

---

**Trottscliffe**                      **564061 160224**    **22 November 2013**    **TM/13/03625/FL**  
Downs

Proposal:                      Demolition of Cedar Bungalow and outbuildings and erection of  
3 terraced dwellings, landscaping and car park  
Location:                      Cedar Bungalow Church Lane Trottscliffe West Malling Kent  
ME19 5EB  
Applicant:                      Valley Homes (Kent) Ltd

---

**1. Description:**

- 1.1 It is proposed to demolish the now dilapidated existing small bungalow at the site and to erect a terrace of three no. 3 bedroom dwellings towards the frontage of the site, behind a new parking and turning area.
- 1.2 Since the application was originally submitted in November 2013, the proposals have been amended twice to alter the positioning of the row of terraced properties within the application site. The proposals, as being considered in this report, relate to the latest amendment to the application which was subject to consultations and neighbour notifications in March 2014.
- 1.3 The proposed terrace of three dwellings would have a stepped façade, with the western most dwelling, referred to as 'House 1' (adjacent to 2 Trosley House Cottages) set back approximately 1.5m behind the front building line of the garage of this adjoining dwelling. The remaining two new dwellings ('House 2' and 'House 3') within the terrace are set back some 3 metres from the front of 'House 1'. Overall, House 1 would be located some 9 metres north of the main frontage of the application site with Church Lane, whilst Houses 2 and 3 would range between some 16 – 21 metres from the Church Lane frontage.
- 1.4 Each of the dwellings would comprise of an entrance hallway, sitting room, utility/cloak room and open plan kitchen/dining/family area at ground floor, two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor and a further bedroom and en-suite within the roof space. The dwellings would have north facing rear gardens, mainly laid to lawn and separated by close boarded fencing. House 1 would have the largest garden at 17 metres in length, House 2 would be 14 metres in length and House 3 would have the shortest garden (owing to two rear parking spaces) at 9 metres in length.
- 1.5 The proposed terrace would be of traditional appearance with brickwork at ground floor level above a ragstone plinth, plain clay tile hanging to the first floor elevation and plain clay tiles/fittings to the roof. Each dwelling would have a brick chimney and there would be three hipped roof dormers on the front (south) and rear (north) elevations, providing a single front and rear dormer to each of the three dwellings. It is proposed that white aluminium windows and timber doors are used

throughout, although all external materials proposed at this stage are indicative and would be subject to future approval as part of an appropriately worded planning condition.

- 1.6 As mentioned above, the application site sits on an elevated position, ranging approximately 1 – 1.5 metres above the level of Church Lane. Although exact finished floor levels of the proposed dwellings have not been indicated on the submitted plans, it is indicated that the overall ridge height of the terrace will sit at a level just below that of the ridge height of the main roofs of the pair of semi detached dwellings immediately to the west (1 & 2 Trosley House Cottages).
- 1.7 Vehicular access would be provided to the site via the existing access to the site. Six car parking spaces and a turning area would be provided in front of the proposed terrace, between the new dwellings and the boundary with Church Lane. A further two spaces would be provided to the rear of 'House 3' (the eastern most house within the terrace), accessed by an informal access track leading to land within the applicant's ownership behind the application site. Pedestrian access would be from Church Lane.
- 1.8 Owing to the level change on the frontage of the application site with Church Lane, it is proposed that a landscaped bank is created, planted with a number of native and specimen trees, low level shrubs and hedging. The final specification for this bank, which potentially could include a low level section of retaining ragstone walling, is yet to be determined, and would be the subject of further approval as part of a planning condition requirement.
- 1.9 The application is accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal, a Topographical Survey and a Desk Study in respect of potential contamination.

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

- 2.1 Called in by Cllr Kemp owing to the history of the site and the local concerns raised during the application determination.

## **3. The Site:**

- 3.1 The application site is located within the confines of Trottiscliffe and within the Trottiscliffe Conservation Area (CA). The eastern boundary of the application site also comprises the boundary of the settlement with the Metropolitan Green Belt as well as defining the extent of the CA. The site and surrounding area lies within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a water gathering area.
- 3.2 The application site comprises a broadly rectangular site located on the northern side of Church Lane. It is presently occupied by a relatively small and dilapidated single storey wooden bungalow, located within the southern part of the site, in relatively close proximity to the western boundary of the site. It is surrounded by a



TM/12/00297/CA Refuse 4 December 2012  
Appeal Dismissed 4 September 2013  
Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of Cedar Bungalow and outbuildings and erection of 4 detached dwellings, landscaping and car parking

TM/13/00075/FL Refuse 16 April 2013

Demolition of detached dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 3 detached dwellings and associated works

TM/13/00076/CA Refuse 16 April 2013

Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of detached dwelling and outbuildings

TM/13/00077/FL Refuse 16 April 2013

Demolition of detached dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 2 detached dwellings and associated works

TM/13/00078/CA Refuse 16 April 2013

Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of detached dwelling and outbuildings

## 5. Consultees:

- 5.1 Trottiscliffe PC: The PC is pleased to see that the concerns regarding shadowing of the garden of the adjacent property [2 Trosley House Cottages] have been acknowledged, but still have some concerns over this. Although it is felt that this is an improvement on previous applications, it is regrettable that the new configuration leads to a considerably smaller garden to one of the properties ['House 3']. The PC still has concerns over the external materials and landscaping and requests that they be separately conditioned on any permission granted.
- 5.2 KCC (Highways): Subject to the provision and permanent retention of vehicle parking spaces shown on the submitted plans prior to the use of the site commencing, has no objections to the revised proposals.
- 5.3 KCC (Archaeology): Has no comments to make on these proposals.
- 5.4 Environment Agency: Has assessed this application as having a low environmental risk and, therefore, has no comments to make.
- 5.5 Private Reps: 18/0X/17R/0S + site and press notice. The following concerns have been expressed to the initial and amended proposals:
- The proposed terrace would be constructed right up to the boundary of an existing house [2 Trosley House Cottages]. The proposed building would start near the front corner of the adjoining property, continuing past the garage and

would result in a large flank wall towering over the adjoining property. No other house in the village would be so adversely affected;

- The development would be completely out of scale in this ancient village environment where no neighbouring property is three storeys high;
- The application site is on an elevated position, above the ground level of Church Lane. Any building on this site will therefore appear more dominant in the street-scene;
- The proposed terraced houses, at a higher level than Church Lane will directly overlook the front rooms of no's 1 – 4 Pine Cottages;
- Inadequate parking provisions proposed – there is no overspill capacity in Church Lane;
- Increased traffic on Church Lane, an already narrow rural street;
- If the existing Cedar Bungalow is to be replaced, it should be on the basis of a “one for one” replacement, not a three for one ratio;
- The size of the dwellings and the rear north-facing gardens are too small – this will result in occupiers of the new homes who will not want to stay in the village because of the lack of space/storage room;
- The development is largely located on land which currently is used for agricultural purposes, very little of it is on the area used by the original house. This would seem to contradict the protection afforded by the area's status as an AONB;
- The application site is within a Conservation Area – conservation implies retaining the status quo, something not being proposed in this case;
- Concerns with site drainage arising from increased built development within a currently green site;
- Requests that a ragstone wall be created at the front of the site where there is a change in level down to Church Lane – this would help reduce the impact of car headlights shining on properties on the opposite side of the road [1 – 4 Pine Cottages]; and
- The proposed hipped dormer windows are out of keeping with the area.

## **6. Determining Issues:**

- 6.1 Policy CP1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 (TMBCS) sets out the Council's overarching policy for creating sustainable communities. This policy requires, inter alia, (1) all proposals must result in a high quality

sustainable environment; (3) the need for development will be balanced against the need to protect and enhance the natural and built environment, and preserve, or where possible enhance, the quality of the countryside, residential amenity and land, air and water quality; (5) where practicable, new housing development should include a mix of house types and tenure and must meet identified needs in terms of affordability; and (6) development will be concentrated at the highest density compatible with the local built and natural environment mainly on Previously Developed Land.

- 6.2 Policy CP13 of the TMBCS allows for the redevelopment of a site within the confines of an 'Other Rural Settlement' such as Trottiscliffe. This policy states that new development will be restricted to minor development appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement. In the case of redevelopment, development will only be permitted if: (a) the overall trip generation is projected to be lower than that associated with the former use; (b) if there is some significant improvement to the appearance, character and functioning of the settlement; or (c) there is an exceptional local need for affordable housing in terms of TMBCS Policy CP19.
- 6.3 Policy CP24 of the TMBCS relates to achieving a high quality environment. This policy requires that development must, inter alia, (1) be well designed and of a high quality in terms of detailing and use of appropriate materials, and must through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings; and (3) development which by virtue of its design would be detrimental to the built environment, amenity or functioning and character of a settlement or the countryside will not be permitted.
- 6.4 The site is within the confines of the Trottiscliffe Conservation Area (CA) and the Kent Downs AONB (AONB). Policy CP7 of the TMBCS requires development to not be detrimental to the natural beauty of the AONB, whilst Policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS, Policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD and paragraphs 17 and 56 to 66 in the NPPF require development to be of a high standard of design and to reflect the character of the area.
- 6.5 In terms of the impact on the CA it is also necessary to refer to paragraphs 131, 132, 133 and 137 of the NPPF; these outline the importance of heritage assets that includes conservation areas. It is outlined that development that leads to substantial harm to a heritage asset should be refused unless it can be justified that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that would outweigh the harm. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset should be treated favourably. The statutory requirement to give special consideration as to whether a development proposal will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of a Conservation Area is furthermore set down in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 6.6 MDE DPD Policy SQ8 states that, inter alia, (2) development proposals will only be permitted where they would not significantly harm highway safety and where traffic generated by the development can adequately be served by the highway network and (4) development proposals should comply with parking standards which will be set out in a Supplementary Planning Document. In this instance, the adopted parking standards are set out in Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 Residential Parking (IGN3).
- 6.7 Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) seeks to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. The site of the existing dwellinghouse (Cedar Bungalow) is considered to be Previously Developed Land (PDL), however, residential garden land is specifically excluded from the definition of PDL within the NPPF. Accordingly, the grounds of Cedar Bungalow (i.e. its immediate curtilage) is not considered to constitute PDL. The definition of PDL in the NPPF states that "*it should not be assumed that the whole curtilage should be developed*". Whilst the majority of the site is not classed as PDL that, in itself, does not mean it is not capable of being developed as there are specific policies in the Local Development Framework against which to consider the principle of the development and its detailed merits.
- 6.8 Paragraph 53 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area. Whilst there are no directly related adopted Development Plan Policies in place resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens, the general character tests set out in TMBCS Policies CP13 and CP24 and MDE DPD Policy SQ1 are the most directly relevant policies to consider in this respect.
- 6.9 The application site is formed of the dilapidated wooden structure which formed Cedar Bungalow, a shed/outbuilding to the rear of the bungalow and low level remains of walls of what is thought to be previous vegetable gardens. The majority of the application site, however, forms part of the former garden of Cedar Bungalow and is laid to grass, with a band of large coniferous trees along the eastern and southern boundaries and other low level overgrown vegetation. The proposals would result in the demolition of the Cedar Bungalow and any associated outbuildings/structures and the construction of a terrace of 3 no. three bedroom dwellings with associated vehicle parking; representing a net gain of 2 new dwellings.
- 6.10 Whilst I accept that, at least in principle, the previously developed part of Cedar Bungalow (i.e. the built development footprint) is capable of being redeveloped, there is no presumption in favour of the development of the garden areas of this dwelling in this instance. The key test here, however, is whether the proposals are

acceptable in terms of their appearance, character and impact on the functioning of this rural settlement, as required by all relevant adopted policies, including TMBCS Policy CP13.

- 6.11 As the site lies within the defined rural settlement of Trottiscliffe, the proposals must be considered in relation to the requirements of TMBCS Policy CP13. As the proposals represent the overall redevelopment of the application site, it can only be considered to accord with Policy CP13 where specific tests would be met (as outlined in paragraph 6.2 above).
- 6.12 In respect of highway matters, as discussed in more detail below (see paragraphs 6.27 to 6.28), I have concluded that in highway capacity, safety and vehicle parking terms the development proposals are acceptable. I therefore conclude that the redevelopment scheme would not result in an unacceptable highway impact, amounting to a detrimental impact on the character and functioning of the village, and, therefore, find the scheme compliant with the first key test of TMBCS Policy CP13.
- 6.13 As discussed in further detail below (see paragraphs 6.16 to 6.21), I have concluded that the current, now dilapidated, Cedar Bungalow adds little to the overall character or appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area. I have also formed the view that the new terrace is of a design, scale and layout that preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, would not be detrimental to the natural beauty of the AONB. On this basis, I conclude that the redevelopment scheme would not harm the appearance and character of this part of Trottiscliffe to warrant refusal.
- 6.14 The proposals have not been submitted to meet an exceptional local need for affordable housing and, therefore, the latter policy test of TMBCS Policy CP13 is not relevant in this instance.
- 6.15 Taking the three strands of TMBCS Policy CP13 into consideration (i.e. trip generation, improvement to the settlement and affordable housing), for the reasons discussed above I consider the proposals to generally accord with these overarching policy objectives.
- 6.16 In terms of the loss of the existing dwelling, Paragraph 136 of the NPPF requires LPAs to not permit the loss of a heritage assets without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred. I am of the opinion that the existing bungalow has limited heritage merit, but relates to the rural character of the Trottiscliffe Conservation Area. However, in the event that a suitable scheme were proposed for the site, I do consider that the loss of the existing building could be justified.
- 6.17 I am aware that there is not a consistent design or form of dwellings within this part of Trottiscliffe. The wider Conservation Area takes in both the historic core of the village and adjoining areas which contribute to its character. The designated area

as a whole, therefore, includes a mix of building types and ages as well as a variety of materials. In the vicinity of the application site, building types comprise detached houses, which tend to be fairly substantial in scale and individual in design, together with more modestly scaled cottages in pairs or short terraces. I note that there is no consistent building line along Church Lane and the layout and spacing of buildings is varied. Architectural styles also vary and most properties have more than one external wall finish which gives a richness of colour and texture.

- 6.18 The application proposal would create a terrace of three modestly proportioned 3 bedroom houses (Houses 1 – 3) set back from the Church Lane frontage behind a car parking area and a landscaped bank. The ground levels of houses 1 – 3 would be raised above Church Lane which, together with their siting, would make the houses fairly prominent in the street scene. That said, the new terrace would not appear dissimilar in overall height terms to that of the adjoining pair of semi detached dwellings to the west (1 – 2 Trosley House Cottages), owing to the proposed roof ridge height of the new dwellings sitting slightly below that of the main roof ridge of 2 Trosley House Cottages.
- 6.19 The terrace would be of a traditional appearance, with a mix of brickwork, plain clay tile hanging and plain clay roof tiles. Other traditional detailing would include brick chimneys, a variety of front porches and a low level ragstone plinth. The use of a staggered frontage between House 1 and House 2 is proposed to reduce the overall bulk and visual impact on the adjoining dwelling (2 Trosley House Cottages), an approach which I consider acceptable in design and street scene terms in this instance. Overall, I consider that the design approach and traditional detailing to be acceptable for this Conservation Area setting. The use of a planning condition could sufficiently control external materials of the dwellings, including appropriate window and door joinery details and to control the eaves and dormer construction details to ensure it is in keeping with the rural character.
- 6.20 The proposals involve a car parking area in front of the new terrace which would provide six vehicle spaces. A further two vehicle parking spaces are proposed to the rear of House 3, accessed off an informal access track leading between the eastern end of the new terrace to further land owned by the applicant behind the application site. Given the level change of some 1 – 1.5 metres between the application site and Church Lane, the application proposes a landscaped bank at the front of the site, planted with a mix of trees, hedging and low level shrubs. I consider that the detailing of this bank will form an important part of ensuring that the proposed development fits in well with the street scene. On the basis that full details of this bank have not been provided at this stage, I consider that the use of a planning condition could sufficiently control the exact details of this important bank feature for later consideration.

- 6.21 For the reasons outlined above, I am of the opinion that the proposals would comply with TMBCS Policies CP1, CP13 and CP24, together with MDE DPD Policy SQ1 which require proposals to protect or enhance the historic environment and, through their scale, layout and materials, respect their surroundings. I am also of the opinion that the scheme would accord with paragraph 131 of the NPPF which requires proposals in Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance the character of the area.
- 6.22 Members will be aware that the proposals have generated objections from the local community, primarily based on the number of dwellings proposed, the specific design and layout approach taken and impact on surrounding residential amenity. The proposals as now amended have been subject to much scrutiny from Officers, resulting in a number of design and layout changes to reduce, as far as possible, the potential impact of the scheme on surrounding residential dwellings. A number of site visits have been taken to the application site and surrounding area, including a visit in the house and rear garden area of the closest dwelling which borders the application site to the west (2 Trosley House Cottages).
- 6.23 House 1 (the westerly most dwelling) is proposed to be located approximately 1 metre from the boundary between the application site and 2 Trosley House Cottages. The front building line of House 1 is proposed to be sited approximately 1.5m further back than the front wall of the attached garage to 2 Trosley House Cottages. House 1 would then extend some 12.5m in depth. The west flank elevation of House 1 will be visible (in part) from 2 Trosley House Cottages since the new flank elevation will extend approximately 7m from the rear façade of the attached garage to 2 Trosley House Cottages. The extent of the flank elevation which would be visible from the adjoining property would be approximately half the depth of the proposed dwelling, broadly speaking from the new ridge height backwards. Of this 7m, approximately 5.5m would be two storey height, with the remaining 1.5m comprising of a single storey 'lean to' style extension. A further projection on the rear of House 1, extending to the line of the proposed rear façade of Houses 2 and 3, would be some 6m from the boundary of the application site with 2 Trosley House Cottages.
- 6.24 Whilst I am sympathetic to the concerns expressed by the owners of 2 Trosley House Cottages owing to the change of outlook and overall increase built form which will undoubtedly arise from these proposals, having considered the proposals in light of the orientation, scale, layout and overall bulk of the proposed dwellings, I do not consider that such impact is a sufficient ground to refuse the proposals in this instance.
- 6.25 I note that the west flank elevation of House 1 would not include any windows at first or second floor level which could give rise to overlooking of either the main dwelling or the private rear garden of 2 Trosley House Cottages. It is noted that there would be a window inserted in this elevation at ground floor level to provide

light into the kitchen, but owing to a levels and existing boundary wall along the dividing boundary, I am satisfied that there would not be any overlooking issues arising in this instance.

- 6.26 Owing to the layout of the terrace within the application site, the front façade of House 1 would be situated some 20m from the façade of 1 Pine Cottages which is located on the opposite side of Church Lane. Owing to the stepped arrangement of the proposed terrace properties, this façade to façade distance would increase to between 26 – 29m for Houses 2 and 3 across to no's 3 & 4 Pine Cottages. Whilst I accept that the new terraced properties will be higher than 1 – 4 Pine Cottages, owing to the existing change in levels, the distances proposed in this instance are considered to be acceptable within the built confines and would not result in an unacceptable or overriding residential amenity objection.
- 6.27 The development proposals put forward make use of the existing highway access from Church Lane to the existing Cedar Bungalow dwelling and land owned by the applicant further beyond (to the north). As outlined above, it is proposed that a car parking area of 6 spaces is proposed to the frontage of the site, together with a further 2 car parking spaces directly behind House 3. The adopted car parking standards (Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 – Residential Parking) state that within a village environment three bedroom houses should be served by 2 independently accessible spaces per unit. Additional visitors parking should also be provided at the ratio of 0.2 spaces per unit. On the basis of the proposed three no 3 bedroom dwellings and the need for visitors' parking spaces, there is a requirement to provide 7 off-street parking spaces.
- 6.28 The proposed layout incorporates an overall 8 off-street parking spaces within the application site. This level meets, and indeed exceeds, the required level of parking provision. I note that KCC Highways and Transportation have raised no objections to the proposals, subject to the provision of car parking spaces prior to first occupation of the dwellings and their retention thereafter. Whilst I accept that there are wider parking challenges within the local area, based on the proposals put forward, I consider the development to be acceptable in highway terms.
- 6.29 The application site is not of such a size that would trigger the requirement for affordable housing as required by Policy CP17 of the TMBCS. Owing to the size of the site and the requirements of Policy CP17 it would be unreasonable to request an affordable housing contribution in this instance.
- 6.30 The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal for the site which concludes that subject to the implementation of recommendations in respect of protecting slow worms and nesting birds during the construction phase, together with recommendations regarding lighting (for bats) and habitat enhancements, the proposal should not materially harm protected species. Having regard to the

standing advice for protected species, I consider that any ecological matters could be reasonably secured by condition which would comply with Policy NE3 of the MDE DPD and paragraphs 117 and 118 of the NPPF.

6.31 A number of other important technical matters such as soft landscaping, contamination, refuse facilities, boundary fencing, external lighting, site drainage and finished floor levels can all be dealt with by appropriately worded planning conditions.

6.32 Having considered the application in light of Development Plan Policy, planning policy guidance and in respect of other material planning objections received, I consider the proposed scheme of three terraced dwellings, the access and the proposed parking arrangements to be acceptable in this location within the built village confines of Trottiscliffe. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns received in respect of overdevelopment and amenity impacts, having considered the proposals as a whole, I am satisfied that the scheme is acceptable and would result in no unacceptable or overriding harm to the historic fabric of the area. I, therefore, recommend that subject to the detailed planning conditions, as set out below, planning permission is granted for this redevelopment scheme.

## **7. Recommendation:**

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Letter dated 28.11.2013, Notice dated 22.11.2013, Letter dated 22.11.2013, Design and Access Statement dated 22.11.2013, Ecological Assessment dated 22.11.2013, Desk Study Assessment G/121108/001 dated 22.11.2013, Topographical Survey ZET/CEDAR/001 dated 22.11.2013, Email dated 03.03.2014, Proposed Floor Plans 2916 4 dated 03.03.2014 and Proposed Elevations 2916 5 dated 03.03.2014, subject to the following:

### **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. No development shall take place until details of any joinery, eaves and dormer construction to be used 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.

4. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment. All planting, seeding and turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be implemented during the first planting season following occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the earlier. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying, being seriously damaged or diseased within 10 years of planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees or shrubs of similar size and species, unless the Authority gives written consent to any variation. Any boundary fences or walls or similar structures as may be approved shall be erected before first occupation of the building to which they relate.

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

5. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking and turning 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.

6. No development shall commence until details of a scheme for the storage and screening of refuse has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is occupied and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To facilitate the collection of refuse and preserve visual amenity.

7. No building shall be occupied until the gardens between the plots have been fenced in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such fencing shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To retain and enhance the character of the locality.

8. There shall be no external lighting except in accordance with a scheme of external lighting submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

9. No building shall be occupied until works for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage have been provided on the site to serve the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of pollution prevention.

10. No development shall take place until details of proposed finished floor, ridge and eaves levels of buildings and ground levels within the application site have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved level details.

Reason: In order to control the development and to ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of existing buildings or the visual amenity of the locality.

11. No development shall take place until details the construction and appearance, including the external materials to be used, of the proposed bank fronting onto Church Lane have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved bank details.

Reason: In order to control the development and to ensure that the development does not harm the character, appearance or the visual amenity of the locality.

### **Informatives**

1. Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council operates a two wheeled bin and green box recycling refuse collection service from the boundary of the property. In addition, the Council also operates a fortnightly recycling box/bin service. This would require an area approximately twice the size of a wheeled bin per property. Bins/boxes should be stored within the boundary of the property and placed at the nearest point to the public highway on the relevant collection day.
2. During the demolition and construction phases, the hours of working (including deliveries) should be restricted to the following times; Monday to Friday 08:00 hours – 18:00 hours; Saturday 08:00 hours – 13:00 hours; and no work on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Contact: Julian Moat