

<b>Platt</b>	<b>562307 157438</b>	<b>8 April 2008</b>	<b>(A) TM/07/01810/FL</b>
Borough Green And Long Mill	<b>562114 157246</b>	<b>27 March 2008</b>	<b>(B) TM/07/01807/FL</b>

Proposal: (A) Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 11 dwellings with car ports and access road  
(B) Erection of 8 dwellings with private access

Location: (A) Platt C Of E Primary School Maidstone Road Platt Sevenoaks Kent TN15 8JY  
(B) Playing Fields Grange Road Platt Sevenoaks Kent

Applicant: Rydon Homes Ltd

---

## 1. Description:

- 1.1 Members will recall that these applications were deferred from the February 2009 meeting of the Area 2 Planning Committee to enable Members to inspect the sites and also to seek revisions to the two applications.
- 1.2 The Members' Site Inspection took place on 12 March and a meeting was held on the 6 April with the applicant to discuss how the two schemes could be amended to address some of the concerns previously raised by members of the public.
- 1.3 The schemes differ from those considered in February 2009 in that the school site was 12 units (now 11) and the playing field site was 7 units (now 8).

(A) TM/07/01810/FL:

- 1.4 This proposal would see the existing school buildings demolished and eleven dwellings erected in their place, together with an access road and car ports. Nine of the dwellings would be arranged in three blocks standing towards the rear of the site. These would be arranged in one terrace of three, one terrace of four and one pair of semi-detached houses.
- 1.5 The terrace of three houses (units 1-3) would stand 8.9m high to ridge level and would incorporate a hipped roof. They would contain three bedrooms each.
- 1.6 The terrace of four dwellings would contain three 2-bedroom dwellings and one 3-bedroom dwelling. The building would stand 7.7m high to ridge. The pair of semi-detached houses within plots 8 and 9 would contain one 2-bedroom dwelling and one 3-bedroom dwelling. This building would stand 7.7m high to ridge.
- 1.7 One of the other dwellings, a 1-bedroom flat, would be located in the first floor (roof void) of a 4 bay car port. This building would stand 7.3m high and incorporate a hipped roof. The remaining dwelling would be a detached 2 storey, 2-bedroom property. These two dwellings would be located towards the front of the site – indeed the north elevation of the car port would form part of the boundary wall that would run along the northern boundary of the site.

- 1.8 A three bay car port would be located on the eastern side of the site, which would be supported only by posts. A hipped roof would stand on top of the timber frame and would be clad with plain tiles. This structure would stand between two mature trees that would be retained under this proposal.
  - 1.9 The buildings would be constructed externally from stock brickwork, plain tile hanging and weatherboarding. The roofs would be hipped and clad with plain tiles. Specific details of materials have not been submitted at this stage.
  - 1.10 A brick wall is proposed to be erected along the Maidstone Road frontage of the site. Due to the change in land levels across the site frontage, this wall would vary in height between 1.8 and 2.4m, except where it would incorporate with the north elevation of the car barn/unit 10. At this point the wall would measure between 3.2m and 3.4m in height.
  - 1.11 A new vehicular access from Maidstone Road would be created at the eastern side of the site and the existing access to/from Platt Common would be closed under this proposal.
  - 1.12 In total, the development would be served by 23 car parking spaces, provided within a tandem layout in communal areas and will be provided on an allocated basis.
  - 1.13 The site area is 0.37 ha. The development of 11 dwellings, therefore equates to a density of 29.7 dwellings per ha.
  - 1.14 Four units of affordable housing would be provided within this development. The applicant has stated that he will accept any mix in terms of tenure that the Borough Council considers to be appropriate
- (B) TM/07/01807/FL:
- 1.15 Previously, seven dwellings were proposed for this site. The proposal is now for eight dwellings. The dwellings would be arranged in a loose circle configuration around a shared private driveway.
  - 1.16 Units 1, 2 and 3 are arranged in a small terrace of 1 no. 2-bedroom and 2 no 3-bedroom houses that would stand 8.1m high to ridge level and would be located towards the front of the site close to Grange Road. Car parking for these dwellings would be located within and in front of a car port located at the southern end of the site in front of these houses. The back gardens of these dwellings would face towards Grange Road.
  - 1.17 Units 4-7 would be arranged as two pairs of semi-detached, 3-bedroom houses at the rear (west side) of the site linked by their garages. Three of these would have attached garages and would stand 8.8m high to ridge level. The parking provision for the fourth unit (unit 4) would be contained within and in front of the car port that

also provides parking for units 1-3. Whilst these units are of the same height, units 6 and 7 would stand on ground that would be 1.1m higher than the adjacent units at 4 and 5, due to the difference with the existing land levels within this part of the site.

- 1.18 Unit 8 is a detached 'L' shaped, 4 bedroom dwelling standing a maximum of 8.5 m high. It would incorporate an integral double garage.
- 1.19 The dwellings would be constructed from stock brickwork, red/orange tile hanging and plain roof tiles.
- 1.20 The site is the subject of Tree Preservation Order ref 12.15.41. This relates to four individual trees (three Oak and one Birch) and three groups of 2 Oak trees. Under the current proposal one Oak and the Birch would be removed.
- 1.21 The site area is 0.32 ha. The development of 8 dwellings equates to a density of 25 dwellings per hectare.
- 1.22 The applicant is proposing to provide 3 affordable units. The applicant has stated that he will accept any mix in terms of tenure that the Borough Council considers to be appropriate.

## **2. Reason for reporting to Committee:**

- 2.1 The applications were deferred from the February 2009 Meeting of the Area 2 Planning Committee. The applications therefore need to be referred back to Members for determination.

## **3. The Site:**

(A) TM/07/01810/FL:

- 3.1 The site lies within the settlement confines of Platt, on the south side of Maidstone Road and contains the existing Platt Primary School and its playground. The site is bound to the west by the main access to Platt Common and to the east and south by residential development within Platt Common.

(B) TM/07/01807/FL:

- 3.2 The site is located within the settlement confines of Platt on the west side of Grange Road and is Platt School's playing field. The site is bound to the north, south and west by residential development. Residential development is also located on the east side of Grange Road. As is stated in paragraph 1.18 the site contains trees that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

#### 4. Planning History:

TM/03/03647/OA      Refuse      15 July 2004

Outline Application: New replacement primary school with attached playing field, new replacement Memorial Hall, 20 affordable houses, 16 private houses and public open space

Members should note that these current application sites are two of the three interlinked application sites that comprised the full extent of TM/03/03647/OA

#### 5. Consultees:

(A) TM/07/01810/FL:

- 5.1 PC: No comments have been received at the time of writing this report concerning the latest revisions to this scheme. Any comments received before the Committee Meeting will be reported in a supplementary report.

(Comments brought forward from my previous committee report relating to the 12 unit scheme).

- 5.1.1 The twelve dwellings on this site give a building density of 32.4 dph which meets national guidelines of 30 to 50 dph and is comparable to recent developments of this scale in the area. The figure of twelve dwellings for this site has also been endorsed by the Planning Inspector and Secretary of State in relation to appeal APP/H2265/A/04/1163825. This Council, however, continues to believe that repeated developments at this density, which is double the current average density within the village envelope, is rapidly having an adverse affect on the overall character of the village and would welcome a reduction in the figure. We therefore object to this level of density for the site.
- 5.1.2 We welcome the inclusion of two of our suggestions to reduce the bulk and height of the previous proposals viz. deletion of the roof rooms and their associated windows plus the reduction of the roof pitch angles on plots 1 to 9. The splitting of plots 4 to 9 into two groups of three is also a valuable improvement. We feel, however, that there may still be scope for further improvement of these aspects of the design through further roof pitch reduction and reduction of the FFLs of plots 4 to 9 by excavation from the existing levels. Reduction of roof pitch would also have the added benefit of making any future application for loft rooms impractical thus retaining any advantage that has been obtained from the current removal of such rooms. Although, as stated above, we feel the number of dwellings is too high, the general proposed distribution of the twelve dwellings on the site is considered to be acceptable as it preserves the important existing trees on the site.

- 5.1.3 There would appear to be two parking spaces for each dwelling, which is the recommendation that the Planning Inspector made for the similar Brickmakers Arms site. As we have often claimed in the past we consider this to be a minimal requirement for this rural location which has a very limited public transport service. The layout and access to the main parking area around plots 10 and 11 is the same as in the previous version of this application and is considered to be unsatisfactory. With all of the parking being in the form of pairs of spaces configured 'nose to tail' there will need to be a great deal of manoeuvring in the limited space available when some spaces are being accessed. The widening of the access to this main parking area to allow cars entering and leaving to pass each other is welcomed. We are concerned not only by the parking arrangements within the site but also by the effect that this development will have on parking arrangements within the general area of the site as the front of the school site has traditionally been used by near-by residents outside of school operating times.
- 5.1.4 The access to the site is considered to be of suitable width with adequate site lines.
- 5.1.5 This proposal has created a significant change to the access available at the entrance to Platt Common. Currently there is an access to the proposal site at the North-West corner that joins onto the Platt Common entrance before it reaches the A25, the actual Platt Common entrance being only of a single car width. With the existing configuration it is very common for cars entering Platt Common to utilise this corner access to the proposal site for highway safety considerations. When entering Platt common from either East or West along the A25 it is not possible to see a vehicle that is leaving Platt Common unless it has actually reached the end of the road. Such a vehicle coming down Platt Common will only be seen by the driver entering after he has started to turn into the entrance and it is normal for the entering vehicle to pull over to the open school site access to prevent blocking of the traffic flow on the A25 while the leaving vehicle exits. This planning application has removed this 'bolt hole' for vehicles entering Platt Common which will, if implemented, result in obstructions to the traffic flows on the A25. We believe that it is a mandatory requirement that the entrance to such a multi dwelling area as Platt Common from a major road such as the A25 is at least wide enough to allow vehicles to enter and exit at the same time. The proposed development has therefore generated a high risk access area at the Platt Common entrance. It should also be remembered that this access is close to the entrance to the Platt Industrial Estate which itself often has congestion due to HGV movements in and out at the same time.
- 5.1.6 Comparison of drawing number SMP-PS-03 of this application with drawing 143/PS1-03 of the previous proposal indicates a change to the position of the site limits on the Platt Common boundary. The new proposal appears to indicate that the position of the existing chain link fence on that boundary is the actual site limit. We feel that the access problem to Platt Common described above could easily be addressed by removal of the earth bank and scrub growth that is just outside of

this boundary and incorporating a retaining wall on the line of the existing fence in order to accommodate ground level differences. This would increase the width of the Platt Common entrance to just over 4m and thus allow two way vehicle movement at this critical access from the A25. Suitable hedging should be incorporated along the proposal site side of this wall to provide natural screening between the development and Platt common. Any planting along the northern boundary of the site must not be allowed to obstruct the Easterly site line of vehicles leaving Platt Common.

- 5.1.7 As with other recent developments we are concerned with the noise levels incident to the site, which are towards the top of NEC Category C, and the appearance of the acoustic wall introduced to mitigate the noise levels within the development site. It is surprising to see that the figures measured for the incident noise on this site are slightly lower than those measured recently at the nearby Brickmakers Arms site even though this location is subject to additional HGV traffic that is accessing the Platt Industrial Estate. We feel that the validity of the calculation of noise levels towards the rear of the site should be carefully assessed.
- 5.1.8 There is inherently limited parking for residents near to this site particularly at Whatcote Cottages and Pine View and it should be borne in mind that Platt Common is a private access road and the A25 is a busy main road. Roads close to such construction sites are often badly affected by parking of the vehicles of workers on the site and we would ask that strong measures be taken to ensure that such workers vehicles must be accommodated within the construction site to avoid such problems.
- 5.1.9 These two proposals are considered to be linked to such an extent that one of the two proposals will not be possible without the other taking place. Therefore two aspects of the proposals can be considered on a combined sites basis.
- 5.1.10 The proposal to include a total of eight Affordable Houses with six of these being for rent and two for shared equity is acknowledged to meet the basic requirements of Policy CP17/2 of the T&MBC LDF in full. The proposals have also made use of clause CP17/4 to incorporate all of this housing onto one of the two sites. This clause, however, is prefixed by the phrase 'In exceptional circumstances'. No such exceptional circumstances have been put forward by the applicants to justify this concentration of that element of housing onto just one of the sites. Unless some valid justification is put forward we consider that the affordable housing requirements should be split between the sites to that they are fully integrated rather than lumped together in a group.
- 5.1.11 The perceived need for affordable housing in the area would be that the emphasis should be on shared equity type rather than the social rented. A variation of the balance between affordable housing categories is allowed under CP17/3 and we would wish to see this balance changed significantly, if not completely, to the shared equity type.

5.1.12 With regard to the absolute number of affordable homes to be incorporated to these two proposals we would like to see a reduction in the total number, which is not substantiated by local need, with any reduction being balanced by means of the commuted sum payment alternative given by CP17/4.

5.1.13 The two site areas and numbers of dwellings are both believed to be just below the level that would require mandatory provision of recreation facilities in one form or another. We believe, however, that due to the strong links between the two developments, they should be considered as one for such purposes. The combination of the two developments covers an area of 0.69 Ha with current proposals for nineteen dwellings. We consider that this is sufficient to justify either the provision of some recreation facility in one or other of the sites or for a contribution to be made for additional facilities within the local area. The safety of children should be borne in mind when considering such facilities as, although there is a longer safer route from the School site to the village recreation ground in Stonehouse Field via Platt Common and the centre of the village, the shorter more direct route is alongside the very busy A25 road.

5.1.14 In the event that these applications become approved we consider that any further extensions to the proposed dwellings by future owners would be very likely to produce sites with very overcrowded appearances. We would therefore ask for removal of permitted development rights on all of these properties so that any additions would require planning approval involving local consultation.

5.2 KCC (Highways): I refer to the above planning application and have no objections to the proposal in respect of highway matters.

It is noted that amended drawings have been submitted reducing the number of units from 12 to 11. The layout on drawing number SMP-PS-03 Rev C is similar to the previous one.

5.3 DHH:

Environmental Protection: (Comments brought forward from my previous report)

The submitted noise assessment shows that this site falls into NEC C, and, as such, permission should not normally be granted. However, I note the design of the buildings will reduce noise in habitable rooms to NEC B. Therefore, if in balancing you are minded to support this application, I would recommend a condition to safeguard the aural amenity of future residents.

Housing:

Investigations/research into this application is ongoing. Further comments will follow in due course.

5.4 KCC (Education and Community Services):

The proposal would create the demand for extra primary and secondary places. At present, the additional requirements for the school places can be accommodated within local schools.

An assessment has identified a need for a contribution towards Libraries and Youth and Community services. The cost of providing additional Library facilities is currently £227.00 per dwelling and youth and Community facilities is currently £827.00 per applicable house or £206.75 per applicable flat.

Adult social services assessments show requirements towards social care at a cost of £1,201 per dwelling.

5.5 Private Reps (Including site and press notices): 16\0X\0S\33R.

No letters supporting the application or making neutral comments have been received. 33 letters of objection were received regarding this application up to the time when it was put to committee in February 2009. Twelve of these letters have been submitted by one local resident.

If comments are received from local residents concerning the merits of the revised (current) submission, these will be reported in a supplementary report.

The reasons for objecting to the proposal are as follows:

- The density of the development is too high.
- The height of the terraced building is too high and will dominate the approach to St Marys Platt.
- The bulk and height of the buildings are unacceptable and will dominate this part of Platt.
- The development will dramatically increase the traffic movements into the A25. This is a dangerous position being near the brow of a hill and a bend from the direction of Wrotham Heath. This traffic combined with that of the new school will add significantly to this dangerous and crowded highway.
- The parking provision of 24 places allows two per dwelling. It is considered that only 16 spaces are usable. The parking is mainly in one compact area and does not seem appropriate for a development of this nature. There is no provision for visitors.
- There is a single lane access to the parking area which will cause problems.
- There should be a proper boundary with Platt Common, such as a wall.



- The proposed mixture of affordable housing does not comply with the Council's adopted policy.
- The ground level with the adjacent site "Pinehurst" is inaccurate, as is the height of this building which is shown in relation to the proposed development.

5.5.1 In addition to the above, a petition with 89 signatories has been received objecting to the proposed development on the grounds that this site and the playing field site development proposal should be treated the same in terms of both density and the application of the affordable housing policy.

(B) TM/07/01807/FL:

5.6 PC: No comments have yet been received at the time of writing this report concerning the latest revisions to this scheme. Any comments received before the Committee Meeting will be reported in a supplementary report.

(Comments brought forward from my previous report relating to the 7 unit scheme).

5.6.1 We are dismayed that the previous proposal for five dwellings on this site has been increased to seven. Although the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State had said with regard to previous proposals for this site that more dwellings should be incorporated than the four proposed at that time, neither authority had actually quantified the number of dwellings that they considered suitable for this site. We understand that the figure of five previously proposed met highway standards for a development of dwellings from a single private access drive and it would appear that the requirements of that standard have been overridden in order to satisfy density requirements from elsewhere. Highway safety should, we feel, be the predominant consideration in such a location and should also take into account the public highway that provides access to this site. As we pointed out in our submission dated 06 July 2007 the entrance to the site is from a very narrow lane, Grange Road, which has no footway for most of its' length and is not wide enough in many places for two cars to pass. We therefore object to the increase from five to seven dwellings on grounds of highway safety in accessing the site itself and on the approach road to the site.

5.6.2 Layout of the dwellings within the site is almost identical to the previous proposal for five dwellings which avoids most of the existing trees on the site and is considered to be acceptable. The physical appearance of plots 3 to 6 is significantly less desirable than the equivalent two dwellings of the previous proposal when plots 3 & 4 occupied the same space.

5.6.3 The car parking provisions show a total of sixteen spaces in either garages, car ports or parking bays, the same number as that previously provided for the five dwelling proposal. Four of these sixteen are associated with plot 7 with the

remaining six plots having two spaces each. Although this allocation may be to, or fractionally above, standard guidelines, we consider them to be minimal for this rural location which has poor public transport access. This could easily lead to parking encroaching onto the access road and inhibiting the movement of any large vehicles that may need to enter the site. Such vehicles would then have to either stop in Grange Road or enter the site and have to leave in reverse as they would be unable to turn round.

5.6.4 As with the previous proposals we welcome the move of the access to the North of the site that will avoid any disturbance to the large mature tree at the existing access. The site lines available from the access are considered suitable for the location.

5.7 KCC (Highways): I refer to the above planning application and have no objections to the proposals in respect of highway matters

The number of dwellings has now been increased from 7 to 8 using the same vehicle access off of Grange Road. Plots 1 to 7 are either 2 or 3 bedrooms with Plot 8 having 4. The plan, number SMP - PF - 03 Rev A dated April 2009, shows Plots 1 to 4 being served by an adjacent car port block with additional parking in front. Plots 5 to 7 being served by an attached single garage with additional driveway parking. Plot 8 is served by a double garage with driveway parking in front. The parking provision meets the maximum requirements of KVPS (2006) and is therefore acceptable. The applicant is reminded of the parking bay and preferred garage sizes stated in KVPS (2006).

5.8 DHH:

Environmental protection:

I would welcome the use of conditions to control the hours of working during the demolition/construction phase and to control bonfires from taking place within the site.

Housing:

Investigations/research into this application is ongoing. Further comments will follow in due course.

5.9 Private Reps: 11\0X\0S\20R letters of objection have been received to the earlier iterations of this development. The reasons for objection are as follows:

- The density of the development is well below that required in current Government guidance contained in PPS 3.

- With regard to the issue of density, the site is being treated differently to the Platt School site.
- The Secretary of State has previously determined that a development of 4 dwellings in density terms was not acceptable.
- Loss of light to the garden of a property to the rear (4 The Ferns)
- The proposed houses will tower over the adjoining properties.
- The trees shown to be left standing are likely to be chopped down, whether or not they are protected.
- The proposed provision of the affordable housing does not comply with the adopted planning policy.

5.10 In addition to the above, a petition with 89 signatories has been received objecting to the proposed development on the grounds that this site and the playing field site development proposal should be treated the same in terms of both density and the application of the affordable housing policy.

5.11 One further letter of objection has been received from a local resident concerning the latest (current) scheme for the development of this site. The objection is raised on the grounds that the further increase to the number of units within this site will impact upon highway safety.

## **6. Determining Issues:**

6.1 The main determining issues concerning these developments relate to the scale of the development within the locality, affordable housing and the impacts of the developments upon highway safety in the locality.

6.2 Both sites are located within the settlement confines of Platt, where minor residential development that is appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement is acceptable in principle under policy CP 13 of the TMBCS. This policy goes on to state that in relation to redevelopment, permission will only be granted if the overall trip generation is projected to be lower than that associated with its former use or if there is some significant improvement to the appearance, character or functioning of the settlement. This element of the policy applies to the proposal to redevelop the school site.

6.3 Policy CP 24 of the Core Strategy requires all development to be well designed and must through scale, appearance, density, layout and character be designed to respect its surroundings.

6.4 This report discusses two separate but related applications and discusses the full merits of each application in turn.

(A) TM/07/01810/FL:

Issues of density, scale, bulk and design

6.5 The reduction to 11 dwellings within this site would reduce the density of development to 29.7 dwellings per hectare. This is a higher density than that of housing located in the immediate area (most notably that located within Platt Common to the south and that which fronts onto Maidstone Road to the west of the site). However current Government guidance contained within PPS 3 states that developments should not have a density of less than 30 dwellings to the hectare. Furthermore, the layout and form of the proposed development is such that it would not appear as a significantly denser development than the existing residential properties in the locality, in my opinion. PPS 3 deals specifically with this issue and reads as follows:

*“The density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. If done well, imaginative design and layout of new development can lead to a more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment.”*

6.6 Much concern has been expressed by objectors to the scale, form, bulk and height of the proposed dwellings. However, I must stress that these comments were submitted regarding earlier proposals, rather than the scheme that is currently before Members to consider.

6.7 The site is not level and the land rises from east to west along the Maidstone Road. Land levels also vary significantly between the Maidstone Road frontage to the rear of the site (to the south). The topography of the site influences how this development would be perceived within the public realm.

6.8 The form, bulk and height of the nine dwellings located in the rear part of the site have been amended significantly since the application was last reported to committee. Previously, three separate blocks containing 3 terraced dwellings measuring 8.9 and 9.1m high were proposed. The terrace of three dwellings within plots 1-3 remains unchanged, sitting on the lower part of the site (the south east corner). However the form, size and design of the dwellings within units 4-9 has changed quite notably. A terrace of 4 dwellings is now proposed for units 4-7 and a pair of semi-detached houses is now proposed for plots 8 & 9.

6.9 This significant change was brought about by the desire to reduce the height of the dwellings that would stand on the higher part of this site. The proposed dwellings that would be located within plots 4-9 would now stand 7.7m high to ridge level, a reduction of 1.4 metres in height from the scheme that was reported to the February meeting of the Area 2 Planning Committee. This has been achieved by altering the roof design of these buildings. The submitted drawings show that the

dwellings within plots 4-9 would be lower in terms of ridge height than the existing school building by 0.8m.

- 6.10 The use of a 4 dwelling terrace building would not, in my opinion, be out of keeping with the character of development within the locality. A much longer housing terrace exists at Whatcote Cottages, on the opposite side of the road to the application site.
- 6.11 Much criticism has been received from objectors regarding the representation of how the proposed development would appear in the street when compared to the existing dwellings adjacent to the site (Pinehurst to the west and the dwellings within Pineview to the east). I can now confirm that existing ground levels and the height of the neighbouring dwelling "Pinehurst" contained on a submitted survey drawing have been measured on site by one of the Council's in-house surveyors. Anomalies with some of the previously submitted survey data were found and the applicant has since submitted revised levels data that now correlates with our own measurements. In light of this I am now satisfied that the dwelling "Pinehurst" has now been accurately represented on the latest streetscape and comparison of massing drawings submitted by the applicant in terms of its height above ground level compared to the proposed development.
- 6.12 The further reduction in height of the dwellings within plots 4-9 clearly reduces the height of these dwellings below the ridge height of the adjacent dwelling at "Pinehurst".
- 6.13 The reduction from 12 to 11 units was achieved by the removal of one of the car port buildings that would have contained a flat over the parking spaces. This building was previously shown to be located in the North West corner of the site adjacent to the junction of Platt Common with Maidstone Road. This has also enabled the acoustic wall fronting Maidstone Road to be pulled back by some 5 metres further from Maidstone Road in this section of the site. Additional planting is also now proposed to take place in front of the repositioned wall. These changes have greatly opened up this area of this site, presenting a less harsh and less dense form of development than was previously proposed. I am satisfied that the development is of a scale, bulk, mass and form that would not dominate the street scene in this locality and would not be out of scale or proportion with the adjacent dwellings. When viewed from Maidstone Road, the development would sit comfortably between the existing dwellings that flank this site. This judgement is made in the full knowledge to the visual impact that arises from the current development of the site with the large scale and somewhat inelegant school complex that sits high above the road and is set in a sea of hardstanding between the building and the road.
- 6.14 I note the request of the PC that permitted development rights be removed from these dwellings in order to control further development within this site. When the scheme was first submitted to the Council, the permitted development rights

relating to the extension and alteration of dwelling houses were different to what they are now. In light of the particular circumstances of this case, I consider it would now be appropriate to remove permitted development rights within Class A (extensions).

- 6.15 Detailed landscaping details have not been submitted as part of this scheme, but it is proposed to retain two mature, high value trees, an Oak and an Ash located on the eastern side of the site. It is also proposed to plant a Beech hedge in front of the acoustic brick wall facing towards Maidstone Road and additional tree planting. All of these measures would assist to soften the impact of the proposed development upon the character of the street scene. A landscaping condition is suggested.
- 6.16 Specific details have not been submitted concerning the precise materials to be used in this development. However, the dwellings would be constructed from red stock brick, with clay tile hanging or weatherboarding at first floor level. The roofs would be clad with plain tiles. This approach is in keeping with the local vernacular.

#### Highway Safety issues

- 6.17 Kent Highway Service considers that traffic generation is not an issue in this particular development. The level of car parking to be provided allows for 23 car parking spaces for 11 dwellings. They would be provided in a tandem layout on an allocated basis. The level and layout of the parking areas has received criticism from local residents and the PC. However, KHS believes it to be acceptable. Indeed, given that the development comprises 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings, the provision of 23 car parking spaces exceeds the maximum number spaces that could be required under the current Kent Vehicle Parking Standards. It would, therefore, be unreasonable to require the developer to provide more car parking to serve this development, in my opinion.
- 6.18 Concerning the question of accessing the proposed parking spaces, they are of a size that is considered to be reasonable. I note the concerns of the PC that the proposed tandem layout may require vehicles to manoeuvre around each other. However, the Kent Highway Service considers the layout to be acceptable in this specific context. The parking will be on an allocated basis which will help to reduce conflicts between future residents and is quite common in new developments. The omission of the car port and flat in favour of open parking, would improve manoeuvring into and out of the parking spaces in my opinion.
- 6.19 I note the comments of the PC regarding the junction of Platt Common with Maidstone Road. It was originally proposed to realign the boundary of the site in this corner to create a conventionally shaped bell mouth, which would have

narrowed the entrance to Platt Common where vehicles currently wait to let others pass. It is now proposed to leave the shape of the existing bell mouth very much as it currently exists, in response to the PC's concerns.

### Affordable Housing

- 6.20 Previously, it was proposed to consider the affordable housing of this and application B together. However, it is now proposed to deal with this matter separately for each application.
- 6.21 The application triggers the requirement for affordable housing as specified by Policy CP 17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007, due to the number of units to be provided. The policy requires the provision of 40% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable. Of this level, the policy goes on to state:

*“Unless circumstances dictate otherwise, 70% of the affordable dwellings provided on each site shall be social rented housing with the remainder being intermediate housing”.*

- 6.22 Of the proposed 11 units, 4 would have to be affordable to comply with policy CP 17. The applicant has confirmed that 4 affordable units would be provided within the terrace containing units 4-7. The applicant has also stated that he will accept which ever tenure split the Council requires. In line with Core policy CP 17, this would yield 3 dwellings for social rent and 1 which would be shared equity.

### Other development contributions

- 6.23 I note the comments of the PC regarding the possibility of seeking contributions towards the provision of recreation facilities either within one of the sites or in terms of a commuted payment to improve existing local facilities. Unlike Affordable Housing, the site area is not large enough to trigger the requirement to provide open playing space. Accordingly, there is no policy support to require such a provision.
- 6.24 KCC, through its agent has requested financial contributions for libraries, adult education, youth & community and adult social services. Whilst the County Council considers that the development would put added pressure on the existing services, it has not identified any capital projects where the requested money would be spent or identified local deficiencies which would be placed under additional pressure by the occupiers of the proposed development. Due to this, I do not consider it reasonable to require the developer to make the requested contributions.

Noise:

- 6.25 The comments of the PC are noted. However, the DHH is satisfied with the methodology used by the applicant's agent in assessing the level of road traffic noise that would affect the redevelopment of the Platt School site.
- 6.26 The acoustic report indicates that the proposed layout of the buildings, the inclusion of an acoustic brick wall along the north site boundary and the use of suitable windows and other façade elements would be sufficient to provide a "good" internal noise level for the proposed dwellings in line with BS8233. The report states that the level of noise reduction to habitable rooms is achievable through the use of appropriately designed windows, doors and roof construction. DHH and I are satisfied that the proposed development would provide a satisfactory aural environment for its future occupiers. Details of proposed mitigation can be controlled by conditions.

Other matters

- 6.27 The development has been designed so as to minimise its impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light and privacy. Units 4-7 look towards the rear garden and obliquely towards the rear elevation of the property "Rudge". However, a distance of over 25 m stands between the rear elevations of the proposed and existing dwellings. This, coupled with the mature trees that align the rear (south) boundary of the site, would safeguard the amenity of this neighbouring property, in my opinion.
- 6.28 During the Members Site Inspection it was queried how high the proposed dwellings within the rear part of the site would be in comparison to the neighbouring dwelling "Rudge". Information submitted by the applicant shows that the ridge level of units 4-9 would be lower than the ridge level of "Rudge" by 0.8m.
- 6.29 The development has also been designed so as not to overlook other residential properties.
- 6.30 I am now satisfied that this development is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.



(B) TM/07/01807/FL:

Issues of density, scale, bulk and design

6.31 This development has been criticised for being of a density below that specified in PPS 3. PPS3 indicates that 30 dwellings per hectare should be used as national indicative minimum guide when developing policies. PPS 3 also states:

*“Good design is fundamental to using land efficiently. Local Planning Authorities should facilitate good design by identifying the distinctive features that define the character of a particular local area.”*

6.32 When considering the previous application that included these sites, the Inspector commented upon the proposal to develop this site with four dwellings. The Inspector acknowledged at paragraph 259 that the site layout would be constrained particularly by its short frontage compared to its depth and the presence of many mature trees. However the view was taken that a development of 4 units (12.5 dwellings per hectare) on this site would be an unsustainable form of development and that it should be possible to develop this land more efficiently without compromising the objective of achieving a high quality design which is informed by its context. The SoS agreed with this opinion.

6.33 The site contains mature Oak and Birch trees that are protected by a TPO. The site is also located in an area characterised by low density residential development (dwellings located within large gardens).

6.34 In light of the context for this particular site, a balance has to be struck between avoiding a profligate use of land, but without causing undue detriment to the character of the locality. The current proposal would have a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. Whilst still below the recommended national minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare, the development has a significantly greater density than that of the previously refused scheme that related to this site. It is also my opinion that given the SoS and the Inspector’s comments, development at a “lower” density than the nominal minimum is justified by site specific considerations.

6.35 The proposed scheme would require the removal of the protected Silver Birch tree and one Oak, which is growing immediately next to another one. (These trees were also shown for removal under the scheme that was put before Members in February 2009). However, the scheme has been designed so as not to require the removal of any of the other protected trees within this site and respects the general character of residential development in the immediate locality.

6.36 In light of all of these factors I am satisfied that the proposed development on the Platt School playing field does strike the right balance in terms of its density.

- 6.37 The layout of the proposed development is one that is, in my opinion, respectful of existing residential properties in the locality. The retention of the mature trees within the site would provide an attractive back drop for the proposed development. The development would not appear cramped or out of character with the neighbouring properties, which vary in terms of size, form and detailed design. A vernacular form and design has again been adopted for this development with the use of brick walls, plain tiled roofs and red/orange tile hanging.
- 6.38 The development would require the loss of the protected Silver Birch and one Oak tree. The Oak is one of a pair growing close together and its removal would not cause significant detriment to the character of the locality and its removal would provide improved growing conditions to its neighbour. Whilst an attractive specimen in its own right the loss of the Silver Birch, is not considered to cause significant harm to the character of the locality, given the presence of the mature remaining Oak trees within this site.

#### Highway safety issues

- 6.39 The development would incorporate a mixture of parking arrangements. Units 1-4 would have communal parking provided within and in front of a proposed car port situated between units 3 and 4, adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. Units 5-7 would be provided with parking immediately next to the respective dwellings including attached or integral garages. For units 1-7 (2 and 3 bedroom dwellings) 2 car parking spaces would be provided. Unit 8 would accommodate 4 car parking spaces (two in the integral double garage with a further two in front). As with the proposed school site redevelopment, the proposed car parking provision meets the requirements of the current Kent vehicle Parking Standards.
- 6.40 Access to the 8 dwellings would be via a private way, which Kent Highway Services has not objected to on this occasion.
- 6.41 I note the comments of the local resident that Grange Road cannot take the additional traffic generated by this proposal. However, Kent Highway Services has not objected to any highway related aspect of this development.

#### Affordable Housing

- 6.42 Previously, it was proposed to consider the affordable housing requirements of this and application A together. However, it is now proposed to deal with this matter separately for each application.
- 6.43 The application triggers the requirement for affordable housing as specified by Policy CP 17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007, due to the number of units to be provided. The policy requires the provision of 40% of the

total number of dwellings to be affordable. Of this level, the policy goes on to state:

*“Unless circumstances dictate otherwise, 70% of the affordable dwellings provided on each site shall be social rented housing with the remainder being intermediate housing”.*

6.44 In this case, it is proposed to provide 3 affordable dwellings (plots 1-3) and the applicant has confirmed that the tenure mix required by the Council would be complied with. In line with policy CP 17, 2 units would be socially rented and the third, shared equity.

#### Other development contributions

6.45 I note the comments of the PC regarding the possibility of seeking contributions towards the provision of recreation facilities either within this site or in terms of a commuted payment to improve existing local facilities. Unlike the issue of affordable housing, the site does not trigger the requirement to provide open playing space. Accordingly, there is no policy support to require such a provision.

6.46 KCC has requested financial contributions for libraries, adult education, youth & community and adult social services. Whilst the County Council considers that the development would put added pressure on the existing services, it has not identified any capital projects where the requested money would be spent or identified where local deficiencies are which would be placed under additional pressure by the occupiers of the proposed developments. Due to this, I do not consider it reasonable to require the developer to make the requested contributions.

#### Other matters

6.47 An objection has been received from a resident within 4 The Ferns located immediately to the west of the proposed development. The concern is that the development would overshadow and overlook this property. However the nearest dwelling would be located over 35 metres away and would not face directly towards this property. I am satisfied that the proposed dwellings, due to their distance from this existing property, as well as their orientation, would not cause unacceptable overlooking or overshadowing to this property.

6.48 I would recommend that conditions be imposed to control the insertion of additional windows at first floor level in the rear (North) elevation of unit 8 and in the south (side) elevation of unit 3 to protect the amenity of adjacent residential properties (“Cobdene” to the north and “Davals” to the south of the application site).

6.49 In light of the above, these two schemes are considered to be acceptable in planning terms and, therefore, recommend that permission be granted.

**7. Recommendation:**

(A) TM/07/01810/FL:

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Certificate B dated 22.05.2007, Design and Access Statement dated 22.05.2007, Survey 143/PS1-02 A dated 30.01.2009, Site Layout SMP-PS-03 A dated 12.06.2008, Acoustic Assessment dated 20.06.2007, Letter dated 16.04.2009, Site Plan SMP/PS/01 dated 16.04.2009, Site Survey SMP/PS/02A dated 16.04.2009, Site Layout SMP/PS/03C dated 16.04.2009, Landscaping SMP/PS/04 tree removal dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP/PS/05A dated 16.04.2009, Drawing SMP/PS/06A development grain dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP/PS/10A dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP/PS/11A dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP/PS/12C dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP/PS/13B dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP/PS/14C dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP/PS/15B dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP/PS/16B dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP/PS/17A dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP/PS/18B dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plans And Elevations SMP/PS/19B dated 16.04.2009, Elevations 143/PS1-20D dated 16.04.2009, Section 143/PS1-21B dated 16.04.2009, Section 143/PS-22E dated 29.04.2009, Section 143/PS1-23A dated 16.04.2009, Letter dated 12.06.2008, Email dated 28.10.2008, Letter dated 15.07.2008, Email dated 10.07.2008, Letter dated 27.03.2008, Arboricultural Assessment J 37.12-SCHOOL dated 27.03.2007, subject to:

**Conditions / Reasons**

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. The access shall not be used until the area of land within the vision splays shown on the approved plans has been reduced in level as necessary and cleared of any obstruction exceeding a height of 1.05 metres above the level of the nearest part of the carriageway. The vision splay so created shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

4. No building shall be occupied until that part of the service road which provides access to it has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

5. The access drive shall be constructed no steeper than 1 in 14.3 for the first 4.5 metres from the edge of the highway and no steeper than 1 in 8 on any other part.

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

6. The access shall not be used until vision splays of 2m x 2m x 45° between the driveway and the back of the footway have been provided. The area of land within these vision splays shall be reduced in level as necessary and cleared of any obstruction exceeding a height of 0.6m above the level of the nearest part of the carriageway. The vision splays so created shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

7. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space 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 or 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 parking space.

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

8. No building shall be occupied until the area shown on the submitted plan as 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.

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

9. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the tree protection measures specified in arboricultural report by Broad Oak Tree Consultants Limited dated 25.03.008 ref. J 37.12-SCHOOL, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

10. No development shall be commenced until full details of a scheme of acoustic protection of habitable rooms having windows that will be exposed to a level of road traffic noise in Noise Exposure Category B or C as set out in Policy P3/17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of acoustic protection shall be sufficient to secure internal noise levels no greater than 30 LAeq dB in bedrooms and 40 LAeq dB in living rooms with windows closed. Additionally, where the internal noise level will exceed 40 LAeq dB in bedrooms or 48 LAeq dB in living rooms with windows open the scheme for acoustic protection should incorporate appropriate acoustically screened mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation should also be provided to bedrooms having openings onto facades that will be exposed to a level of road traffic noise in excess of 78 LAmax (slow) time weighting.

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the aural amenity of the occupiers of the dwellings hereby approved.

11. 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 west (flank) elevation of the dwelling within plot 9, 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.

12. 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 rear (south facing roof slope) of the dwellings within plots 4-9 inclusive without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. (D014)

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.

13. Within one month of the implementation of this planning permission a scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for the provision of affordable housing which meets the requirements of the TMBC Local Development Framework Core Policy CP 17 and the Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing. Such a scheme shall be implemented before 50% of the total number of market housing units permitted by this permission are constructed and the scheme shall be completed before 50% of the said market housing units are occupied.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy CP 17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document adopted 2008.

14. No development shall take place until details of the ridge levels and the finished internal ground floor levels of the dwellings hereby approved have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall be carried out in strict accordance with those details.

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

15. 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, of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of that Order unless planning permission has been granted on an application relating thereto. (R001)

Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity.

**Informative:**

1. The Borough Council will need to create new street name(s) for this development together with a new street numbering scheme. To discuss the arrangements for the allocation of new street names and numbers you are asked to write to the Chief Solicitor, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, Gibson Building, Gibson Drive, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent, ME19 4LZ or telephone Trevor Bowen, Principal Legal Officer, on 01732 876039. To avoid difficulties, you are advised to do this as soon as possible and, in any event, not less than one month before the new properties are ready for occupation. (Q051)

(B) TM/07/01807/FL:

- 7.2 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Certificate B dated 22.05.2007, Design and Access Statement dated 27.03.2008, Arboricultural Assessment J37.12-FIELD dated 27.03.2008, Letter dated 16.04.2009, Site Plan SMP-PF-01 dated 16.04.2009, Site Survey SMP-PF-02 dated 16.04.2009, Site Layout SMP-PF-03 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Site Layout SMP-PF-03 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Tree Removal Plan SMP-PF-04-REV A dated 16.04.2009, Parking Layout SMP-PF-05 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Plan SMP-PF-06 REV A Development Grain dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP-PF-10 REV B dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP-PF-11 REV B dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP-PF-12 REV B dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP-PF-13 REV B dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP-PF-14 REV B dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP-PF-15 REV B dated 16.04.2009, Floor Plan SMP-PF-16 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Elevations SMP-PF-17 REV B dated

16.04.2009, Plan SMP-PF-18 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Section SMP-PF-20 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Section SMP-PF-21 REV A dated 16.04.2009, Section SMP-PF-22 REV A dated 16.04.2009, subject to:

**Conditions / Reasons**

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. The access shall not be used until the area of land within the vision splays shown on the approved plans has been reduced in level as necessary and cleared of any obstruction exceeding a height of 1.05 metres above the level of the nearest part of the carriageway. The vision splay so created shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

4. No building shall be occupied until that part of the service road which provides access to it has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

5. The access drive shall be constructed no steeper than 1 in 14.3 for the first 4.5 metres from the edge of the highway and no steeper than 1 in 8 on any other part.

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

6. The access shall not be used until vision splays of 2m x 2m x 45° between the driveway and the back of the footway have been provided. The area of land within these vision splays shall be reduced in level as necessary and cleared of any obstruction exceeding a height of 0.6m above the level of the nearest part of the carriageway. The vision splays so created shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.



7. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space 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 or 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 parking space.

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

8. No building shall be occupied until the area shown on the submitted plan as 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.

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

9. The window on the north elevation at first floor level in unit 8 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.

10. 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 north elevation at first floor level of unit 8 or the south elevation at first floor level of unit 3 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.

11. 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 roof of the buildings within plots 3 and 7 without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. (D014)

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.

12. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the tree protection measures specified in arboricultural report by Broad Oak Tree Consultants Limited dated 19.03.008 ref. J 37.12-FIELD, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

13. Within one month of the implementation of this planning permission a scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for the provision of affordable housing which meets the requirements of the TMBC Local Development Framework Core Policy CP 17 and the Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing. Such a scheme shall be implemented before 50% of the total number of market housing units permitted by this permission are constructed and the scheme shall be completed before 50% of the said market housing units are occupied.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy CP 17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document adopted 2008.

14. No development shall take place until details of the ridge levels and finished internal ground floor levels of the dwellings hereby approved have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall be carried out in strict accordance with those details.

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

### **Informatives**

- 1 The Borough Council will need to create new street name(s) for this development together with a new street numbering scheme. To discuss the arrangements for the allocation of new street names and numbers you are asked to write to the Chief Solicitor, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, Gibson Building, Gibson Drive, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent, ME19 4LZ or telephone Trevor Bowen, Principal Legal Officer, on 01732 876039. To avoid difficulties, you are advised to do this as soon as possible and, in any event, not less than one month before the new properties are ready for occupation. (Q051)

Contact: Matthew Broome