

## SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS

AREA 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATED 5 January 2017

---

### **East Malling & Larkfield TM/16/02919/FL Larkfield South**

#### **Demolition of existing garages and erection of a pair of semi-detached bungalows, with associated parking at 53 New Hythe Lane Larkfield Aylesford for Harestone Associates**

PC: Further comments received following publication of the main report, reproduced in full below:

We have noted the Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to conditions and informatives, which are taken forward in the report's recommendations.

If permission is given we support Condition 4. There is in fact a gate already in place which may meet this condition but we assume this will be checked.

We accept there was a planning approval back in 2008 but we would argue that traffic conditions have worsened since that time with the completion of "The Lakes" and "Leybourne Park" residential areas at the northern end of New Hythe Lane. Traffic levels have, we consider, greatly increased.

This is particularly apparent on this section of New Hythe Lane between the A20 and Kingfisher Road which is the most restricted part of the Lane with the terraces of properties on the west side abutting the road with no pavement and the parked vehicles on the same side to the north. There is also the access to the Fire Station, Larkfield Green estate and Morrison's with congestion at peak times.

Proposed Condition 4 is to "ensure vehicles waiting to access the site do not create congestion and thereby cause harm to the wider highway network". The Parish Council agrees with this aim but with two dwellings the likelihood of one vehicle waiting in the Lane to let another exit is more likely. Therefore a second dwelling serviced by a single width access is likely to cause additional congestion when this occurs.

Given the "bottleneck" situation at this location with already problems caused by parking outside the terraced properties it is felt nothing should be done to worsen the current position, which we do consider is severe at peak times particularly as the Lane acts as a main part of the local road network serving not only Larkfield but as a through route from the A20 to the A228. As we understand it the parking standards are guidelines and in this case we feel a higher provision should be made rather than the acceptable standard provision accepted by KCC. The proposal is to have just one parking space for each dwelling and an additional one for No.53 itself.

As the report records the garages are "not currently in use" and seem to have been abandoned for that purpose.

We do understand this site is "compromised" but its planning history with the commitment to one dwelling but we feel having two with just basic parking spaces and a single width access, in this particular location, should be resisted with at least more parking provision.

DPHEH:

The submitted plans indicate that the existing gate is in excess of 5m from the back edge of the highway.

IGN3 is an adopted document for development control purposes. Rather than acting as guidance in reaching decisions on planning applications, the LPA must have regard to it rather than seeking to deviate from the standards it sets out in favour of locally preferred standards. The possibility of adopting locally set standards is a matter for the emerging Local Plan and not for the determination of individual planning applications at this time.

Since publication of the main report, Officers have taken the opportunity to revisit the recommended conditions at page 17 onwards. It is considered that further conditions protecting the turning area as proposed and requiring the proposed areas for bin storage to be provided and retained in perpetuity should be included.

## **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

### **Additional Conditions:**

**10. No building shall be occupied until the area shown on drawing number 0301-01 00-101 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 2015 (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.**

**11. The bin storage areas shown on drawing number 0301-01 00-101 shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and shall be maintained and retained at all times thereafter.**

**Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure adequate turning facilities are retained within the site.**

---

**Aylesford**  
**Aylesford South**

**TM/16/03184/FL**

**Extensions to create a first floor including front and rear dormer windows and associated works at 17 Gorse Crescent Ditton Aylesford for Mr A Dawling**

Private Reps: Since publication of the main report further representations have been received from three households maintaining objections to the proposed development and disagreeing with the planning judgements made throughout the report. These are not reproduced in full but further comments summarised as follows:

- No. 17 is currently a three bedroom single storey dwelling that lies near the southern end of a continuous row of seven bungalows which run northwards towards Brassey Drive;
- Royal Institute of Surveyors (RICS) guidelines relating to Right to Light should be considered as part of the assessment;
- Would set an unacceptable precedent in allowing bungalows to become houses;
- Query height of the extension as set out in Officer report (paragraph 1.2);
- Proposal would lead to a shortage of accessible homes for people in the community;
- Need for the development to be constructed in materials to match the existing;
- Visual eyesore and out of keeping with the locality

To clarify, the dimensions have been taken from the scaled drawing provided by the architect. For information, these are summarised as follows:

Existing ridge height (when measured from the north elevation) – 4.6m

Proposed ridge height (when measured from the north elevation) – 6.7m (increase of 2.1m)

Existing eaves height (from front of dwelling northern corner) - 3.4m

Proposed eaves height – (from front of dwelling northern corner) - 3.75m (increase of 0.35m)

It is important to remember that in reaching a conclusion on the acceptability of this scheme, Officers have considered it in light of how it would appear within the site and the wider street scene in physical terms rather than simply concentrating on the relative dimensions involved.

The RICS 'Right to Light' document is not adopted for development control purposes. The planning application must be assessed in line with the adopted development plan and in this respect the adopted policies are set out at paragraph 6.1 of the main report.

In these respects, No. 17 is situated within a relatively large plot and good separation exists between this dwelling and No.19 to the north. This combined with the rise in land levels due to the slope in the road would ensure that, in planning terms, an acceptable relationship would be maintained between the two properties in terms of residential and visual amenity.

The Medway Gap CAA provides a general summary of the character of the area but does not make a specific reference to a row of seven bungalows in Gorse Crescent as set out by objecting residents. As explained previously, the CAA notes that bungalows and houses exist along the street which creates a mixed character across the area and would mean that the proposed development would not appear out of keeping with its surrounding visual context particularly given the change in topography as land rises along the street.

I appreciate the concerns expressed by the local residents regarding the loss of bungalow accommodation within the area. However, there is no adopted policy seeking to retain such accommodation and therefore no justification in planning terms to seek retention of this dwelling in its current form.

Equally, the Planning System does not deal with precedents. Each case is determined wholly on its own merits in light of prevailing planning policy and the individual circumstances of application sites and their surrounding context.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**

---