





TM/08/01270/RD      Approved

28 May 2008

Details of external lighting control and management submitted pursuant to condition 2 of planning permission TM/07/03969/RM: 3 storey B1 development with separate energy centre building and associated landscaping and car parking (approval of reserved matters TM/05/00163/FL).

## **5. Consultees:**

5.1 West Malling PC: No comments.

5.2 Kings Hill PC: No objections subject to no left-in/left-out junction to the A228.

5.3 KHS: No new highways issues from the amendments.

5.4 DHH: No comments.

5.5 Private Reps + site and PROW press notice: (15/4R/0S/0X) Objections are as follows:

5.5.1 We are satisfied by the boundary planting that in the long term will provide partial screening. Our objections to the building itself still stand. The fact that it is a reserved matters approval means that there is general consent for commercial premises to be built on an area of which the application is a sub-site. All reserved matters applications should still meet the general planning policies and guidelines and the specific Kings Hill policies laid down by TMBC which we do not believe that this building does: this building will be intrusive beyond Kings Hill, it will negatively impact our nearby conservation area which has its inward and outward views protected by planning policy; the planning committee agreed at the last meeting that it was a sensitive site, in fact one of the most sensitive sites on the whole Kings Hill estate; the revised plans have removed the fretwork that gave the committee some comfort that the outline might be somewhat broken up when viewed from afar.

5.5.2 The sample of glazing confirms our fears that the elevation will be highly reflective, given the almost mirror-like reflection of the buildings opposite the glass sheets. We believe that the applicant should be required to adhere to the originally intended frit work for safety reasons and to reduce the adverse visual impact of the building on the surrounding landscape.

5.5.3 I am extremely concerned about the final outward appearance of the Rolex Building in what is meant to be a rural area. The proposed glazing panels will cause unnecessary glare and reflection for drivers on the A228 and for all who live in the close proximity.

- 
- 5.5.4 The previous objections and concerns of New Barns hamlet residents are still relevant. These concerns were recognised and taken into consideration by committee members. In particular there was discussion surrounding both the possible negative visual impact of the main building on the overall landscape given that it is a near-boundary development situated in a rural area and the likely impact on the New Barns conservation area.
- 5.5.5 Given the landscape and conservation area setting to be treated sensitively, it was felt that the exterior frit work on the West and East elevations of the building was crucial to softening its visual impact both on the countryside and landscape in general and in reducing the impact on New Barns in particular e.g. the materials are dark coloured facades with frit work that will be a mix of colours mainly black/dark grey/green. The officer report considered that this use of materials and the colours to be used will be the most effective in created a subdued visual impact.
- 5.5.6 We were therefore distressed and disappointed to learn that the proposed frit work on the West and East elevations is replaced by a metal framework over glazed panels, this would lead to a negative visual impact of the building in the wider landscape as viewed from the New Barns conservation area, the A228 approach and from further a field.
- 5.5.7 Such an external appearance could create unacceptable and unsafe glare from Lavenders Road bridge, Lavenders Road (to the west of the bridge) and from the New Barns Oast drive in particular. We do not believe that the proposed poplar planting to the North East boundary of the Rolex site would have any impact from these vantage points.
- 5.5.8 The bunding which will be established along the north/east boundary of the Kings Hill site, should not be used as a reason for granting permission for changes to the external appearance of the site.
- 5.6 We are also disappointed to see that it appears that the applicant has not accepted the invitation to consider a reduction in slab levels to minimise the visual impact of the building.
- 5.7 We strongly urge the Council to reject the changes to the exterior appearance of the building and to require the applicants to revert to the original plans for the frit work.
- 6. Determining Issues:**
- 6.1 In the light of the February 2008 approval of reserved matters, the issues relevant in this application are limited to the changes: additional tree planting; a larger energy centre and the loss of a frit work pattern and change in colouring of the main east and west elevations of the building.

- 
- 6.2 The landscaping changes will serve in the long term to screen the development from the residents of New Barns and Members will note this change is supported by the private representations received.
- 6.3 The enlargement to the energy centre comes about from an unforeseen constraint of using ground source energy. Any extra length/bulk is to be screened by landscaped enclosures to each end and therefore no objections are raised.
- 6.4 The issue of contention if the change in materials to the 2 main elevations. As has been highlighted by the objectors, this was a matter which I discussed in some detail in the February 2008 report.
- 6.5 Since that report, Policy P2/2 of the TMBLP has been superseded by Policy E1 of the Development Land Allocations. This requires, *inter alia*, development in Kings Hill not too impact on rural amenity by visual intrusion. Other policies referred to in the February Report are still valid: Policies TM1 and QL1 of the KMSP and Policy CP24 of the TMBCS in terms of design and impact on the locality and Policies QL6 and QL8 of the KMSP and PPG15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) relating to the character and appearance of Conservation Areas and the setting of listed buildings respectively.
- 6.6 As before, the main building reflects the established bulk of similar office complexes on Tower View.
- 6.7 The approved materials were dark coloured facades with frit work that would have been a mix of colours mainly black/dark grey/green. It was considered that those materials and colours would be the most effective in creating a subdued visual impact in the surrounding rural area as they help the building blend in with its setting when it is viewed against tree-scape that is predominantly green with black shadows in the summer and brown with black shadows in the winter.
- 6.8 It is the case that the loss of the frit work will alter the visual mix of colours and there will no longer be an external vertical pattern that would resemble trees. However, the external glass does have a green tint and I have no reason to doubt the architect's assertion that this is the only option for the external curtain glazing that will be adequately environmentally sustainable to combat solar heat gain. The inner layer will be a mix of grey-green coloured glass and grey-green panels and I remain of the opinion that, viewed in combination, the palette of colours seen externally will be sufficiently subdued and appropriate for the location of this building.
- 6.9 I share the disappointment of the objectors that the frit-work pattern on the glass is being lost as the new elevations are architecturally less interesting. Rolex have sought formal approval for the amendment. That does indicate to me that they have weighed up the issues and likely objections but have still decided that the impact of the frit-work on the internal conditions in the workshop is detrimental enough to seek a fresh approval of Reserved Matters.

6.10 Members will be aware that planning decisions have to be made on their individual merits, that is whether the external materials now being submitted are acceptable *in their own right*, notwithstanding any previous approval for a different treatment. Whilst Members may feel that the revision will be architecturally less interesting, I would advise that the palette of colours (grey and green-grey) is adequately subdued for the proposed location of the site at the edge of Kings Hill, close to, but not abutting, the rural area. I therefore recommend approval.

## 7. Recommendation:

7.1 **Approve Reserved Matters** as detailed by: Certificate B dated 03.07.2008, Letter dated 03.07.2008, Notice dated 03.07.2008, Letter dated 28.07.2008, Elevations VIEW FROM SOUTH WEST dated 28.07.2008, Site Plan 1813(PI)102 P2 dated 03.07.2008, Location Plan 1813(PI)104 P7 dated 03.07.2008, Floor Plan 1813(PI)111 P9 dated 03.07.2008, Floor Plan 1813(PI)112 P8 dated 03.07.2008, Floor Plan 1813(PI)113 P6 dated 03.07.2008, Floor Plans And Elevations 1813(PI)114 P3 dated 03.07.2008, Elevations 1813(PI)125 P5 dated 03.07.2008, Elevations 1813(PI)126 P8 dated 03.07.2008, Section 1813(PI)135 P7 dated 03.07.2008, Section 1813(PI)136 P6 dated 03.07.2008, Plan 1813(PI)150 P2 dated 03.07.2008, Landscaping WT1265L01 K dated 03.07.2008, Landscaping WT1265L02 F dated 03.07.2008, Landscaping WT1265L03 G dated 03.07.2008, Design and Access Statement dated 03.07.2008, Report dated 28.07.2008.

Contact: Marion Geary

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS**

AREA 2 PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATED 29 October 2008

---

**Kings Hill  
Kings Hill****TM/08/02086/RM**

**Details of Reserved Matters being; access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale submitted pursuant to planning permission TM/05/00163/FL: 3 storey B1 development with separate energy centre building with car parking and security gate (resubmission of TM/07/03969/RM) at 1 Jubilee Way Kings Hill West Malling Kent ME19 4UW for Rolex Watch Company Limited**

Applicant: All curtain walling spandrel panels and framing are a green grey RAL 7010 plus natural silver anodized brise soleil to the south elevation. Green grey will allow the building to integrate with the surrounding woodland landscape. The outer glass proposed is the only product providing a combined thermal resistance to overheating and a good transmission of natural light that can be obtained in the desired green. Investigations have revealed that a ground source heating and cooling system is not viable at this location. The detail of the construction has not changed, only the frit to the glass has been removed. The approved application proposes no planting at north east boundary. This application proposes planting of a semi-mature woodland mix with faster growing trees for more immediate impact (silver birch and alder) supplemented by a slower growing mix of oak and hornbeam. We believe that establishing a woodland mix will provide better cover than treatment with poplars. Specific Kings Hill policies laid down by TMBC recommend a maximum development height of 17m (catering for 3 storeys) with up to 25m (catering for 5 storeys) in exceptional circumstances. This application proposes a building approximately 14.210m above average ground levels. This is almost 3m lower than the recommended height for a three storey building at Kings Hill and 10.790m below any permitted structure at Kings Hill.

Kings Hill PC: No objections subject to not including the LILO access road.

**RECOMMENDATION UNCHANGED**

---