issues. Street scene plans, street sections and level details have all been submitted to fully demonstrate the relationship between the proposals and surrounding buildings in terms of height and scale. The proposal has considered car parking provision. Accordingly, it is my view that the proposed scheme accords with the Plaxtol Parish Design Statement in all of the respects outlined above.
- 5.30 Paragraph 2(d) of the same section of the Plaxtol Parish Design Statement seeks to encourage smaller dwellings in the interests of a balanced community. In this respect having two relatively large dwellings rather than the possibility of one even larger dwelling would be more in keeping with the pattern of development in the village and provide more variety and availability of housing.

- 5.31 It has been requested that if approved, the new dwellings are restricted from future additions. Due to their location at the very edge of the built confines boundary, I consider the removal of permitted development rights for additions to be an appropriate and reasonable restriction to protect encroachment into the open countryside and Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 5.32 The proposal has been described within representations as being “back land” development. The site is in a back land setting but the existing dwelling has established the use of the land as residential. The additional dwelling proposed on the site, above the replacement dwelling, is sited side by side with the proposed replacement and as such, the additional dwelling is considered as an infill plot. In any event, there are no specific policies which restrict back land development.
- 5.33 The site would provide adequate parking and turning provision to accord with the maximum requirements of Kent parking standards. Accordingly, KCC Highways raises no objection to the proposal.
- 5.34 No plans for landscaping or boundary treatments have been submitted though a detailed scheme would be required by condition. As the site lies within the CA all trees are currently protected unless specific notification is made for any works to the Council.
- 5.35 It has been established that minor development is acceptable in this location provided that the trip generation is not higher. The addition of an additional dwelling in this location would result in a higher trip generation, though marginally over and above the existing site. However, as the site is located off a shared drive and sufficient parking and turning is available, I do not consider that there would be an undue impact on the local highway network. Moreover, KCC Highways has raised no objection on highway grounds. I therefore consider the increase in trip generation to be marginal and the on site parking and turning provision would override this marginal increase.
- 5.36 In addition to the above the removal of the existing bungalow and replacement with two dwellings as shown, would have a positive contribution to the appearance and character of the locality and in turn enhance visual amenity. This view is made due to the subservient nature of Little Mount, which does not positively influence the character of the settlement, as described in paragraph 5.6 above. The proposed dwellings have an individual character, whilst incorporating Kentish features and materials. These dwellings would therefore, in my view provide a more apparent architectural input to the streetscene, whilst being set back from the street. I therefore consider that the proposal would accord with policy CP13 of the Core Strategy in this respect.
- 5.37 For the same reasons outlined in the above paragraph, I consider the proposals for redevelopment of the site would accord with PPG15 as they would provide a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and thereby enhance the special

character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would also therefore accord with policy QL6 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006.

- 5.38 Policy EN4 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006 seeks to protect the natural beauty of the AONB while policy CP7 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy also seeks to ensure users quiet enjoyment of the AONB. The proposal would retain a large area of open garden to the rear, and the development proposals set out would only encroach marginally further north than the footprint of the existing bungalow (though they remain in the confines boundary). Accordingly, I do consider that the principles of policies EN4 or CP7 would be upheld.
- 5.39 The Director of Health and Housing has requested provision of affordable housing due to the site area of the proposal. However, it would be a departure of national, strategic and local policy to allow the entire site to be developed. Accordingly, the actual developable area of the site is the southern third which lies within the built confines. This site cannot therefore be made to secure the provision of affordable housing as it does not meet the threshold.
- 5.40 In light of the above considerations, I am satisfied that the demolition of Little Mount is justified and the development proposals are acceptable in principle. I consider the detailed design, siting, scale, form, pattern and character of development is appropriate and would not give rise to harm to residential or visual amenity. In addition I consider that the proposal would also enhance the character and setting of the CA.

6. Recommendation:

- 6.1 **(A) TM/07/03561/FL: Grant Planning Permission, subject to the following conditions:**

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. No development shall take place until details and samples of materials to be used externally have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the visual amenity of the locality.

3. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping and boundary

treatment. All planting, seeding and turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be implemented during the first planting season following occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the earlier. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying, being seriously damaged or diseased within 10 years of planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees or shrubs of similar size and species, unless the Authority gives written consent to any variation. Any boundary fences or walls or similar structures as may be approved shall be erected before first occupation of the building to which they relate. (L003)

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

4. No building shall be occupied until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space(s) has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown (other than the erection of a garage or garages) or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space. (P003)

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking or garaging of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

5. No building shall be occupied until the area shown on the submitted plan as a turning area has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved turning area. (P011)

Reason: Development without provision of adequate turning facilities is likely to give rise to hazardous conditions in the public highway.

6. Any gateway to the access shall be set back 5.0 metres from the edge of the highway. (H013)

Reason: To enable vehicles to stand off the highway whilst any gates are being operated.

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order) no development shall be carried out within Class A, B, C and E, of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of that Order unless planning permission has been granted on an application relating thereto. (R001)

Reason: In the interest of maintaining the openness of the countryside and Green Belt and residential amenity.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the first floor west (flank) elevation of Plot 1 other than as hereby approved, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. (D013*)

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control any such further development in the interests of amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the first floor east (flank) elevation of Plot 2 other than as hereby approved, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. (D013*)

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control any such further development in the interests of amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

10. The window on the first floor (east) flank elevation of Plot 2 serving an en-suite shall be fitted with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung light shall be non-opening. This work shall be effected before the room is occupied and shall be retained thereafter. (R003*)

Reason: To minimise the effect of overlooking onto adjoining property.

11. The window in the gable of the first floor front elevation on Plot 2 shall be fitted with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung light shall be non-opening. This work shall be effected before the room is occupied and shall be retained thereafter. (R003*)

Reason: To minimise the effect of overlooking onto adjoining property.

12. The westernmost window at first floor level on the front elevation of Plot 1 shall be fitted with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung light shall be non-opening. This work shall be effected before the room is occupied and shall be retained thereafter. (R003*)

Reason: To minimise the effect of overlooking onto adjoining property.

13. No development shall be commenced until:

(a) a site investigation has been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, and

(b) the results of the investigation, together with an assessment by a competent person and details of a scheme to contain, treat or remove any contamination, as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment and scheme shall have regard to the need to ensure that contaminants do not escape from the site to cause air and water pollution or pollution of adjoining land.

The scheme submitted pursuant to (b) shall include details of arrangements for responding to any discovery of unforeseen contamination during the undertaking of the development hereby permitted. Such arrangements shall include a requirement to notify the Local Planning Authority of the presence of any such unforeseen contamination.

Prior to the first occupation of the development or any part of the development hereby permitted

(c) the approved remediation scheme shall be fully implemented insofar as it relates to that part of the development which is to be occupied, and

(d) a Certificate shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority by a responsible person stating that remediation has been completed and the site is suitable for the permitted end use.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety. (N015)

Informatives

- 1 With regard to the construction of the pavement crossing, the applicant is asked to consult The Highway Manager, Kent Highways, Joynes House, New Road, Gravesend, Kent, DA11 0AT. Tel: 08458 247 800.
- 2 The applicant is advised to not allow bonfires on the site during demolition and construction works as this would result in a nuisance to adjacent residents and is contrary to Waste Management Legislation.

(B) TM/07/03562/CA:

6.2 Recommendation (B) TM/07/03562/CA: Grant Conservation Area Consent, subject to the following condition:

1. The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made and

planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides. (C004)

Reason: To ensure that the demolition is carried out as a continuous operation with the redevelopment of the site, in the interests of visual amenity.

Contact: Lucy Stainton