

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 15/500451/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Re-development of an existing single dwelling site into 5 new build detached houses with associated parking and landscaping.			
ADDRESS 48 Lancet Lane, Maidstone, Kent, ME15 9SD			
RECOMMENDATION APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposed development is located within the urban area of Maidstone and the principle of sustainable residential development is accepted in accordance the Local Plan 2000 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Cllr Derek Mortimer has requested the application be determined at committee for the reasons set out in the report.			
WARD South Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr Malcolm Creswell AGENT Architecnique Architects	
DECISION DUE DATE 29/04/15	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 29/04/15	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 23/06/2015	
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
12/2279	Erection of a 4 bedroomed dwelling to the rear of existing dwelling with access onto Sevington Park: amended design to that approved under reference MA/09/1090 to incorporate p.v. panels on the roof	Permitted with conditions	11.02.2013
<i>Summarise Reasons:</i> This application is essentially a resubmission of approved 09/1090 with p.v. panels added to the roof. The house has been constructed.			
09/1090	Erection of a detached 4 bed dwelling to rear of existing dwelling with access onto Sevington Park	Permitted with conditions	18.08.2009
<i>Summarise Reasons</i>			
07/2624	Removal of existing dwelling and the construction of six, four bedroom houses with garages and amenity space. Resubmission of MA/07/1633	Approved at planning committee 12.3.2009	26.03.2009
<i>Summarise Reasons:</i> This application was essentially a resubmission of 07/1633 with the design, layout and vehicle access altered to take into account the Inspectors decision. The current application is essentially a resubmission of this approved scheme with the inclusion of			

one house on the north of the site which has been approved and built ref: 12/2279.			
07/1633	Removal of existing dwelling and the construction of six, four bedroom houses with garages and amenity space	Refused	13.01.2008
<p><i>Summarise Reasons:</i> Refused by MBC and dismissed at appeal for the following reasons; design, the house proposed on the junction of Lancet Lane and Sevington Park would have a blank flank elevation, location and width of the vehicle access and hardstanding. The Inspector concluded that the proposal constituted an unsympathetically designed housing estate with inadequate room for frontage planting and over dominant areas of hardstanding</p>			

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The site is located in a residential area within the urban area of Maidstone. The site is located on a corner plot at the junction of Lancet Lane and Sevington Park and is currently occupied by a large detached dwelling set within a spacious garden with access onto Lancet Lane.
- 1.02 The site area is approximately 2,500sq m and contains one TPO tree in the southwest corner and one on the northern boundary adjacent 1a Sevington Park.
- 1.03 Adjacent to the site to the east is an area of highway verge separating the boundary to part of the site and Sevington Park.
- 1.04 To the north of the site is a detached dwellinghouse, 1a Sevington Park which was approved under planning permission 12/2279 and also formed part of the 6 unit scheme approved under permission 07/2624. To the west and abutting the site boundary are 50 Lancet Lane and the rear gardens of 2, 4 and 6 Old Drive.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 Demolition of the existing detached dwellinghouse at 48 Lancet Lane and erection of five detached dwellings with attached garages, off-street parking and landscaping.
- 2.02 Two dwellings (Plots 1 and 2) would face onto Lancet Lane and would share a newly positioned vehicular access off Lancet Lane. The existing vehicle access would be blocked up with new boundary treatment proposed. Plot 1 and 2 would be detached dwellinghouses with single bay integral garages, they would be approx. 9.1m to the ridge and 4.9m to eaves height. The houses would be formed of brickwork at ground level with Tudor panelling, render and hanging tiles above. Plot 2 would be a handed version of Plot 1 with the exception being the eastern elevation facing the junction of Sevington Park which would include a gabled section, additional fenestration and detailing to create a double frontage at the corner of the site.
- 2.03 Plots 3, 4 and 5 would face Sevington Park and the three houses would share a new vehicular access from Sevington Park. The three houses would all be detached with single integral garages. The three houses would be a similar design formed of brickwork, render and tile hanging. Plot 3 and 4 would be approx. 8.9m to the ridge and 4.8m to the eaves. Plot 4 would be some 8.6m to the ridge and 4.8m to the eaves.

- 2.04 The five houses would be set back from the highway with landscaping and forecourt parking located at the front. Rear gardens would mainly be laid to lawn with a small patio area at the rear of each property.

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.01 The site had a previous application (ref: 07/2624) for a similar development approved on this site, which has subsequently expired. The main difference between the current application and the scheme approved under 07/2624 is the omission of one dwellinghouse that was granted permission and has been built under planning permission 12/2279. The design, form, layout and palette of materials proposed in the current application are essentially the same as the approved 07/2624 scheme.
- 3.02 Planning permission 07/2624 was submitted in response to an Inspectors decision to refuse another 6 unit scheme on the site (ref: 07/1633). 07/2624 included a number of design and layout changes to the earlier refused scheme to respond to the Planning Inspectors decision. 07/2624 was approved at planning committee subject to conditions. The application was deferred by planning committee twice before it was approved at the third meeting. The scheme was deferred by committee members, inter alia, in order for the applicant to submit details of revised elevational treatments to the dwellings that reflected the character of Lancet Lane and additional ragstone walling in accordance with the Inspector's decision.
- 3.04 Planning permission 07/2624 was approved at committee on 12.03.2009. Material changes in policy since this scheme was approved include the adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework. Garden Land development has been removed from the definition of previously developed land in the NPPF. Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2000 and The Loose Road Character Area Assessment adopted December 2008 are still relevant.

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Development Plan: ENV6, T13

Supplementary Planning Documents:
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards
The Loose Road Character Area Assessment 2008
Draft Maidstone Local Plan
Draft North Loose Neighbourhood Development Plan

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

16 objections have been received from neighbouring properties. A petition of 34 neighbours has also been received. Objections are summarised as follows:

- Contrary to the emerging North Loose Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Access and parking is inadequate.
- Overspill parking would occur on the street.
- Traffic congestion.
- Pressure on foul sewerage and water systems.
- Out of character with Lancet Lane.
- Would set a precedent for similar developments.

Planning Committee Report

- Overdevelopment of the site
- The application is unclear whether protected trees would be removed.
- Contrary to the Loose Road Character Assessment
- Loss of privacy, light and outlook
- The boundary wall adjacent Lancet Lane should be retained
- Increased pressure on local schools

The North Loose Residents Association is objecting on the following (summarised) grounds:

- Contrary to the emerging North Loose Neighbourhood Development Plan
- The proposal is similar to a scheme refused at Valley Drive (APP/U2235/A/14/2219898)
- The proposal is garden development.
- Poor vehicle access and parking arrangements
- Visitor parking not clear.

Loose Parish Council objects on the following (summarised) grounds:

- Contrary to the emerging North Loose Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Contrary Loose Road Character Assessment 2008.
- Impact to trees.
- Traffic congestion.

Further representations have been received following the submission of amended plans and further the objections are summarised as follows:

- Previous objections reiterated.
- The changes do not make a positive difference to the original scheme.
- Insufficient gaps between buildings.
- Material changes have occurred in the locality since the previous application was approved.

Cllr Derek Mortimer: *'I wish to 'call in' the above application to committee for the following reasons.*

Lancet Lane has its own unique character and quality and I feel these proposals do not meet the distinct nature of the area and contrary to the Loose Road Character Assessment 2008. This area has a very significant charm in terms of architecture and amenity and I feel that this proposal will spoil these valued assets.

I also consider that the proposed parking and access arrangements are not adequate for the size of the properties and would cause additional pressures on this residential area.

I also have concerns regarding overlooking and privacy of neighbouring properties'

Former Cllr Mike Hogg also called the application into committee for the following (summarised) reasons:

- Contrary to Draft North Loose Neighbourhood Plan
- Contrary to Policy DM5 of the Draft Local Plan
- Out of character with Lancet Lane

- Increased traffic

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 **KCC Highways:** Initial response received on 24 March 2015 which raised no objections in principle on highways safety or parking grounds. The KCC Highways Officer raised concern with the parking layout and recommend a number of changes to the scheme to improve the parking layout, vehicle access and turning on the site.

6.02 Following the submission of an amended layout KCC Highways provided further comments on 14 July 2015 with further observations and an indicative layout plan suggesting further improvements (which has been made by the applicant on drawing no. 014-017/003 D). KCC Highways Officer comments as follows:

'In the context of the location, the standard of the surrounding roads, and properties with a predominance for off-street car parking, together with excellent crash record, it is considered that for a development of this scale, the standard of car parking proposed is acceptable. Subject to the onsite increases in parking and turning spaces indicated, and the following, I write to confirm on behalf of the local highway authority that I have no objection'.

6.03 **MBC Landscape:** Initial comments from the Landscape Officer advised that a number of the trees on the site are protected by TPO No. 8 of 1982 and the applicant had not submitted an arboricultural assessment. The Landscape Officer accepts that there will probably be some tree losses but there would be limited space for replanting to mitigate their loss. A key concern of the Landscape Officer is relationship between the retained Yew at the south western corner of the site, adjacent to Lancet Lane. This tree, T1 of the TPO, is situated in close proximity to the house proposed on Plot 1 and would have a poor relationship with this dwelling.

6.04 Following the Landscape Officers initial comments an arboricultural assessment and a revised layout has been submitted which sees the house on Plot 1 moved further back on the site away from the TPO Yew tree.

6.05 The Landscape Officer raises no objections to the revised layout subject to landscaping and tree protection conditions.

6.06 **MBC Environmental Health:** The Environmental Health Officer has advised that the site is in an Air Quality Management Area and recommends two conditions to minimise exposure of new residents to poor air quality.

7.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

7.01 The site is located within the urban are of Maidstone where the principle of additional housing is acceptable in accordance with the Local Plan and NPPF. The Local Plan 2000 does not have any specific policies which prevent the development of garden land in the urban area.

7.02 The existing dwelling on the site is not a listed building and not within a Conservation Area. Whilst it is attractive and prominent within views along Lancet Lane, its retention could not be sought under adopted planning policies and a reason for refusal on the loss of the dwelling could not be sustained.

- 7.03 Paragraph 53 of the NPPF states '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'.
- 7.04 Representations have been received relating to conflict with the emerging North Loose Neighbourhood Development Plan. The NP includes housing and design policies and a specific policy on garden land development, HD Policy 1 which advises that garden development with only be accepted in exceptional circumstances. Whilst work on the NP is progressing the Plan has been withdrawn for further Regulation 14 consultations and there are still a number of key stages ahead including, publication, independent examination and referendum. The NP is a material consideration, however, at its current stage, any conflict is not considered grounds to refuse planning permission.
- 7.05 Policy DM5 of the Draft Maidstone Local Plan advises development of garden land to create new buildings will be permitted providing specific criteria are met. The Draft Local Plan has not yet been adopted is afforded limited weight in the decision making process and any conflict is not considered grounds to refuse planning permission.
- 7.06 Given the sustainable urban location of the application site the principle of additional residential development is accepted in accordance with the Local Plan and NPPF. As such I consider the key issues to be the impact upon the character and appearance of the streetscape, impact upon neighbour amenity, highways safety and parking congestion and impact on trees and ecology.

Visual Impact

- 7.07 The site does not fall within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings located with proximity to the application site.
- 7.08 The site does fall within the Loose Character Area Assessment adopted December 2008. Section 8.5 of this document refers to Lancet Lane and advises, inter alia, that proposal should respond to the spacious character of the area, retain traditional boundary treatment, respect the character of the historic lanes and protect and enhance the landscape features.
- 7.09 The design, form, layout and proposed palette of materials are essentially the same as the proposal approved at committee in March 2009 under ref: 07/2426, after the adoption of the Loose Character Area Assessment.
- 7.10 The proposal would clearly result in a loss of garden land through the net gain of 4 additional houses. However, it is necessary to assess whether the increased housing density and loss of landscaping would warrant a sustainable reason for refusal in this instance.
- 7.11 The application site is located toward the western end of Lancet Lane and currently comprises a large detached dwellinghouse on a spacious corner plot with a large area of garden to the front and rear. The existing house is set back from the fairly consistent building line along Lancet Lane. The property opposite the site at 39 Lancet Lane is similar in terms of design, the size of the plot and sense of spaciousness around the house. However, these two properties are somewhat of an anomaly in Lancet Lane. To the west of the application site are two detached houses sat on much smaller plots than the application site and set back approx. 6.5m from the pavement. To the east of the application site the streetscene is comprised of fairly spacious plots (although not as spacious as the current application site) and

the houses are set back approx. 12m from the pavement in a fairly uniform building line. The houses in Lancet Lane located to the east are separated from the application site by the junction at Sevington Park while the two houses immediately to the west (Nos. 50 and 52 Lancet Lane) are considered to form the immediate streetscape of the site. The spacing between Plot 1 and Plot 2, the proposed density and set back from the pavement is considered to form an acceptable transition between the streetscape on the east of the junction with Sevington Park and the streetscape to the west of the junction. The dwellings facing Lancet Lane are separated by a gap at first floor level in excess of 7 metres which allows views through the properties and would generally reflect the character of Lancet Lane. The amended design of Plot 2 includes a double frontage with an active frontage onto Lancet Lane and Sevington Park which is an important design feature at this prominent corner location and responds to the Inspectors assessment to the refused 2007 scheme.

- 7.11 Sevington Park comprises a small cul-de-sac of detached properties on smaller plots and with less spacing between the houses than is evident on Lancet Lane. Plots 3, 4 and 5 would be spaced approx. 3 metres apart and would respect the building line and spacing between the existing houses in Sevington Park. The arrangement at the front of Plots 5 allows for an acceptable level of landscaping and Plot 3 and 4 would be located behind the TPO trees and landscaping on the highway verge. The palette of materials, form, scale, spacing between the buildings and set back from the road would be in keeping with the existing streetscape of Sevington Park.
- 7.12 The elevational treatment to the dwellings include brickwork, projecting tudor panelling and vertical tile hanging. This mix takes reference from the character of the properties in the immediate area and would integrate and complement the street scenes of Lancet Lane and Sevington Park.
- 7.13 As regard to boundary treatment the ragstone walling is being retained as part of the application in accordance with the Character Area Assessment and will be extended in places where the existing drive is blocked up. Further details of the boundary treatment will be sought via condition.
- 7.14 Overall it is therefore considered that the proposed development respects the local character of Lancet Lane and Sevington Park, in terms of the scale, layout, spacing and set back from the streetscene and, the five houses would connect with, and contribute positively, to their surroundings offering an acceptable level of landscaping at front of the plots. Parking would be located behind the landscaped frontages and would not appear overtly dominant.

Residential Amenity

- 7.15 No.50 Lancet Lane abuts the western boundary of the application. No.50 Lancet Lane is set in some 2.5m from the boundary with the application site with the proposed house at Plot 1 set some 4m away from the western boundary giving a total separation of some 6.5m between the two houses. The house at Plot 1 would project beyond the established rear boundary of No.50 Lancet Lane, however, given the separation distance between the two properties and the established natural screening along the boundary, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unreasonable loss of neighbour amenity to No.50 in terms loss of light or outlook. The proposal is in accordance with the BRE guidelines.
- 7.16 Plots 3, 4 and 5 would back onto the rear gardens of Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Old Drive. There would be minimum separation distance of approx. 20m between the existing

rear windows of No.2-6 and the rear walls / windows of the proposed dwellings. There is also significant landscape screening along the western boundary of the application site.

- 7.17 Overall it is considered that the proposal would not result in any direct loss of privacy to neighbouring habitable windows or outdoor private amenity areas given the separation distances involved and the established boundary screening.
- 7.18 The house proposed on Plot 5 would be broadly parallel with No.1a Sevington Road with a gap of approx. 3m between the houses. The proposed house at Plot 5 would project some 1.8m beyond the established rear elevation of No.1a and there are no habitable room windows in the southern flank wall of No.1a. As such the proposed relationship with No.1a is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of neighbour amenity in terms loss of light, outlook or privacy.
- 7.19 The internal room sizes and private outdoor amenity proposed is considered to offer an acceptable standard of living accommodation for future occupants in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standards. The Environmental Health Officer has advised that the site is in an Air Quality Management Area and recommends two conditions to minimise exposure of new residents to poor air quality

Highways

- 7.20 The proposal includes single bay garages for each house and at least two off-street parking spaces for each property. The proposed layout has been drawn up in accordance with advice from KCC Highways to provide suitable on-site parking, on-site turning and visibility splays. The proposal would constitute a net increase of four houses on the site which is considered not to result in a significant increase in vehicle movements. In this regard the NPPF advises that *'development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe'*. KCC Highways have not raised any objections on parking or highways safety grounds.
- 7.21 A condition will be attached to secure cycle parking as part of the development to promote sustainable modes of travel.

Landscaping

- 7.22 The application is accompanied by the same arboricultural report submitted with MA/07/2426 and the proposed development would result in the loss of the same trees as previously proposed (not including those which have already been removed under planning permission 12/2279).
- 7.23 The landscape officer has not raise any objection to the loss of trees on the site. The two TPO trees would be retained on the site and the dwelling proposed on Plot 1 has been shifted back on the site to have regard to the Landscape Officers comments. The amenity value of the trees have been assessed on the site and only the two TPO trees are considered to be worthy of protection.
- 7.24 The proposal would result in the loss of garden land and associated landscaping which is regrettable, however, the proposed layout offers a good opportunity for landscaping at the front of the properties and further details will be required as a condition to ensure indigenous species are planted.

- 7.25 Overall it is not considered that the loss of landscaping and garden land would warrant a sustainable reason for refusing the scheme. In this regard weight is afforded to the fact that the council currently cannot demonstrate a five-year housing supply, and the loss of landscaping and garden land are not considered to significantly outweigh the overall benefits of the scheme.

Ecology

- 7.26 The applicant originally submitted the same ecology report that was submitted for application 07/2624, however given the date of this report it was considered appropriate that fresh surveys and a report should be submitted for this application.
- 7.27 An updated ecology assessment has been completed by Ecosa, the same company which undertook the original surveys in 2008. An extended Phase 1 habitat survey indicates that the existing house and site currently supports a low status non-breeding day roost of long-eared bat and a low diversity of foraging and commuting bats within the grounds. The surveys found the site as having low potential for supporting foraging badger and medium potential to support breeding birds and, the small population of slow-worm recorded in 2008 is assumed to remain on the site, as advised by the applicant ecologist. However, the ecology report advises that based on the evidence from the survey the grounds of 48 Lancet Lane do not provide a significant element of this population's habitat requirements. A mitigation strategy is recommended to ensure that any reptiles are removed from the site and placed in a suitable habitat in the local area. The report concludes that the site is considered of low ecological value overall. The ecology mitigation and enhancement includes:
- New native trees and landscaping.
 - Vegetation clearance to be undertaken between September and February to avoid bird nesting season.
 - A mitigation strategy to be produced prior to works on site aimed at avoiding harm to reptiles during the development of the site and providing improved habitat.
 - A bat licence will be required prior to the commencement of works.
 - Swift bricks and bird / bat boxes installed.
- 7.28 48 Lancet Lane is not located in a conservation area and the property is not listed, therefore its demolition does not require planning permission. The ecology report includes a number of mitigation measures regarding bats and reptiles found within the site, including the installation of bat boxes and ecologist involvement during construction / clearance works, which are considered to be acceptable and were considered acceptable during the assessment of planning permission 07/2426. In addition, bats are a protected species and the relevant licences will be required before any demolition of the existing houses can commence on site.
- 7.29 Whilst there would be some ecological and landscape impacts from the proposed development, as there were with the previously approved scheme, the updated ecology surveys indicates that there have been no material changes to the ecological habitats on the site since 2008 therefore it is considered that the ecology impacts do not warrant sufficient reason for refusal subject to conditions to mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 7.30 The previous approval 07/2624 required an agreement be secured with KCC to provide a potential reptile habitat for slow worms on the parcel of land adjoining the application site owned by KCC. The condition also required specific details for the

future management of this piece of land which was onerous on KCC. Without agreement from KCC Highways it is not considered appropriate to attach this condition however an ecology mitigation strategy and reptile protection will need to be submitted in accordance with condition 11 below.

Other issues

- 7.30 Several objectors have referred to an application that has been refused at Valley Drive stating that this scheme is similar. Members are advised that the current application should be assessed on individual merit. However, I would note that the proposals at 41 and 56 Valley Drive (ref: 14/0061) comprised a backland development with the formation of a new cul-de-sac whereas this application proposes five frontage properties. In my view the schemes are not similar in terms of design or layout, although both involve garden land development. The application at Valley Drive was refused due to the scale of the backland development which was considered to be out of context with the low rise pattern of development in Valley Drive.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.01 Overall I consider that the submitted ecological survey and report provides sufficient mitigation for the protected species on the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the large garden of the existing single property could provide a wider range of habitats for wildlife than the smaller gardens of five properties this would not be a ground that could sustain a reason for refusal.
- 8.02 The proposed development is located within the urban area of Maidstone and the principle of sustainable residential development is accepted in accordance the Local Plan 2000 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.
- 8.03 The proposed development is acceptable and my recommendation is for approval with conditions.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions for the following reasons:

CONDITIONS to include

- (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) Prior to the commencement of the development, written details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted and full details of the construction of the ragstone wall shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed using the approved materials and details;

The details and samples of the materials submitted shall include details of swift bricks or bat / bird boxes;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

Planning Committee Report

- (3) 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 2015 (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.

- (4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development within Schedule 2, Part 1, Class(es) A, B, E and F shall be carried out without the permission of the Local Planning Authority;

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the enjoyment of their properties by existing and prospective occupiers.

- (5) The tree protection measures outlined in the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment by Quaife Woodlands dated July 2007 shall be fully implemented prior to any clearance or demolition works on site and maintained throughout the construction until the completion of the development;

Reason: To safeguard existing trees to be retained and to ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development.

- (6) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping using indigenous species which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development and a programme for the approved scheme's implementation and long term management. The scheme shall be designed using the principles established in the Council's adopted Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Guidelines. The landscaping scheme shall include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- Details of all retained trees and landscaping.
- Details of new native tree and landscaping along the east and south boundary of the site adjacent Lancet Lane and Sevington Park

Reason: No such details have been submitted in accordance with policies ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan (2000).

- (7) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing nos. 014-017/001A, 014-017/002A, 014-017/005A, 014-017/006A, 014-017/007A, 014-017/008A, 014-017/003D, 014-017/004C; dated Nov'14 and drawing nos. 014-017/204A and 014-017/304B and 014-017/203B and 014-017/303A and 014-017/103A (Plot 1 only) and 014-017/205A and 014-017/104B (Plot 1 only) and 014-017/201C and 014-017/301E; dated Oct'14 and drawing nos. 014-017/101B and 014-017/106A and 014-017/108A and 014-017/109A and 014-017/110A; dated

Planning Committee Report

July'15 and Arboricultural Implications Assessment by Quaife Woodlands dated July 2007 and ECOSA Ecology Assessment (Final Document); dated August 2015

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

- (8) Prior to the commencement of the development, details of all fencing, walling (including details of ragstone walling) and other boundary treatments shall be 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(s) or land and maintained thereafter;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the enjoyment of their properties by existing and prospective occupiers.

- (9) Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) in the first floor of the west facing flank wall of plot 1 shall be obscure glazed and non-openable unless 1.7m above internal floor levels and shall subsequently be maintained as such to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority;

Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjoining properties and to safeguard the privacy of existing and prospective occupiers.

- (10) No additional windows, doors, voids or other openings shall be inserted, placed or formed at any time in the first floor of the west facing flank wall of plot 1 facing wall(s) of the building hereby permitted;

Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjoining properties and to safeguard the privacy of their occupiers.

- (11) Prior to the commencement of any works on the site, including clearance a detailed mitigation strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority with regard to bats and widespread reptiles and their habitats. All works shall then proceed in accordance with the approved strategies and the recommendations contained within the ecological report carried out by ECOSA Ltd dated August 2015 with any amendments agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and maintained thereafter;

Reason: To ensure no damage occurs to protected species or their habitat during any clearance or construction work and that adequate alternative habitats are available following the completion of development.

- (12) 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.

INFORMATIVES

Planning Committee Report

- (1) There shall be no burning on site.

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, 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 and construction work.

You are advised that measures to provide for wheel cleaning, dust laying and road sweeping equipment for the duration of the construction period should be provided on the site.

to Applicant: APPROVAL

The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering pre-application advice.

Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.

As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The applicant/agent was advised of minor changes required to the application and these were agreed.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

Case Officer: Andrew Jolly

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.