

**Trottiscliffe
Downs**

TM/14/02117/FL

Demolition of Cedar Bungalow and outbuildings and erection of 2 semi-detached dwellings, landscaping and car parking at Cedar Bungalow Church Lane Trottiscliffe West Malling Kent ME19 5EB for Valley Homes (Kent) Ltd

Private Reps: One further letter of representation has been received, raising the following key points:

- The plans for this application are now for a semi-detached property but with an increase in bedrooms from 3 to 4, although the development is very much the same size and position as the previous terrace of 3 x 3 bedroom properties;
- The parking problems have been addressed at great cost to 2 Trosley House Cottages;
- The proposed building would still start at the back of the garage to 2 Trosley House Cottages and continue past the end of the garden. It will still completely box this property in – the proposed houses would have a large flank wall in close proximity to the rear garden of 2 Trosley House Cottages. No other property within the village has been so adversely affected by development as this would be;
- We accept that Cedar Bungalow is no longer habitable and would need to be replaced with another building, but build a single house or semi-detached property situated so that each would have a garage and parking space to the side with a small garden;
- Concerned that the traffic going in and out of the properties would be considerable as with 4 bedrooms the possibilities of 4 cars per property is great. The traffic up and down Church Lane would still be increased drastically with the addition of 2 extra households; and
- Considers that no new buildings should be at this density in the village as it is supposed to be a Conservation Area.

DPHEH: It is worth noting that these considerations have been addressed within section 6 of the main report. Specifically, the following key points are noted:

- In considering whether this scheme has overcome the previous 'overbearing' impact on 2 Trosley House Cottages, paragraph 6.11 of the main report notes that

the western flank elevation has been ‘pulled back’ into the site through a reduction in the number of units within the scheme. The flank elevation is now at a distance of just over 5m from the common boundary. This, together with the stepped nature of the rear elevation (i.e. the proposed western flank is not all 2.5 storeys in height), leads me to conclude that this scheme will not give rise to an unacceptable amenity impact on 2 Trosley House Cottages; and

- Parking and highway impacts are specifically discussed in paragraphs 6.19 and 6.20 of the main report. It should be noted that the proposals meet the Council’s adopted car parking standards *with the added benefit of the visitor space*. I have also concluded that the residual cumulative transport impacts of the development are not severe (in the context of paragraph 32 of the NPPF) and there are no overriding or justifiable grounds to refuse the proposals on transport grounds. Nevertheless, there would be no harm in inviting the applicant to provide a further visitor space – but this cannot be required.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

Additional Informatives:

4. The applicant is encouraged to consider providing an additional visitor parking space within the space available in the parking/service area at the front of the site.

5. In determining the finished floor, ridge and eaves levels of the dwellings (pursuant to the requirements of condition 10), consideration should be given to the existing topography of the site and in ensuring that the development sits appropriately in the context of surrounding residential dwellings.

Platt **TM/14/00714/FL**
Borough Green And
Long Mill

Demolition of two existing outbuildings and conversion of existing stable block with two single storey extensions into 2 no. residential dwellings, together with associated parking and landscaping works at Stone House Farm Stables Long Mill Lane Platt Sevenoaks Kent TN15 8LH for Stone House Stables Ltd

Private Reps: One additional email representation (with photographs) has been received. The email with attachments is appended to this Supplementary Report in full for Members information.

DPHEH: In light of some very recent clarification by the High Court surrounding Green Belt matters it is worthwhile providing further commentary with regard to these proposals in light of national Green Belt policy. As noted in paragraph 6.4 of the main report, the

proposals involves partial demolition of several buildings (or part thereof), together with new build elements. As stated in the main report, The NPPF identifies at paragraph 89 that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is, by definition, inappropriate unless it comprises (*inter alia*) the “extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building”. It is my view that the proposed extensions could, in themselves, be considered disproportionate and therefore this part of the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. . That said, it should be noted that the proposals result in an overall reduction in footprint of built development within the Green Belt (*the proposals involve the demolition of 147 sq. metres of footprint from the existing built form and its replacement with 100 sq. metres of new extension*). In terms of the overall balance of judgement in this case it must also be recognised that the removal of the office element of the use on each unit will overcome a concern expressed locally with regard to the permitted scheme, but conversely the removal of those office cells would lead to the loss of characterful built elements.

The context of the application is also subtly different from the previous scheme in that the residential use of these buildings, including associated works (but not extension) can now occur under permitted development rights. (These rights were introduced for a temporary period but the Government has recently announced that such rights will be made permanent in the near future).

The key question arises therefore as to whether the inappropriate development element of the scheme – the new extensions – should be allowed because the removal of the office element from the existing permission and the reduction in footprint compared to the present situation are positive benefits which amount to the very special circumstances necessary to offset the objection in principle to inappropriate development (and bearing in mind the loss of the characterful castellated outbuildings).

Taking the balance of all of these matters into account it is considered that the positives amount to very special circumstances that are, in this instance, sufficient to offset the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. It is therefore concluded that the proposals are, in this instance, acceptable in the context of Green Belt policy.

I note that concerns have been expressed that the submitted elevation drawings are felt to be ambiguous with regards to the retention of the castellated features on the gable ends of the retained and converted main stable building. It is the applicant’s full intention to ensure that these important characterful features are retained as part of their conversion works. In order to satisfactorily secure the retention of this existing architectural detailing as part of the conversion works, I propose that condition 3 within the main report is amended to require details for approval of the retained castellated features.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**Amend Condition 3:**

3. No development shall take place until details of any joinery, eaves and dormer construction to be used, together with retained castellation detailing, have been submitted to and approved in writing 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 visual amenity of the locality.

**Ightham
Ightham**

TM/14/01489/FL

Use of land as hand car wash and associated canopy and storage container at Land Adjoining Ightham Farm Shop Sevenoaks Road Ightham Sevenoaks Kent for Mr Astriti Zholi

DPHEH:

In light of some very recent clarification by the High Court surrounding Green Belt matters it is worthwhile providing further commentary with regard to this proposal in light of national Green Belt policy. Paragraph 6.6 of the main report indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

In this case, no such very special circumstances have been demonstrated to outweigh the degree of harm caused to the Green Belt, arising from both the inappropriate nature of the development by definition and the other harm to the open nature and function of the Green Belt as described at paragraph 6.6 of the main report. In reaching this decision, regard has been had to the advice contained in paragraph 28 of the NPPF which supports the principle of developing policies to support a prosperous rural economy including the provision of local services, but this does not, in my view, override the Green Belt objection.

RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED

Email and photographs from Adam and Sally Green (Stone House Farm) dated 12 August 2014, reproduced in full as follows:

"To the Members of the Committee,

We are the owners of Stone House Farm, the only residential property adjacent to the application site.

We have absolutely no objections to the residential development of this site. On the whole, we believe it is the only possible natural evolution of the site and since there is already an existing permission to develop, there is also no grounds to object to its development.

We welcome some of the recent changes to the submitted design (dated 25th July 2014) regarding the loss of privacy to our own house and the retention of the stepped parapet gable walls on the stable block.

However, the unique ironstone detailing including the stepped parapet walls and the crenellated corner turrets of the stable block gable walls and of the 2 detached 'gatehouses' (outbuildings) is inherent to the look of these structures. This was mirrored on the adjacent building of Stonehouse Farm when it was built comparatively recently in 2001. These details define the aesthetic of this entire ex-agricultural farm site as a whole.

Given the very close proximity of the southerly gatehouse and Stonehouse Farm, demolishing this gatehouse with its unusual architectural detailing, specifically the corner turrets with crenellations on top, means that the reflection of these details in the adjacent building of Stonehouse Farm loses it's context entirely, and no longer makes sense. Please see the 7 attached photographs showing these stonework details.

We, and many of the people who object to this design, strongly feel that the preservation of the gatehouses along with these unusual architectural details, is essential to a building conversion at this site in order to be in-keeping, and so not out of context with its immediate environment.

An email to the planning department dated 16th June 2014 from the applicant's planning consultant, Mr Kevin Wise, states that "there is no objection <from the developer> to the principle of retaining the battlement / crenulation detailing on the buildings. The plans will be amended accordingly". This is repeated in his email on the 23rd July 2014.

Unfortunately, the submitted changes on the plans and elevations (dated 25th July 2014) do not entirely reflect this. The elevations clearly state that the "parapet wall retained, crenellations removed, parapet carried down".

There is conflicting language at use here, but it should be clarified, as detailing is very important in architecture.

We are not, in theory, against the demolition of the 2 ironstone gatehouses (detached outbuildings) , but their replacement with a featureless and detail-less L- shaped ironstone wall is out of context with the immediate environment. It is reasonable to expect that these

existing architectural details should be included in that wall. This is the principle of our objection.

Another point is that the surrounding playing fields are enjoyed by a great many residents of St. Mary's Platt and also Borough Green with youth and senior Football club and Cricket club matches played at the weekends, especially on Saturday mornings. This is the only time of the week that the small car park, through which is the only access to the site, is subject to a high amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. We urge the members of the committee to restrict the potential construction during this time so that the local community can enjoy these recreational facilities without being impacted by building / demolition noise and vehicle movement.

Yours sincerely,

Adam and Sally Green"









This page is intentionally left blank