

APPLICATION: MA/11/2100 Date: 5 December 2011 Received: 8 December 2011

APPLICANT: Charing Healthcare Ltd

LOCATION: CHIPPENDAYLE LODGE RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME, 10
CHIPPENDAYLE DRIVE, HARRIETSHAM, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME17
1AD

PARISH: Harrietsham

PROPOSAL: Part single-storey, part two-storey extension to form 23 bedroom extension to existing residential care home as shown on site location plan, drawing nos. 2114/50, 2114/51, 2114/52, 2114/53revX, 2114/54, Design and Access Statement, Planning Statement and Acoustic Survey received 08/12/2011.

AGENDA DATE: 26th January 2012

CASE OFFICER: Steve Clarke

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

- It is contrary to views expressed by Harrietsham Parish Council

1. POLICIES

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ENV6, H26, T13
- South East Plan 2009: SP2, SP3, CC1, CC6, H4, T4, BE4, BE5, NRM10, AOSR7
- Village Design Statement: N/A
- Government Policy: PPS1, PPG13, PPG24

2. HISTORY

2.1 Previous relevant planning history relating to the site is as follows:

- MA/09/0574: An application to discharge condition 3-materials; condition 4-landscaping; condition 8-waste management relating to MA/08/2030: APPROVED 24/06/2009
- MA/08/2034: Erection of refuse storage: WITHDRAWN 15/12/2008
- MA/08/2030: Amendments to planning permission MA/07/1572 for part single storey, part two storey rear extension to form twenty three additional bedrooms for use in conjunction with Residential Care Home: APPROVED 08/01/2009

- MA/07/1572: Erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension to provide twenty additional bedrooms for use in conjunction with residential care home: APPROVED 21/02/2008
- MA/07/1526: Proposed link and conversion of bungalow into six bedroom care home unit - APPROVED.
- MA/06/1938: Conversion of existing bungalow to three self contained units to be used in connection with the residential care home with external alterations and extension and alterations to the main entrance - APPROVED.
- MA/05/0454: Removal of condition 3 of planning permission MA/01/1460 to enable unrestricted occupation of bungalow - REFUSED - APPEAL DISMISSED.
- MA/04/1125: Removal of condition 3 of original planning permission MA/01/1460 to enable unrestricted occupation of the bungalow - REFUSED.
- MA/01/1460: Erection of 1 no. bungalow for use by the proprietor of the residential home (revised scheme to that permitted under MA/00/1272) - APPROVED.
- MA/00/1272: Erection of 1 No. bungalow for use by the proprietor of the residential home - APPROVED.
- MA/86/1938: Change of use to residential care home for the elderly and erection of first floor side extension over existing garage and two storey side extension - APPROVED.

- 2.2 In March 2008, planning permission was granted under reference MA/07/1572 for the erection of a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension to provide 20 additional bedrooms, (giving a total of 46). That proposal included the extension of the existing car park to provide a total of 16 spaces. As a result of the development, it was anticipated that staffing levels would have increased from 1 part-time and 3 full-time, to 2 part-time and 6 full-time members of staff.
- 2.3 That scheme was amended under application MA/08/2030 and approved in January 2009. This showed a revised internal layout and created an additional 3 bedrooms (that would result in a total on site of 49 bedrooms) and the provision of two additional car parking spaces giving a total of 18 on site. Precedent conditions relating to the application were subsequently discharged under application MA/09/0574 on the 24 June 2009.
- 2.4 The currently proposed extension is very similar in plan form and elevational treatment to that permitted under application MA/08/2030. The number of

proposed additional bedrooms (23) also remains the same, but changes have been made to the internal layout.

3. CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Harrietsham Parish Council:

'Wish to see the above application **refused** for the following reasons:

- There are concerns with the practical aspects of the parking, deliveries & collections and also the refuse collection. These do not appear to have been addressed in the application, and there is no mention of whether there would be any medical waste in the refuse.
- The access for emergency vehicles appears to be restricted.
- The application requires a current sound audit as the report submitted from 2006 is unacceptable.

The Parish Council would also request that the application be reported to the Planning Committee, if the Planning Officer's view differs.'

3.2 Kent Highway Services: Have no objections and have commented as follows:

'I refer to the above planning application for the extension of this residential care home. Use is to be made of the existing access which is considered adequate to serve this development. A total of 18 parking spaces are proposed which is in line with the guidance given in the Kent & Medway Vehicle Parking Standards.

I confirm that I have no objections to the proposals in respect of highway matters'

Conditions requiring the provision of the indicated parking spaces before first use of the development and their subsequent maintenance, the provision of cycle parking and requiring wheel washing measures to prevent deposition of mud etc. onto the highway, have also been recommended.

3.3 MBC Landscape Officer: Raises no objections and has commented as follows:

'The proposed site plan, drawing no. 2114/52 dated July 2010, indicates the removal of a few trees which are internal to the site and to which I raise no objection.

The trees to the north are outside of the site boundary and I would assume are in the ownership of Network Rail. Whilst they appear in close proximity to the proposed extension it would not be expedient to protect them because vegetation management, including tree removal, could be undertaken without the LPA's consent, making it difficult to sustain an objection on arboricultural grounds. It should be noted though, that shading by trees may be an issue in future which would not be in the control of the applicant. I would also add that the proposed tree and hedge planting specification is currently unclear, necessitating further details.

Recommendation: The recommendation is, therefore, to raise no objection on arboricultural grounds.

Conditions: If minded to grant consent the following conditions should be included:-

-standard landscape conditions

-provision of a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement in accordance with BS5837:2005.'

3.4 **MBC Environmental Health:**

'I have nothing to add to my comments made previously for MA/08/2030 on 6th January 2009.

Recommendations: As before, i.e. The acoustic report submitted for that application was, and remains, adequate for purpose, provided nothing substantial has changed in the interim.'

4. **REPRESENTATIONS**

- 4.1 **One** neighbour letter from a resident of Chippendayle Drive has been received. This raises concerns regarding parking and states that due to the increase bedrooms there will be more staff and visitors and parking is likely to overspill onto an already congested Chippendayle Drive worsening existing problems. Delivery vehicles to the site already have problems.

5. **BACKGROUND**

- 5.1 Planning permission reference MA/08/2030 was never implemented and has now lapsed. This application is very similar. It proposes a development of a broadly similar external design and appearance and also the same proposed number of additional bedrooms at 23 and parking provision on at site 18 spaces.

6. **CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 **Site Description**

- 6.1.1 This application relates to an existing residential care home located within the defined village envelope of Harrietsham. It stands to the east of the dwellings within the Chippendayle Drive residential estate, and to the north-west of some rather more loose-knit dwellings on larger plots which front the A20 Ashford Road.

- 6.1.2 Since the last permission on the site (application MA/08/2030), two additional dwellings have been constructed on land to the rear of and formerly part of the rear garden of 'Seymour' which fronts onto Ashford Road. These are located to the north east of the existing care home and adjacent to the railway-line. They were approved under application MA/07/1356 on 11/10/2007. They are known as 1 and 2 The Friars.

- 6.1.3 The northern boundary of the site adjoins the Maidstone East – Ashford railway line embankment, which is covered with mixed deciduous trees.
- 6.1.4 The main care home building is two storeys with a rear single-storey projection. A previous consent, under reference MA/07/1526, to link and convert the bungalow formerly occupied by the proprietor that lies to the south of the main building, to form a 6 bedroom extension has been implemented. There are currently a total of 26 bedrooms within the Care Home.
- 6.1.5 There are a number of trees within the site. None are protected by Tree Preservation Order.

6.2 Proposal

- 6.2.1 The application is a full application and seeks permission for a part single-storey and part two-storey extension to the existing care home on the site to provide for an additional 23 bedrooms. This would result in a total of 49 bedrooms on site.

(Changes in the current scheme to that approved under planning application MA/08/2030 are highlighted in bold text within the report.)

- 6.2.2 A total of 18 car parking spaces are shown to be provided within the site, an increase from the current 8-10 spaces. These would be provided by extending the existing car park northwards adjacent to 18 Chippendayle Drive onto an area where a metal container is sited and which is currently grassed. Three spaces are also shown to be provided to the southern side of the existing access from Chippendayle Drive. Refuse storage is indicated to be provided in an area adjacent to the former manager's dwelling on an existing area of hardstanding.
- 6.2.3 **The single story element would provide 5 bedrooms with en-suite facilities and a sluice as well as a store cupboard. This is a change from the previous permission which proposed the use of this area of the building as a day-room, kitchen, office and a disabled WC.** This extension would be located on the western side of the site immediately to the north of and linked to the existing single-storey rear extension at the Care Home. It would be approximately 14.5m deep and 14m wide and 3m to the eaves and 6m to the ridge. **The roof of this element is now fully hipped on four sides.**
- 6.2.4 The two-storey element would run in an easterly direction from the side of the day room parallel with the railway line to the north and would be sited a minimum of 2m and a maximum of 6m from the eastern site boundary adjacent to no.1 The Friars, the westernmost of the new dwellings constructed to the rear of 'Seymour' in Ashford Road. This new property has a ground floor doorway

serving a utility room and a first floor window to an en-suite bathroom facing the Care Home site.

- 6.2.5 The two-storey element would be approximately 17m deep at its maximum and 32m in width extending towards the eastern site boundary. The overall ridge height would be approximately 7.8m. Eaves height along the eastern and southern elevations would be 5.8m and on the northern elevation would be a combination of 5.8m dropping to 2.6m along a section of the roof incorporating a form of cat-slide roof with three dormer windows inserted. Two serve bedrooms and one serves the stair and lift core. The two storey element would be no closer to the eastern boundary than previously approved. Two previously approved external fire escapes are again shown on the north elevation facing the railway embankment. These will not be visible from outside the site or from adjoining properties.
- 6.2.6 The day room has been relocated to the southern side of the two-storey extension at ground floor level and now faces onto the central garden area at the heart of the site. It is partially within the main building and partially in the form of projecting bay extension with false pitched roof that projects some 3.6m from the building's main façade at ground floor level.**
- 6.2.7 External materials are indicated to be a mixture of brick at ground floor level and white painted render at first floor level. Roof tiles would be interlocking concrete tiles to match the existing building. These materials are as previously approved.
- 6.2.8 Landscaping details have been submitted and indicate the provision of a Privet hedge along the western boundary of the site with the properties in Chippendayle Drive. This would be planted in double staggered rows with plants at 450mm centres and 300mm between rows. The plants would be 450-600mm in height when planted.
- 6.2.9 In addition, 3 Silver Birch trees would be planted, one at either end of the new privet hedge on the western boundary and one in the north east corner of the site. These would be Standard Nursery Size.
- 6.2.10 A new Heavy Standard size Oak Tree would be planted in the courtyard garden at the centre of the site.
- 6.2.11 Tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837:2005 'Trees in Relation to Construction-Recommendations' for the existing railway embankment trees and a retained tree in the central garden are also shown on the submitted drawings. These tree protection details also show details of the proposed scaffolding method within the Root Protection Areas.

6.2.12 The submitted landscaping and tree protection details are as previously submitted and approved.

6.3 Principle of Development

6.3.1 This proposed extension is very similar in plan form and elevational treatment to that permitted under application MA/08/2030. The number of additional bedrooms remains the same at 23, resulting in the same potential total of 49 on the site, but some changes have been made to the internal layout. Planning permission MA/08/2030 only lapsed on 8 January 2012 and is therefore a material consideration of some weight in the determination of the current application.

6.3.2 Development Plan policy in respect of the Maidstone Borough-wide Local Plan 2000 has not changed since the earlier permission. Policy H26 relating to Nursing Homes and Care Homes remains relevant as a key consideration.

6.3.3 The South East Plan 2009 has replaced the Kent & Medway Structure Plan and although it is scheduled to be revoked as part of the measures in the Localism Act 2011, there are no enabling Orders in place for this as yet. As such it remains part of the Development Plan.

6.3.4 There are no specific policies relating to care home provision in the South East Plan. However, Policy H4 (Type and Size of New Housing) states that local authorities should identify the full range of housing needs including those with particular housing needs such as older and disabled people.

6.3.5 Policy BE4 (The role of small rural towns ('Market' towns)) advises that local planning authorities should support and reinforce the role of small rural towns as local hubs for employment, retailing and community facilities and services.

6.3.6 Policy BE5 (Village Management) encourages local planning authorities to positively plan to meet the defined local needs of their rural communities for small scale affordable housing, business and service development.

6.3.7 Given the previous planning history and the fact that Harrietsham is classified as a rural service centre, I consider the principle of the development proposed is acceptable.

6.3.8 In considering the details of the application, it is necessary to have regard to the criteria of Policy H26 of the Borough-wide Local Plan 2000. The policy states as follows:

`POLICY H26:

IN CONSIDERING PROPOSALS FOR THE PROVISION AND EXTENSIONS OF NURSING HOMES AND RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES, THE BOROUGH COUNCIL WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:

- (1) THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES ADEQUATE AMENITY SPACE FOR RESIDENTS AND SUFFICIENT CAR PARKING TO ADOPTED STANDARDS; AND
- (2) THE EFFECT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA AND THE AMENITIES OF NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES; AND
- (3) IN THE CASE OF PROPOSALS INVOLVING THE EXTENSION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES, THE EFFECT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE BUILDING AND ITS SETTING; AND
- (4) IN THE CASE OF RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES, THE DEVELOPMENT IS WELL RELATED TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT, SHOPPING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES.'

6.3.9 In assessing the application I deal with each criterion separately below.

6.4 (1) Amenity space for residents and car parking issues

Amenity space

6.4.1 The development will leave a substantial garden area of approximately 0.1ha within the site. The new location of the day room now overlooks this area directly rather than the railway embankment as previously approved. In addition, the location of the extension in shielding the garden from the adjacent railway line will provide a sense of enclosure and reduce any impact from the railway further.

6.4.2 Car parking and highway issues

There are no highway objections to the proposals. There will be no adverse impact on local roads and the level of car parking provision is considered acceptable. The internal layout of the site is also considered to be acceptable.

6.5 (2) Effect on the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring properties

Impact on the character of the area

6.5.1 The application site is well contained and being located behind frontage development on Ashford Road and more recent development on Chippendayle Drive has limited impact from public vantage points, which are limited to the access road off Chippendayle Drive and between gaps along that road. I consider therefore that the development would not have an adverse visual impact on the overall character of the area. The relationship between the development and the overall character of the surrounding area has not changed from the previous approval.

Impact on neighbouring properties

- 6.5.2 The two-storey section of the proposed extension is sited away from the properties in Chippendayle Drive towards the eastern boundary running parallel to the railway-line.
- 6.5.3 The car park area is to be extended alongside the boundary with 18 Chippendayle Drive into an area currently grassed and which has metal containers stored on it. There is therefore the potential for use of this area to increase. However, I do not consider that additional activity on this area would in itself be sufficient to warrant refusal. The boundary is formed by a close-boarded fence, but there is currently no planting along the common boundary. This currently exists alongside the existing car park adjacent to the Chippendayle Drive properties. Additional hedge planting and two new trees are proposed for this boundary.
- 6.5.4 The closest section of the additional development at the care home to the properties to the west is single-storey and will not result in any loss of light or privacy to the occupiers of these dwellings. The closest two-storey section of the development is located approximately 25m from the flank boundary of 18 Chippendayle Drive. As this section has no flank windows, I consider this to be an acceptable separation distance that will not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy to either nos.16 or 18 Chippendayle Drive. A single west facing first floor level window (serving a corridor) and the door to a fire escape are located some 55m from the western site boundary and as such are at an acceptable separation distance that will result in no loss of privacy.
- 6.5.5 The most significant change since the previous approval is the completion of the development at the rear of Seymour. The house at no.1 The Friars is located close to site's eastern boundary. As stated earlier in the report, this has a ground floor utility room door and a (conditioned) first floor obscure glazed ensuite bathroom window at first floor level facing the site.
- 6.5.6 On the originally approved scheme within the current application site, three windows (two serving bedrooms and one serving a corridor) were approved at first floor level. There are still three windows but all now serve bedrooms. The windows face largely onto the flank of the adjacent dwelling and I do not consider that the development would unacceptably overlook the private amenity space of the dwelling at no.1 The Friars.
- 6.5.7 The development would not in my view have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

6.6 (3) Effect on the character of the building and its setting

- 6.6.1 The existing building dates from the late 1950s and has no particular character. It has been extended in the past in a variety of styles. The currently proposed addition will not adversely affect the character of the building.
- 6.6.2 It is acknowledged that the number of bedrooms on the site would approximately double and that the proposed floorspace within the extension is also larger than the current floorspace within the site.
- 6.6.3 I am of the view however, that the site is capable of accommodating the proposed extension. There will still be space around the building and separation from the site boundaries. The proposed extension will leave an acceptable and well landscaped amenity area around the building for the occupiers. The remaining garden/landscaping area amounts to approximately 0.1ha in area.
- 6.6.4 There are existing trees within the site close to the proposed extension and also within the railway embankment to the north. Two small trees on the northern site boundary and a Leyland Cypress within the garden south of the proposed extension are not capable of retention. Tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837:2005 'Trees in Relation to Construction-Recommendations' for the existing railway embankment trees and a retained tree in the central garden are also shown on the submitted drawings. These tree protection details also show details of the proposed scaffolding method within the Root Protection Areas.
- 6.6.5 Landscaping details have also been submitted and indicate the provision of a Privet hedge along the western boundary of the site with the properties in Chippendale Drive. This would be planted in double staggered rows with plants at 450mm centres and 300mm between rows. The plants would be 450-600mm in height when planted.
- 6.6.6 In addition, 3 Silver Birch trees would be planted, one at either end of the new privet hedge on the western boundary and one in the north east corner of the site. These would be Standard Nursery Size.
- 6.6.7 A new Heavy Standard size Oak Tree would be planted in the courtyard garden at the centre of the site.
- 6.6.8 Notwithstanding the comments of the Landscape Officer, I consider that there is sufficient detail submitted with the application to identify the tree protection measures and the planting specifications.
- 6.6.9 I consider that the setting of the building will not be harmed by the proposals.

6.7 (4) In the case of residential care homes, the development is well related to public transport, shopping and community facilities.

6.7.1 The site is located within a defined settlement that is classified as a Rural Service Centre, which is served by a railway station and is on a 'bus route. Harrietsham also has a doctors' surgery and a community centre and retains a post office, a local convenience store and a public house and other community facilities.

6.8 Other Matters

6.8.1 The issue of waste has been raised by the Parish Council. A suitable area for the siting of six 1100litre capacity 'Euro' waste bins has been indicated. The submitted details indicate that 2 of the 6 bins will be for general refuse, 2 for recycling and 2 for medical waste. The management of the care home will have a waste contract to manage the waste on the site.

6.8.2 The relationship of the building to the railway line and the internal layout of the development facing the railway have not significantly changed since the previous permission. The recommendations within the acoustic assessment remain relevant and can be subject to an appropriate condition as previously imposed. The Environmental Health Section has no objections provided that this condition is imposed.

6.8.3 The recommended conditions suggested by Kent Highway Services have also been considered. The condition requiring wheel washing measures to prevent the deposition of mud on the highway does not meet the tests of Circular 11/95 and should instead be applied as an informative. The other two recommended conditions do meet the tests and appropriate conditions can be imposed.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 The currently proposed scheme remains largely of the form as permitted under the previous approvals particularly in terms of the overall site layout, design and footprint of the building.

7.2 The scheme as now proposed would result in no unacceptable impact on the properties in Chippendayle Drive to the west of the site or the new dwelling at no.1 The Friars, located to the east of the site.

7.3 There are no objections raised by Kent Highway Services to the development in terms of highway safety or the level of parking provision. The Council's Environmental Health section has also raised no objections to the development, subject to the acoustic report's recommendations being implemented. I concur with these views.

7.4 Subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions the scheme is acceptable and the following recommendation appropriate.

8. 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 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The approved details of the parking/turning areas shall be completed before the commencement of the use of the land or buildings 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 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2008 and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (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 pursuant to policy T13 of the Maidstone Borough-wide Local Plan 2000.

3. The development shall not commence until, written details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building(s) hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed using the approved materials;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development pursuant to the advice in PPS1.

4. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and 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 ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough-wide Local Plan 2000.

5. All trees to be retained must be protected by barriers and/or ground protection in accordance with BS 5837 (2005) 'Trees in Relation to Construction-Recommendations'. No work shall take place and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site on site until the details of protection shown on drawing no. 2114/52 received 08/12/2011 have been erected. The protection measures 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 in accordance with this condition. The siting of barriers/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 setting and external appearance to the development pursuant to policy ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough-wide Local Plan 2000.

6. The proposed development shall be constructed and glazed in accordance with the details recommended in sections 8.1 to 8.4 (inclusive) of the acoustic assessment prepared by Adnitt Acoustics dated 1710/2011 received 08/12/2011, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, and evidence that all recommendations have been implemented shall be provided to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the additional accommodation hereby approved;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory internal environment for the occupiers in accordance with policy NRM10 of the South East Plan 2009 and the advice in PPG24 Planning and Noise.

7. The development shall not commence until details of cycle parking spaces to be provided within the site have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The subsequently approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of promoting alternatives to the of the private car as a means of transport pursuant to the advice in PPG13.

8. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

2114/52, 2114/53revX and 2114/54 received 08/12/2011;

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 and the advice in PPS1.

Informatives set out below

Attention is drawn to Sections 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and to the Associated British Standard Code of practice BS5228:1997 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 in connection with the construction of the development may arrive, depart, be loaded or unloaded within the general site except between the hours of 0800 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays and 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Adequate and suitable provision in the form of water sprays should be used to reduce dust from demolition work.

The developer shall implement a scheme for the use of wheel cleaning, dust laying and road sweeping, to ensure that vehicles do not deposit mud and other materials on the public highway in the vicinity of the site or create a dust nuisance.

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 the South East Plan 2009) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.