

APPLICATION: MA/09/2004 Date: 2 November 2009 Received: 21 December 2009

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs H Boswell

LOCATION: CHERRY-TREE CARAVAN SITE, CHURCH HILL, BOUGHTON MONCHELSEA, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME17 4BU

PARISH: Boughton Monchelsea, Linton

PROPOSAL: Planning permission for change of use of land to holiday caravan site for up to 10no. static caravans including access, hardstanding, cesspool, reception building, boundary treatment and security barrier in accordance with plans numbered CTC4ABC received on the 17 June 2010; design and access statement; transport and noise statement, cesspool details received on 3 November 2009; arboricultural report, received on 21 December 2009 and ecological report, received on 15 April 2010.

AGENDA DATE: 1st July 2010

CASE OFFICER: Amanda Marks

The recommendation for this application is being reported to Committee for decision because:

- It is contrary to views expressed by the Parish Council.

1. POLICIES

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ENV28, ED20

South East Plan 2009: TSR5, CS12, C4, RE3, CC6

Government Policy: PPS1, DCLG: Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism, PPS7, PPS13

1. HISTORY

MA/02/0255 Cherry Tree Caravan Site, Church lane, Boughton Monchelsea. Change of use of site to open air caravan parking for 50 caravans Approved 19/8/02 subject to a legal agreement preventing implementation of planning permission MA/96/1611.

MA/96/1611 Cherry Tree Caravan Site, Church lane, Boughton Monchelsea. (Land to west of vicarage) – Change of use of land for garaging 20 caravans. Allowed at appeal 13/11/00.

- 2.1 As can be seen from the above, this application site has already been subject to two planning applications, for the siting of caravans (albeit for storage purposes). These previous applications were for the same site, utilising the same access point onto Church Hill.

2. CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council would like to see the application REFUSED because:

1. The development, if permitted, will set a precedent for other forms of development on the south side of the B2163. The Parish Council wishes to see the planning authority strongly resist any form of new build or inappropriate development on the south side of Heath Road. Heath Road should remain a natural boundary of built development within the open countryside.
1. The proposal would result in unjustified residential development within open countryside, contrary to Policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 and Policies CC1, CC6, and C4 of the South East Plan 2009.
2. The proposed development is outside the defined boundary of the village and would be contrary to Policy H27 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 and CC1, CC6, and C4 of the South East Plan 2009.
3. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the occupants of The Vicarage.
4. The proposed development would introduce unjustified additional traffic onto a rural lane which will affect its character contrary to Policy NRM10 of the South East Plan 2009.
5. The site borders the remains of first century BC Belgic earth works. The setting of the earthworks will be damaged by the development, contrary to Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009.

3.2 Environment Agency: Raise no objection with the following advice: an acceptable method of foul drainage would be a watertight sealed cesspool; the proposed soakaways are acceptable subject to no discharge into any of the following - contaminated land; directly into groundwater or made ground.

3.3 KCC Archeology: no objections subject to a condition on site fencing to protect the earthwork on the northern boundary.

3.4 Southern Water: No objections.

3.5 MBC: Landscape: 'The tree report accurately describes the trees on the northern boundary as being old. Many of these are also subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The woodland to the west of the site has been described in

less detail, but is coppiced chestnut that is younger, but still well established and, in my opinion, important both in its landscape contribution, but also in its function as a wildlife corridor, linking the TPO'd woodland to the north with the woodland block and hedgerows further south. Continuous woodland and hedgerow cover in this area is also likely to be an important corridor between two nearby blocks of ancient woodland.

I am satisfied that the report identifies the issues that arise where there is a conflict between the proposal and potential damage to retained trees. These are highlighted in section 10 (foundations) and section 13 (services). I also raise no objection to the proposed tree removals and management works detailed in the tree report on arboricultural grounds.

However, although suggestions are made in the tree report on how safeguarding of retained trees could be achieved, there is insufficient detail to demonstrate that damage to trees will be avoided or minimised. I still have some minor concerns about how construction of foundations, installation of services along the existing entrance to the site and installation of caravans will take place without damage to trees. In principle, however, I consider that the proposal can be achieved without detriment to retained trees through the use of appropriate conditions.

I would like to see conditions attached requiring more detailed information in the form of an arboricultural method statement, to be submitted and approved prior to works commencing on site.

My other concerns relate to the future use of the site and how this is likely to impact on the surrounding area. The proposal indicates that the site will be used for leisure/holiday purposes, and is therefore likely to have visiting families with dogs and children. It is reasonable to assume that the trees to the north and woodland to the west will be used for informal recreation unless their use as part of the site is controlled in some way.

The trees (and earthbank) to the north are sensitive due to their age and could be easily damaged. Similarly, the woodland to the west, although not in the same ownership as the site, could be damaged by inappropriate users of the site. For this reason, I consider that access should be prevented to these areas, and that this should be required by a condition that specifies the erection of a permanent fence of at least 1.8m height, to be maintained for as long as the site remains in use as a caravan site. Access to the areas within the same ownership for management purposes could still be maintained through the use of a locked gate. The location, design and method of installation of such a fence should be included within the arboricultural method statement.'

3.6 Kent Wildlife Trust: 'The ecological scoping report acknowledges the considerable nature conservation interest at this site and in the adjacent orchards, hedgerows and woodland. It acknowledges the risk of disturbance to important species and recommends steps are taken to avoid and mitigate this

risk with fencing along the western boundary, some tree work and the use of careful design features for any lighting units.

Unfortunately, these measures will not eliminate the risks, which, because of the close proximity of holiday lodges and woodland/hedgerow habitat, will remain significant as a result of the activities of both visitors and their domestic animals. There can be no doubt that the proposed use represents a far greater risk of disturbance than the current lawful use for the storage of caravans.

The trust feels that the application fails to satisfy national, regional and local planning policies, in particular PPS9, key principle vi. It objects to the grant of planning permission.

If, notwithstanding the Trust's objection, the Council is mindful to grant permission, then I would urge it to attach conditions to fence the whole of the site (to contain domestic pets), to rejuvenate the hedgerow on the northern boundary with new native-species (local provenance) planting and to prohibit the use of external lighting, in addition to the recommendations made by the applicant's ecologist.'

3.7 Natural England: No objections, no further survey work required.

3.8 MBC Environmental Health Officer: 'Contamination unlikely to be present. There are no noise issues in relation to transportation noise. The proposed development is in an isolated area. The application was accompanied by a Transport and Noise Assessment. The report concludes that there would be 20 transport movements per day when the site is fully occupied and that the development would not cause a nuisance to the occupants of the nearest residential property 'The Vicarage'.

The development will be served by a Klargester 8,000l sealed cesspool, which will need to be emptied at appropriate intervals. I note that the plans include an area for separate waste and recycling facilities.'

3.9 Kent Highway Authority: No objections have been raised subject to conditions. Kent Highway Services made the following comments: -

'This site was the subject of a previous appeal for the change of use of land for the garaging of 20 caravans. The appeal was allowed and the Inspector was satisfied that the proposal would not lead to an unacceptable adverse effect on highway safety.

This new application proposes 10 static caravans. The traffic generated by this proposal is not estimated to be high and is unlikely to have an adverse effect on highway safety. 1 parking space is provided for each caravan and the access track to the site is to be 5.5m wide which is considered acceptable. I therefore have no objections to the proposals in respect of highway matters.'

4.0 REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Neighbouring occupiers were notified and nine letters of objection have been received. The objections are summarised below: -

- Detrimental to highway safety as the site would be accessed off a dangerous bend and an existing busy road;
- The additional traffic would exacerbate existing problems at the Boughton Monchelsea crossroads, where accidents have increased with pedestrians due to speeding and volume of traffic;
- Disturbance to wildlife; loss of trees and/or reduction in size and loss of bluebells;
- Detrimental impact on the Special Landscape Area, agricultural land and infringement of the anti-coalescence belt;
- Potential to impact on a pre-roman earthwork which forms the northern boundary of the site;
- Layout and density of the buildings;
- Loss of privacy;
- Noise, smells and disturbance from use of site;
- Inappropriate location between a vicarage and a primary school;
- Contrary to policies contained in the South East Plan which protect the countryside and agricultural land;

4.2 Boughton Monchelsea Village Hall & Recreation Ground: Comments received as follows: 'The organisation is the body responsible for the management of the village hall, recreation ground and children's play area in Boughton Monchelsea village. Our endeavour is to maintain these amenities on behalf of our community in the manner expected of a rural village setting. The planning application was discussed at the management meeting and the proposal was unanimously against the proposal for the following reasons:

1. The volume of additional traffic that would create on a rural village lane.
1. It's detrimental affect to the amenities of local properties, in particular:
 - The vicarage, where the noise, impact on visual appearance and disturbance is not in keeping with the expectation of villagers visiting their rural vicarage and contrary to the environment required by parishioners attending the vicar for more sober reasons; and
 - The primary school, where the effect on visual appearance, quiet surroundings and general disturbance would not be in keeping with the current rural village setting.
2. The overall detriment to the visual scene of the village and a rural lane, and

3. Contrary to the Maidstone local plan of not building in the countryside.

Of particular concern is the expectation that despite the 'holiday caravan site' label, this development will in fact become a permanent site for 'travellers.'

4.3 CPRE: Is opposed to this application for the following reasons (in summary):

1. Inappropriate development in the countryside. Contrary to policy ENV28 of the MBWLP. The scheme for consideration is significantly different to that granted planning permission by the Planning Inspector for the storage of 20 caravans.
1. Concerned to ensure that the wooden lodge type accommodation is conditioned as being mobile buildings to ensure they do not become permanent dwellings.
2. The reception building will generate additional visits to the site and the security barrier will need to be managed. Arrangements are needed for the emergency services.
3. This is an unsustainable location with reliance on the private car. A disproportionate amount of car parking is shown when considering the size of the unit.
4. Despite letters of support from MBC Tourism and Tourism South East, these letters stress quality provision is needed. CPRE does not consider the proposal to fall within this remit. Considers the suggested 20 vehicle movements per day to be an underestimate and no account has been taken of the trips needed by the cess pool emptying lorry.
5. Shared exit off Church Hill with the vicarage will have a detrimental impact on the vicarage. Noise and light pollution inevitable.
6. CPRE request the application be refused.
7. If approved, CPRE request the following conditions be imposed:
 - Any accommodation must be classed as mobile;
 - The length of stay in any one unit must be regulated; suggest a complete closure period;
 - Exterior lighting to be submitted to MBC for approval;
 - Management scheme for the security barrier;
 - The condition of the ancient earthworks must be regularly inspected to ensure that it is not being damaged and that the track to the site is not being pushed towards the vicarage.

5.0 CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

- 5.1.1 The application site lies on the west side of Church Hill, approximately 350m south of the cross roads with Heath Road, outside and to the south of the village boundary of Boughton Monchelsea. The site has an area of 0.6 hectares (including the access track) and lies in the open countryside. There are no site specific designations within the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000; there is however an ancient earth work which runs along the northern boundary. The site is roughly rectangular in shape although tapers to the rear at the western boundary. It is accessed off Church Hill by a gravelled track which runs parallel to the northern curtilage of the Vicarage. The initial few metres of the track also serve as an access into the curtilage of the Vicarage. There is a gated entrance into the site at the top of the access track.
- 5.1.2 The site comprises a grassed open area (approximately 0.3 hectares) with substantial tree and hedge planting on all boundaries with some sections of fencing. The trees along the northern boundary are protected by Tree Preservation Order 8 of 1982. There is a further TPO on land adjacent to the north-west corner of the site – TPO 3 of 1994. The trees are approximately 12m in height and vary in condition and species. The site is relatively level. There is also coniferous hedge aligning the southern boundary of the access track which is planted behind a wooden picket fence of approximately 1m in height; the fence is owned by the applicant, the hedge is within the curtilage of the Vicarage. The northern boundary of the access track contains wire mesh fencing with trees behind on adjacent land.
- 5.1.3 At the time of the most recent site visit there were 4 caravans stored on the site.
- 5.1.4 The closest residential boundary is that of the Vicarage which also serves as a community use for personal business relating to the function of the church. The rearmost part of the dwellinghouse is between 25-30m from the western boundary which abuts the application site. The closest proposed caravan would be 38m from the Vicarage and would be separated by a proposed 8-10m landscape buffer.
- 5.1.5 To the north of the site lie open fields with an expired planning permission for open storage of 50 caravans and sporadic development on the boundary with Church Hill. The southernmost boundary of Boughton Monchelsea Primary School is situated approximately 200m north of the application site.

5.2 Proposal

- 5.2.1 Planning permission is sought for a change of use of land to a holiday caravan park for up to 10 static caravans. The development includes access, hard standing, a cesspool, reception building, boundary treatment and a security

barrier. The site is currently used for the open storage of caravans (permission granted for no more than 20). The lawful use of the site will be discussed later in this report.

- 5.2.2 The application includes the submission of a Design and Access Statement; a Noise and Traffic Report; a Sealed cesspool brochure; and a full ecological scoping survey which has been considered by both Natural England and Kent Wildlife Trust.
- 5.2.3 The style of mobile caravan that is proposed is indicated as being finished in timber cladding with a shallow pitched roof – a design akin to a woodland lodge. Each lodge would be provided with one marked parking bay. Within the site a two-way gravel road is proposed of 4.1m in width and the parking is to be grouped to maximise the retention of green areas.
- 5.4.2 It is proposed that the site be served by a Sealed Cesspool in the absence of connection to mains drainage. This is the most appropriate means of containment of domestic sewage for uses such as that proposed. Each caravan will be connected to this drainage system provided under ground and periodically emptied.
- 5.2.5 A small reception building and bin store is to be provided at the front of the site.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 Development in the countryside is restricted by the terms of Development Plan Policy and Central Government Guidance. There are however, exceptions to this. Policy ED20 of the MBWLP 2000 is a criteria based policy which allows for the provision of holiday caravan sites outside the defined urban and village boundaries. The application should therefore be assessed against the following:

- 1) The site must be unobtrusive in the landscape and not bring detriment to visual or other amenity of the surrounding area;
- 1) The site must be capable of being adequately screened; internally landscaped and capable of appropriate additional landscaping;
- 2) Adequate access, parking and servicing arrangements together with no highway objections;
- 3) Acceptable in circumstances of similar uses in the locality and their combined highway and environmental impact;
- 4) No detrimental impact on neighbouring land uses or residential amenity.

The proposal will be measured against the above criterion within this report.

5.3.2 In addition to policy ED20, there is the more general policy ENV28 which affords protection to the countryside. Policy ENV28 restricts new development in the

countryside subject to 5 criteria and in the case of this proposal it is provided for under criteria 5 – ‘such other exceptions as indicated by policies elsewhere in this plan’; in this instance policy ED20.

- 5.3.3 PPS7 recognises the importance of tourism to the economy and suggests that the benefits of providing self catering holiday accommodation should be balanced against any environmental harm. In principle it accepts that caravan holiday parks are likely to be provided in the countryside; ideally close to settlement boundaries. Emphasis is placed on ensuring no harm is caused to the landscape and environment.
- 5.3.4 In addition to the aforementioned policies, the DCLG issued the ‘Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism’ in 2006. This guide highlights the importance of tourism to the economy and provides a framework for accommodating caravan parks through a plan led system. It is recognised that caravan parks on the edge of settlements are often the best location as these can be more sustainable.
- 5.3.5 All of the above mentioned policies and guidance are supportive of the proposed scheme subject to detailed impact. In light of this, I cannot agree with the views of the Parish Council that the development is inappropriate in the countryside.

5.4 Visual Impact

- 5.4.1 Only the access track is visible from Church Hill, with it being some 60m before a kink in the track and the siting of the small reception building. It is not possible to see within the interior of the site from any public vantage points to the north or south. Dense woodland shields the site to the west and the east contains a high evergreen hedge on the boundary of the vicarage. The site is not elevated and the access track provides further screening on both boundaries. Little has changed in terms of the character of the site since the planning inspectors decision in 1997 where it was considered that “*the caravans would have no appreciable adverse impact on the character of this attractive rural area.*” I am of the opinion that long distance views would not be compromised, and that both within the immediate locality, and the wider area the rural character would be protected.
- 5.4.2 The extent of the existing screening when considered with the relatively isolated location of the site, results in a development which would not be capable of causing visual harm to its setting and that of the surrounding area. This being said, the applicant has included within the proposals some additional landscaping on the eastern boundary. This landscaping would be at least 10metres deep, and include a double staggered indigenous hedge, and tree planting (species to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the development taking place).

I consider that, subject to suitable species being used, this proposed landscaping would be of a form and type that one would expect within the locality, and would blend in harmoniously with the surrounding area. Because the site is already well screened, it is not considered appropriate to request additional planting along any other boundary of the site, or along the access into the site.

5.4.3 I do not agree with representations that the proposal will not be in keeping with rural village life or would compromise the 'quiet surroundings' of the school. The substantial distance from the site to the school is adequate protection, and from my most recent site visit I could only faintly hear the school children outside on their break. The site is well secluded and separate so as not to negatively impact on village life.

5.5 Residential Amenity

5.5.1 There is one residential property which has the potential to be affected by this proposal – that of the Vicarage. The previous inspector's decision found that there would be insufficient grounds for refusal relating to noise and disturbance – this was based on the generous size of the grounds of the Vicarage; the high dense hedges and the existing portakabin office on the northern boundary. These on site circumstances have not changed, with the same access point being utilised, although the nature of this proposal (use) is different. The level of activity generated from 10 holiday caravans to 20 stored caravans is clearly different. In addition to holiday makers being present on site, there will be additional vehicular movements on a daily basis. There is also the added issue as expressed by the Parish Council and the Vicar that there would be a conflict between the two uses as the Vicarage is used for meetings of a sensitive nature.

5.5.2 With the above in mind, the applicant has amended the layout plan to move the caravans further away from the boundary with the vicarage. The nearest caravan would now be some 38metres from the Vicarage, and 12metres from the boundary of the site. An 8-10m fenced over landscaped buffer zone has been provided which adds to the existing vegetation within the vicarage site. It proposed that this include a 1.8metre high close boarded fence along the boundary, and also along part of the access into the site with the Vicarage to further reduce noise and disruption to this property. The plans have also relocated the bin stores so as to place these behind the reception hut and away from the boundary. The residential curtilage of the Vicarage is generous and there is ample private garden area with clear physical and distant separation from the proposed caravan park. I am satisfied that the owners of the Vicarage will not be unduly compromised by the proposed use with regard to the personal enjoyment of their site.

5.5.3 Further information has been sought from the Vicar with regard to the business use of the Vicarage. Visitors do visit the Vicarage for meetings of a more

personal nature both in relation to happy and sad events in their lives. Objection has been raised that a caravan park adjoining the Vicarage would be inappropriate when people are visiting the Vicar to discuss funeral arrangements. The Vicar has provided general information on the nature of visits, but due to personal health issues has not been able to provide a detailed analysis of the frequency of visits, time of day or indicate whether set times are set aside for such meetings. I consider that the majority of visits are likely to be undertaken during the day or early evening and that the combined distance of the caravans; the visual screening and the absence of holiday makers throughout the day are unlikely to cause undue disturbance. I also consider that with regard to vehicle noise disturbance, this is as likely if not more likely to be more pronounced from vehicles driving along Church Hill which is close to the portakabin.

5.6 Highways & Noise

- 5.6.1 A transport assessment accompanied the application. The report advises that 'The visibility from the access looking northward is virtually unlimited from approximately 2.4m from the edge of the carriageway. 'Unlimited' visibility is available to the south from approximately 1.8metres.' The Transport Assessment uses the TRICS database to assess the potential number of vehicle movements per day. Whilst there is not an exact match to the proposed use, the conclusions drawn from comparisons indicate pro-rata approximately twenty vehicle movements per day. I do not consider this to be excessive, and as such would not have a detrimental impact upon highway safety within the surrounding roads.
- 5.6.2 There is an existing bell-mouth which serves the access to the Vicarage and the caravan park. In the previous Inspectors decision, it was considered that the bell-mouth together with the width of Church Hill was adequate to allow safe and convenient manoeuvring for towing vehicles and caravans. As the caravans are now proposed to be permanent features on the site, the majority of vehicle movements will be by car only. The fact that the Inspector considered there to be suitable and safe access for towing to take place, leads me to believe that there will not be an issue with the periodic servicing vehicle required to empty the cesspool.
- 5.6.3 An analysis has also been undertaken of road traffic noise. The anticipated noise is well below the acceptable levels and would be infrequent noise as vehicles arrive/depart from site and door slamming within the site is a considerable distance from the nearest façade of the Vicarage. The Council's Environmental Health Manager is satisfied that there are no noise concerns associated with this application.

5.7 Landscaping, Ecology and Archaeology

- 5.7.1 Landscaping has been mentioned in the previous section on visual amenity. The site already contains a generous amount of screening on the site boundaries. This being said, it is important to retain the existing screening; enhance and protect the boundaries. I consider it would be reasonable and appropriate to ensure fencing around the perimeter of the site, to ensure that holiday makers do not stray under the tree canopies and cause damage to the vegetation. The applicant has indicated that no pets will be allowed on the site. Fencing will also be of benefit as protection of the earthwork on the northern boundary and ecological interests as suggested by Kent Wildlife Trust.
- 5.7.2 The comments of the landscape officer are very detailed and therefore I will not reiterate these. The main conclusions to be drawn are that the proposal can be undertaken without detriment to the existing trees subject to safeguarding.
- 5.7.3 With regard to matters of ecology, it was initially considered by Natural England that further survey work may be required. However, as detailed in the consultee comments, after clarification between the applicant's ecologist and Natural England, there is no need for further work to be undertaken. KWT do however, raise concern over the potential impact of the caravan park on ecology and habitats, I consider that their concerns can be addressed through the appropriate fencing off the site perimeter. Also, as mentioned previously no pets are to be permitted on site.

5.8 Other Matters

- 5.8.1 Reference was made earlier in this report to the lawful planning use of the site. In 1996 planning permission was granted on appeal for the open storage of 20 caravans. In 2002 planning permission was granted on land immediately north of the site for the open storage of 50 caravans; this latter permission was subject to a Legal Agreement that prohibited the use of the current application site for open storage of caravans. The 2002 planning permission has not been implemented and has now expired. Due to the wording of the Legal Agreement, should the applicant wish to continue open storage of caravans under the 1996 permission then the Legal Agreement needs to be formally cancelled. This being said, the current application is not for open storage of caravans, it is for a caravan park and therefore as a different use does not in itself require the Legal Agreement to be cancelled.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 In light of the detailed considerations outlined above, I consider that the site is acceptable in policy terms for use as a caravan park. After seeking additional information relating to ecology and landscape issues together with modification to the site layout, I am satisfied that the proposal can be undertaken without

detriment to the character of the area, visual and residential amenity, and will not compromise highway safety.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

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

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section of 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The caravan park hereby permitted shall not be open for business between 14 January to the 1 March in any calendar year (the closure period).

Reason: To ensure that the site is not used for permanent residential accommodation pursuant to policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

3. In the period between 1 March and 13 January (inclusive) in any calendar year (the open period), no caravan/lodge shall be occupied by any one individual or group of individuals for any period longer than one month.

Reason: To ensure that the site is not used for permanent residential accommodation pursuant to policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000.

4. No more than 10 caravan/lodges shall be provided on site, details of which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences. The details shall include external dimensions and materials.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development in accordance with Policies ENV28 and ED20 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

5. The development shall not commence until details of all fencing, and boundary treatment and entry/exit barriers to be placed within the site 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 before the first occupation of the building or land and maintained thereafter;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard

the enjoyment of their properties by nearby residents in accordance with policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan.

6. The development shall not commence until fencing has been erected, in a manner to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, along the length of the earthworks fringing the northern boundary of the site and to the woodland to the west of the site, and no works shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that important archaeological remains are not adversely affected by construction works, to ensure protection of the trees and in accordance with policy ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

7. The approved details of the parking/turning areas shall be completed before the commencement of the use of the land hereby permitted and shall thereafter be kept available for such use. No development, whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order, with or without modification) or not, shall be carried out on the areas indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to them;

Reason: Development without adequate parking/turning provision is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and in the interests of road safety to policy T13 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

8. The development shall not commence until landscaping, planting and management scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following completion of the development. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development pursuant to policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

9. The development shall not commence until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The AMS shall accord with the recommendations of BS5837:2005 'Trees in relation to construction – recommendations' and should include details of foundation design and methods of construction, details and methods of installation of services within and to the site and details of the design, location and installation of tree protection

measures. The AMS should also demonstrate how caravans will be transported to and from the site and installed on their foundations, without damage to retained trees. The approved barriers and/or ground protection shall be erected before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed, nor fires lit within any of the areas protected by this condition. The siting of barriers and/or ground protection shall not be altered, nor ground levels changed, nor excavations made within these areas without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard existing trees to be retained and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development pursuant to NRM7 of the South East Plan 2009.

10. The reception building hereby approved shall be built in accordance with the approved materials as shown on the submitted drawings.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

11. The development shall not commence until details of a properly consolidated and surfaced access (not loose stone or gravel) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy T23 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

12. The development shall not commence until details of any lighting to be placed, erected or provided within the site including any lighting to be attached to the proposed reception building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the subsequently approved details and no additional lighting to that approved shall be placed, erected or provided within the site at any time without the prior approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of the character and amenity of the surrounding countryside and to prevent light pollution pursuant to policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

Informatives set out below

Attention is drawn to Sections 60 & 61 of the COPA 1974 and to the Associated British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228:2009 for noise control on construction sites. Statutory requirements are laid down for control of noise during works of construction

and demolition and you are advised to contact the Environmental Health Manager regarding noise control requirements.

Plant and machinery used for demolition and construction shall only be operated within the application site between 0800 hours and 1900 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sunday and Bank Holidays.

No vehicles may arrive, depart, load or unload within the general site outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1900 Mondays to Fridays and 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

The applicant is advised that it will be necessary to make an application for a Caravan Site Licence under the Caravan Sites and the Control of Development Act 1960 within 21 days of planning consent having been granted. Failure to do so could result in action by the Council under the Act as caravan sites cannot operate without a licence. The applicant is advised to contact the Environmental Health Project Manager on 01622 602145 in respect of a licence.

Standard Full Plans, Outline, Reserved Matters Approval Reason:

The proposed development, subject to the conditions stated, is considered to comply with the policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and Kent Structure Plan 1996) and there are no overriding material consideration to indicate a refusal of planning consent.