

APPLICATION: MA/10/0199 Date: 9 February 2010 Received: 10 February 2010

APPLICANT: Mr L. Lazari

LOCATION: SOUTHVIEW, HEADCORN ROAD, STAPLEHURST, TONBRIDGE,  
KENT, TN12 0BU

PARISH: Staplehurst

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey front, side and rear extensions and the insertion of three rear dormer windows to facilitate loft conversion. (Resubmission of MA/09/2166), as shown on Drawing no 5/0409/1, 5/04094a and scale 1:500 block plan received on 10 February 2009

AGENDA DATE: 18th March 2010

CASE OFFICER: Laura Gregory

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by the Parish Council

### **POLICIES**

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18,  
South East Plan 2009: BE1, CC6  
Village Design Statement: None  
Government Policy: PPS1,  
SPD Residential Extension (Adopted May 2009)

### **HISTORY**

09/2166 - An application for a two storey side extension and single storey front, side and rear extensions, plus addition of three dormers to facilitate loft conversion – WITHDRAWN

09/0993 - Erection of a two storey side extension and two rear dormer windows – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Staplehurst Parish Council** – Wish to see the application REFUSED for the following reasons:

“After much discussion Councillors recommended REFUSAL for the reasons given in the original application because very little had changed; The proposal would overwhelm the existing semi-detached house and would unbalance the symmetry with the adjoining property. The proposed extension was not modest by virtue of its mass, bulk and height which would adversely impact on the streetscene and neighbours. The dormer windows in the roof were not in keeping with neighbouring properties. Councillor’s requested that this application be referred to MBC Planning Committee.”

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

**Two Neighbour Representation** received raising the following objection

- This application is too large a development,
- Out of place
- Will have a deleterious effect on the street scene.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Site & Surroundings**

- 1.1 The application relates to a site which is located within the defined village envelope of Staplehurst and contains a three bedroom dwelling also referred to as ‘Southview’ One of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, the site is located on the north side of Headcorn Road and the adjoining property is known as ‘Oakcot’. The pair are two storey with fully hipped roofs and single storey projections of their sides. To the front there is a brick paved driveway with front lawn and the rear garden is some 30m in length beyond which, are open fields. There is a 2m hedge along the frontage and a large oak tree on the frontage of Oakcot.
- 1.1 To the east is the neighbouring detached dwelling, known as ‘Mon Abri’, which is of different design and at a lower height than Southview. This dwelling has gable roofs and extends to within around 1.1m of the boundary with the site. To the west of Oakcot is a similar pair of semi-detached dwellings.
- 1.2 This part of Headcorn Road on the north side features a variety of dwelling types, ages and designs, although the vast majority are two storeys but there are three bungalows at the eastern end of the road on the north side. There is a regular building line around 15m back from Headcorn Road. The spacing between buildings is not uniform although gaps at first floor level are generally retained between 5-8m. On the south side of the road there are dwellings set back behind hedging and grassed banks with a drainage ditch.

### **Proposal**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey front side and rear extension and insertion of three rear dormer windows. The application is a resubmission of MA/09/2166 which proposed the same development but with a smaller set back of 200mm from the front elevation and higher roof, which measured 100mm below the main ridgeline.
- 2.2 The proposed side extension would measure 7.6m deep and 2.7m wide and would have an eaves and ridge height of 5.2m and 8.7m. It is proposed to be set back from the front elevation by 500mm and have a lower roof, set 400mm below the main ridgeline. The extension is the same dimensions and design as a two storey extension permitted under MA/09/0933.
- 2.3 The proposed front extension would measure 1m deep and 6.9m wide and would have an eaves and ridge height of 2.2m and 2.8m. The proposed side extension would measure 11m deep and 1.9m wide and would have an eaves and ridge height of 2.2m and 2.9m. The proposed rear extension would measure 1.8m deep and 4.8m wide and have the same eaves and ridge height as the side extension.
- 2.4 The proposed dormer windows measure 1.5m x 1.5m and have a ridge line set 600mm below the ridgeline of the extension. Set back 900mm from the eaves line, the dormer windows would be subordinate to the roof plane.
- 2.5 The two storey element of this proposal has been accepted under previous application MA/09/0933. The difference with this application is that now single storey front, side and rear extension is proposed in addition to the two storey extension

### **Planning Assessment**

- 3.1 The main issue to consider is whether the proposed development is in accordance with the criteria of policy H18 of the Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions. As set out below, there are three issues relating to this policy which need to be considered: Visual Impact, Impact upon Residential Amenity and Parking.

#### Impact upon Visual Amenity

- 3.2 In terms of the impact upon the street scene, under the Council's recently adopted SPD *Residential Extensions*, it is recognised that the infilling of the spaces between dwellings with two storey side extensions can create a terraced appearance which can affect the symmetry of a pair of semi detached houses and the rhythm of the street scene. It is therefore recommended that where there is a pattern of gaps between dwellings, a minimum gap of 3m should be maintained at first floor level between the

extension and the adjacent property thus allowing the pattern and rhythm of gaps in the street to be maintained.

- 3.3 In this application, a set back of 500mm from the front elevation is proposed at first floor level. Furthermore, the proposed ridgeline is to be set below the main ridgeline by 400mm and a space of 1.9m is proposed between the flank wall of the first floor extension and the boundary with adjacent property. Overall, a space of 2m would be maintained between the extension and adjacent property The Eagles
- 3.4 With a space of 2m maintained at first floor level between the proposed extension and the adjacent dwelling, it is considered that there would be no significant erosion of the pattern of gaps between the dwellings and the visual break between the two dwellings which is currently enjoyed would be preserved. The proposed development is of a modest scale which would not overwhelm the dwelling and the proposed set back and lower roof would, ensure that symmetry of semi detached dwellings is preserved. Moreover, it would ensure that the extension is easily assimilated into the street, appearing neither visually dominant nor obtrusive.
- 3.5 In terms of the design, the proposed pitched roof to the rear extension and rear dormer window compliments the character and appearance of the dwelling and with the dormer windows positioned on the rear elevation, the proposal is in accordance with the Council's SPD which, advises that dormers should not be allowed on front elevations where there are none already.
- 3.6 Considering the relatively modest scale of the development and the sympathetic design of the extensions, a pleasant outlook to the site and surrounding area would be sustained as a result of the proposal.

#### Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 3.7 With regard to the impact on the residential amenity of adjoining property, having assessed the extension in accordance with the BRE guidelines it is not considered that the proposed development would cause a significant or unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to either the adjoining or adjacent properties. Furthermore with a space of 2m between the two storey extension and the adjacent dwelling, the overbearing impact of the extension is considered not to be significant.
- 3.8 Considering that the windows in the extension are to the front and rear elevations and therefore would face out onto the street and the applicant's rear garden, it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable or significant loss of privacy. On the whole, the proposed development would have a minimal impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining and adjacent to dwellings and as such, a pleasant outlook to neighbouring properties would be maintained.

#### Parking

- 3.9 Considering the proposed development would result in a new garage and that there is the development would not result in any changes to the current level of parking provision provided on the driveway, it is not considered that the development would not result in any detrimental highway or parking issues.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.1 In conclusion, given that the proposed two that the two storey extension is of the same scale and design as the one approved under MA/09/0933 it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable. The additions of modest single storey front side and rear extensions are acceptable and the design is sympathetic to the character and forms of the original dwellings and surrounding area. It is for these reasons that the proposed development is considered to be acceptable. It is in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and members are there recommended to approve the application subject to the following conditions.

### **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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building(s) hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, in accordance with policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local 2000

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