

**Addington**                      **565581 159196**    **25 June 2015**                      **TM/15/02126/FL**  
Downs And Mereworth

Proposal:                      Demolition of existing sheds/buildings and erection of a detached 3-bay garage and single storey outbuilding comprising a home gym, home office and store  
Location:                      Shelmerdene Addington Green Addington West Malling Kent ME19 5BE  
Applicant:                      Mr C Adams

---

**1. Description:**

- 1.1 The original scheme proposed a single L-shaped outbuilding comprising a 4-bay garage/garden store (11.7m x 5.9m) and home gym/office (14m x 5.9m), with an eaves height of 2.5m and ridge height of 5.4m. The external materials were to consist of timber wall cladding and clay roof tiles.
- 1.2 Amended plans were submitted on 5 November 2015 revising the proposal from one L-shaped building to two separate outbuildings (garage and home gym/office), reducing the overall size and height of the buildings. The external roof material has also been changed from clay tiles to natural slates.
- 1.3 The application now proposes the following:
- Detached 3-bay garage
  - Single storey outbuilding comprising a home gym, WC/shower room, home office and store room
- 1.4 The 3-bay garage is to measure 8.85m wide x 5.3m deep, with an eaves height of 2.4m and ridge height of 3.95m. The garage will face north and is to be inset 1.7m from the southern boundary and about 200mm inside the eastern boundary which is enclosed by a recently constructed brick wall. The external materials proposed include horizontal timber boarding to walls above a brick plinth, natural slate to the roof and vertical oak boarding for the garage doors.
- 1.5 The outbuilding comprising the home gym/office is to measure 14m wide x 4.8m deep, with an eaves height of 2.45m and ridge height of 3.85m. It is to be inset a minimum of about 200mm from the western boundary and about 1.7m in from the southern boundary. A separation of 1.5m is provided to the proposed garage. External materials are to consist of horizontal timber board wall cladding above a brick plinth, natural slate roof and oak effect UPVC windows and doors.

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

- 2.1 The application has been called in by Councillor Kemp due to neighbour concerns.

### 3. The Site:

- 3.1 The application site is located to the north of The Green, behind the four cottages of Nos.1 and 2 School Row, The Old Cottage and The Old School that front The Green. The site is accessed via a road extending north from The Green which adjoins an access road that turns to the east extending to a former commercial nursery yard. The dwelling on the site is a detached bungalow that faces south and is set back about 20m from the access road. The vehicle entrance is on the southern boundary where an automatic timber sliding gate is provided. A brick wall encloses the south and east boundaries either side of the entrance gate, which was granted planning permission in August 2014 under ref. TM/14/01750/FL. Permission was also granted in October 2014 (TM/14/02985/FL) for the enlargement of the residential curtilage where a condition removed Class E permitted development rights for domestic outbuildings.
- 3.2 The western part of the site where the proposed outbuildings are to be sited is within the confines of the settlement, with the remaining eastern and northern parts being in the countryside and Metropolitan Green Belt. The Addington Conservation Area (CA) abuts the southern and western boundaries of the site. The application site is also within a Water Catchment Area.
- 3.3 The four cottages mentioned above lie to the south of the site, with Park Cottage to the west. Nos. 1 and 2 Overlea Cottages lie to the southeast on the other side of the access road. An area of woodlands lies to the north, with a field to the northeast, which are also under the control of the applicant. The M20 Motorway lies further to the north. A commercial yard that was previously used for the storage and distribution of plants lies to the east. This has recently been granted planning permission for redevelopment to a dwelling.

### 4. Planning History (relevant):

TM/64/10624/OLD      grant with conditions      15 October 1964

outline application for foreman's bungalow

TM/64/10977/OLD      grant with conditions      12 August 1964

outline application for erection of a foreman's bungalow

TM/89/11693/FUL      Grant      11 September 1989

Application for removal of Condition (iii) of MK/4/64/155 and Condition (i) of MK/4/64/550 (agricultural occupancy)

TM/14/01750/FL      Approved      26 August 2014

Proposed new brick boundary wall and sliding hardwood gate

outline application for foreman's bungalow

TM/14/02985/FL

Approved

21 October 2014

Change of use of agricultural land to residential curtilage (retrospective)

## **5. Consultees:**

5.1 PC (original plans): We are objecting for the following reasons:

1) The proposal represents an inappropriate over-development of the site and is therefore harmful to the Green Belt. The proposed roof height and resulting roof space is too high given the proximity of the proposed building to the boundary. The construction of any new building in the Green Belt would be considered inappropriate if it resulted in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. We believe that the proposed building is disproportionate to the size of the original building.

2) We believe that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the spaciousness of the locality and neighbouring properties. The proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the area given that the proposed building abuts the conservation area with a number of historic cottages set around a village green. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

3) We are concerned that given the size of the proposed facilities that they could be used for commercial activities and/or turned into residential accommodation.

5.2 Private Reps: 3 + site and press notices/0S/3R/0X. The concerns raised (to original plans) include:

- The size and scale of the building would be out of character with the village and the setting of the Conservation Area
- The height of the building would dominate the adjacent cottages resulting in an overbearing visual impact, which is further exacerbated by the difference in ground levels
- Noise impact from the home gym and its siting close to the boundaries
- The home gym appears more commercial than domestic
- Loss of light from overshadowing
- The proposal would appear as overdevelopment of the site.

**6. Determining Issues:**

- 6.1 The proposed new buildings are located in the section of the site that is within the settlement confines of Addington and situated close to existing development and is therefore acceptable in principle.
- 6.2 The main issues for consideration are therefore the impact of the proposed development on the appearance of the site, setting of the CA and on neighbouring residential amenity.
- 6.3 The original submission proposed a very large single L-shaped building of a height of 5.4m that provided substantial scale and bulk. The applicant has submitted amendments to the scheme, now proposing two separate buildings; a 3-bay garage and an outbuilding housing a home gym and home office. The larger outbuilding has been repositioned to lie adjacent to the western boundary opposite the neighbour's outbuilding. This building has been reduced in depth by about 1m and reduced in height by 1.55m to 3.85m high. The garage has been repositioned adjacent to the southern boundary and reduced in width by 3m and in height by 1.45m to 3.95m high. I consider that the provision of two detached buildings with different roof forms instead of one larger building substantially reduces the overall visual size, scale and roof bulk of the development.
- 6.4 The buildings are traditional in their design providing hipped roofs, and the application of natural timber board wall cladding and slate roofs would result in an appearance that is both traditional to rural areas in the Borough and respectful to the CA. I am of the view that the revised buildings are now appropriately domestic in height and scale. Although the buildings are relatively large in size, I consider their scale now to be adequately proportionate to the main house; they are well separated from the main house and the site is large enough to accommodate them without appearing cramped. The larger outbuilding has also been sited adjacent to an outbuilding within Park Cottage which has a much higher roof than the proposed buildings and it would therefore be seen directly within this context. The buildings would present mainly slate roofs above the brick wall that aligns the eastern boundary that adjoins the access road, which would minimise visual harm to the public realm. They are now no higher than the 4m height deemed acceptable by the Government as it reflects permitted development limits for outbuildings.
- 6.5 I am therefore satisfied that the proposals would not adversely affect the appearance of the host dwelling or harm the setting of the adjacent CA. The proposals would therefore satisfy policies CP24 of the TMBCS and SQ1 of the MDE DPD and paragraphs 129 and 131 of the NPPF.
- 6.6 The application site is set at a higher level than the rear gardens of the adjacent cottages. Taking this into account, the roofs of the proposed buildings would be visible from the rear gardens of the cottages to the south. However, the roof of the buildings hip away from the common boundary, the buildings are set back 1.7m

from the boundary and the overall height of the buildings is now suitably domestic, in my view. The slate roof is also considered to be visually sympathetic to existing development in this immediate area. It is also noted that several of the cottages have sheds in their rear gardens adjacent to the development, providing a visual separation. The buildings would not be readily visible from Park Cottage due to this property's large shed screening the development, or from the properties to the east of the access road extending from the Green where the brick boundary wall enclosing the application site for a large degree screens the development. I am therefore satisfied that the buildings would not be visually intrusive or harmful to neighbouring visual amenity.

- 6.7 The buildings are of a domestic scale and sited to the north of the 4 cottages. The development would therefore not result in a level of overshadowing that would lead to an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- 6.8 I consider the use of the outbuildings to be appropriately domestic and ancillary to the main residential use of the property taking into account appeal decisions on similar sized outbuildings. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm neighbouring amenities.
- 6.9 I note the concerns raised by the Parish Council and several neighbours to the south. These relate to visual impact from the size and scale of the original proposal, impact on the openness of the Green Belt and noise impact from the use of the home gym. The scheme has been revised providing two separate buildings and reducing their size and height and altering the roof materials. I now consider the buildings to be appropriately domestic in their size, height and scale, which is considered to address the key concerns outlined. The buildings are set back from the rear boundaries of the cottages to the south and well separated from these neighbouring dwellings. The use of the home gym would be domestic and as such should not generate an unacceptable level of noise impact, in my view. If it were not for the restrictive condition imposed on the planning permission or the extension to the residential curtilage granted under ref.TM/14/02985/FL, these buildings would meet the criteria for permitted development in the 2015 GPDO.
- 6.10 In light of the above, I consider that the proposals accord with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and NPPF, and therefore approval is recommended.

## **7. Recommendation:**

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Letter dated 25.06.2015, Photograph BI-FOLDING DOORS dated 25.06.2015, Photograph BRICKS dated 25.06.2015, Photograph TIMBER CLADDING dated 25.06.2015, Proposed Plans and Elevations KWTP/01 dated 05.11.2015, Email dated 05.11.2015, subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions:**

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

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

- 2 All materials used externally shall accord with the plans and application details hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

- 3 The outbuilding comprising the home gym and home office shall only be used ancillary to the existing dwelling and shall not be used as a separate hereditament.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area or neighbouring residential amenity.

**Informative**

- 1 The applicant is reminded that the existing timber sheds/buildings which are to be removed as part of the approved development must not be relocated elsewhere on the site.

Contact: Mark Fewster