

REFERENCE NO - 20/503105/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, including loft conversion.		
ADDRESS 13 Blythe Road, Maidstone, Kent ME15 7TR		
RECOMMENDATION GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposed extensions and alterations to 13 Blythe Road would accord with the relevant policies and guidelines on residential extensions. On balance there would not be significant harm to visual or residential amenity, nor other material planning considerations such that this is an acceptable development and approval is therefore recommended subject to conditions.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Ward Councillor has requested that the application be considered by the Planning Committee if Officers are minded to recommend approval due to the impact on neighbouring amenity, scale and massing and privacy matters.		
WARD High Street	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL N/A	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs S Merrett AGENT Ms Karen Thatcher
TARGET DECISION DATE 30.09.2020 (EOT)		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 08.09.2020 (re-consultation date)

Relevant Planning History

20/500282/FULL - Erection of a single storey timber granny annexe for ancillary use to the main dwelling : Permitted (Permission remains extant but has not been implemented)

MAIN REPORT

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 The application site comprises a semi detached 2-storey house located on Blythe Road. The property benefits from a private drive way which could potentially park three vehicles and a large rear garden of approximately 40 metres in length which slopes down to the north of the garden. The dwelling is within Maidstone's urban area boundary as shown in the councils adopted local plan policies map. The majority of properties surrounding the application site are of a similar scale with many benefiting from front, side and rear extensions. The site is not subject to any other land designations.

2. PROPOSAL

2.01 The application seeks permission to extend the existing dwelling incorporating, the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and dormer window in the western roof slope.

2.02 In terms of design the single storey side extension would extend the width of the property by approximately 2.25 metres and would have a depth of 9.6 metres. The side extension would then extend beyond the rear of the property by a depth of 5.3

metres. The rear extension would be part pitched with the same eaves and overall height as the single storey side and part flat roof. The flat roof element of the rear extension would have an eaves height of 2.7 metres and an overall height of 2.8 metres.

- 2.03 The proposed dormer extensions would be in the western and northern roof slopes of the existing house. The height of the western dormer would be 3.2 metres, it would have a width of 2.9 metres and a depth of 3.4 metres with a pitched roof and will be set down from the apex of the existing roof and the principal elevation. The rear dormer extension would have a height of 3 metres, a width of 2 metres and a depth of 3.1 metres with a pitched roof.
- 2.04 The materials proposed are to match the existing materials of the property.
- 2.05 The block plans shows space to park vehicles on the front private forecourt to be retained with a garden and the retention of approximately 33 metres of garden/amenity area to the rear of the property.

3. POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017:

DM1 – Principles of good design

DM9 - Residential extensions, conversions and redevelopment within the built up area.

SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006)

Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2009)

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

Local Residents:

- 4.01 Three representations from neighbouring properties have been received raising the following objections (summarised):
- Trees within falling distance
 - Parking and traffic issues throughout the construction
 - Excessive scale
 - Loss of light/overshadowing
 - Loss of privacy
 - Detrimental to environment and loss of views
 - Reduction in value of adjoining properties
 - Risk of structural damage to adjacent property
 - Noise and disturbance during construction
 - Poor design
 - Intrusive
 - Potential party wall issues
 - Out of character with Blythe Road
- 4.02 It is important to note that issues such as parking and traffic, disturbance such as noise and mess throughout the construction, reduction in the value of adjacent properties, structural damage to adjacent properties and party wall issues are not planning considerations and therefore cannot be taken into account in the

determination of this application. We also do not have the ability to withhold any building works/consent due to potential disturbance as a result of the works being carried out. The other matters raised by neighbours and other objectors are discussed in the detailed assessment below.

There were no representations in support of the application.

5. CONSULTATIONS : None

6. APPRAISAL

6.01 The key issues for consideration relate to:

- Design and visual impact of the proposed development
- The potential impact upon the amenities of neighbouring householders.

Policy Context

6.02 The Maidstone Borough Local Plan was adopted in October 2017. Policy DM1 sets out the principles of good design. In particular, proposals should respond positively to local character and particular regard should be paid to scale, height, materials, detailing mass and bulk.

6.03 More specifically, Policy DM9 sets out the criteria for domestic extensions. Within the defined boundaries of the urban area, rural service centres and larger villages, proposals for the extension, conversion or redevelopment of a residential property which meet the following criteria will be permitted if:

- i. The scale, height, form, appearance and siting of the proposal would fit unobtrusively with the existing building where retained and the character of the street scene and/or its context;
- ii. The traditional boundary treatment of an area would be retained and, where feasible, reinforced;
- iii. The privacy, daylight, sunlight and maintenance of a pleasant outlook of adjoining residents would be safeguarded; and
- iv. Sufficient parking would be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling without diminishing the character of the street scene.

6.04 The Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (2009) (SPD) states that extensions should respond sensitively to the positive features of the area which contribute to the local distinctive character and sense of place in terms of scale, proportion and height. It is also desirable that the form, proportions, symmetry and detail of the original building should be respected. The scale, proportion and height of an extension should not dominate the original building, should be subservient to the original house and should fit unobtrusively with the building and its setting. The form of an extension should be well proportioned and present a satisfactory composition with the house. Extensions should respect the amenities of adjoining properties in respect of daylight and sunlight and maintain an acceptable outlook from a neighbouring property.

Design and visual impact

6.05 Policy DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2017) is supportive of extensions to dwellings within urban areas provided that the scale, height, form and appearance and siting of the proposal would fit unobtrusively within the existing building and the character of the street scene/or its context. In advising on side

extensions, the Residential Extensions SPD (2009) notes that the acceptable depth and height of a rear extension will be determined by the ground levels distance from the boundaries and size of the neighbouring garden/amenity space.

- 6.06 The proposed side extension is not an uncommon extension within the urban area of Maidstone and it is evident that many properties of this style and age have similar additions. It is not considered that the proposed single storey side extension would be of an excessive scale or unsympathetic design that it would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the property as seen from the highway.
- 6.07 The rear extension seeks to have a depth of 5.3 metres. In terms of design, although the Residential Extension SPD advocates that a rear extension should generally extend no more than 4 metres, however given the size of the plot and the scale of the existing property it is not considered the proposed depth to be an excessive increase and each case is assessed on its merits and there are circumstances where greater depths are acceptable. The rear garden area to be retained would be approximately 33 metres.
- 6.08 The dormer extensions would be significantly set down from the apex of the main dwelling and the western dormer will be set back approximately 4.6 metres from the principal elevation of the dwelling. It is not considered that the property is of such high visual amenity value that the minor change in character would result in significant harm. The application site is not restricted in terms of being located in a conservation area or AONB and is not listed. The hipped roof form of the existing dwelling would still be retained due to the position and scale of the dormer in the side roof slope.
- 6.09 Blythe Road is predominately made up of two storey semi-detached dwellings built in a similar period. However, due to the number of extensions and alterations to the properties it could be considered a mixed street scene with variety in the design and it is considered that, in its context, the proposed development would not appear significantly out of place or out of character with its surroundings. Cumulatively the proposed extensions would significantly increase the amount of space within the property however; the majority of the development would not be visible from the highway.
- 6.10 There is evidence of various side, rear and front extensions to properties in the vicinity and I would not consider the proposal to cause any significant harm to the appearance of this dwelling, the properties adjacent or the character of the vicinity of the site generally. The proposal is therefore in keeping with the existing character and appearance of the street scene.
- 6.11 The materials proposed are to match the existing property which will be in keeping and would appear sympathetic within the mixed street scene where a variety of different materials is present. It is not uncommon for properties within the urban area of Maidstone to have similar materials to the ones proposed and therefore the property would not detract from the characteristics within the vicinity or the wider area.
- 6.12 The proposal has been designed to maximise independence of the applicant's elderly parents, whilst also providing an enjoyable and safe open plan living for the family. The size of the accommodation being proposed is not excessive, and is proportionate to the identified need, taking into account practical considerations.

Impact on neighbouring amenities

- 6.13 Policy DM9 specifically states that domestic extensions will be supported provided that the privacy, daylight, sunlight and maintenance of a pleasant outlook of the adjoining residents would be safeguarded. This requirement is also observed in the Residential Extensions SPD (2009) where it is noted that the design of domestic alterations should not result in windows that directly overlook the windows or

private amenity spaces of any adjoining properties and should also respect daylight, sunlight and outlook.

6.14 15 Blythe Road

6.15 This adjoining property is located to the east of the application. The residential extension SPD advises that where necessary a 45 degree angle light test should be carried out to confirm whether a particular development would result in a loss of daylight to a habitable room. The test failed on the floor plans but passes on the elevational test in regards to the patio doors at ground floor. It is also noted that due to the path of the sun the existing dwelling already partially overshadows this property for part of the day and that this development would not result in such significant harm that it would be detrimental to occupiers of this neighbouring property. The low height of the extension and the flat roof will ensure that the sun will also reach the patio doors over the development.

6.16 The rear extension would be sited along the boundary of this neighbouring property, although it is agreed that the depth of the extension will be fairly large its low height and flat roof will ensure the proposal would not appear overbearing or overshadowing. Concerns have been raised in regards to the loss of outlook and that views of the semi-rural landscape will be compromised as a result of this development. The gardens of 13 Blythe Road are of a fairly large depth of 33m +, it is not considered that the proposed extension would restrict views of the surrounding landscape given the size of the gardens and the existing boundary treatments that consists of trees and vegetation would be retained.

6.17 The proposed raised patio area would be the same height as the existing raised area and it is not proposed to extend any further. When visiting the site, the majority of the existing patio area had garden paraphernalia and it was clear that the whole patio area was in use. Therefore, given that the raised patio area would not extend further than existing and will not be any higher than existing it is not considered that this element of the proposal will not result in any additional significant harm in terms of privacy and overlooking.

6.18 11 Blythe Road

6.19 In terms of the 45 degree angle light test that should be carried out to confirm whether a particular development would result in a loss of daylight to a habitable room. The test passed on the floor plans and the elevations test in regards to the patio doors at ground floor.

6.20 The distance between the proposed development and the boundary of this neighbouring property is 0.9 metres and due to the low eaves height and the proposed roof of the side extension which slopes away from this property it is not considered the proposal would result in a significant impact in terms of loss of light and overshadowing. The proposed dormer extension to the rear represents a minor element to the development that is not of a scale that would result in a loss of light/overshadowing.

6.21 In terms of outlook, as viewed specifically from the dining room of this neighbouring property. The patio doors are to the side of the rear extension and have clear views of the garden and patio area of the host dwelling. It is evident from other properties in Blythe Road that single storey side and rear extensions are not uncommon and the occupiers of this property have chosen to have views onto land that is not in their ownership.

6.22 Furthermore there is no right to a 'view' and the material considerations would be whether a particular proposal is overbearing or detrimental to the outlook which in this case, due to the distance, scale and design of the proposal it would be unlikely. It is also noted that the rear extension of this neighbouring property also has a large window in the rear elevation that looks out onto their own rear garden.

- 6.23 Concerns have also been raised in regards to privacy and overlooking from the windows proposed ground floor side windows and the raised patio area. There are three proposed ground floor windows in the flank elevation facing this neighbouring property. This neighbouring property does not have any windows in the flank elevation apart from the dining room doors in the rear extension. This neighbouring property also benefits from a single storey side extension which runs along the boundary.
- 6.24 Due to the positioning of the proposed windows they would look out onto the flank elevation of the neighbouring property and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 6.25 In terms of the raised patio area as shown on the block plan and an additional section plan, it will be the same height as the existing raised area, it is also proposed to not extend any further than existing.
- 6.26 When visiting the site, the majority of the existing raised area had garden paraphernalia and it was clear that the whole patio area was in use. Therefore, given that the raised patio area will not extend further than existing and will not be any higher than existing it is not considered that this element of the proposal will not result in any additional significant harm in terms of privacy and overlooking.
- 6.27 The proposal would not detrimentally impact other neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook, overlooking or loss of privacy due to the siting and orientation of application site.

Other Matters

- 6.28 KCC Highways state within their residential parking standards that a property with 4+ bedrooms should be allocated at least 2 independently accessible spaces within a suburban area. I would consider the amount of space retained on the private forecourt to accommodate 2+ cars and would therefore be in accordance with policy DM9 and KCC Highways recommendation for properties of this size.
- 6.29 There are no significant trees in close proximity to the site that will be detrimentally impacted by this development. The oak tree raised in the objections is not on the land of the host dwelling and is approximately 8 metres away from the development. The tree in question is not subject to a tree preservation order and as stated in the above assessment the site is not within a conservation area or AONB.
- 6.30 Policy DM1 of the local plan sets out at point viii that proposals should 'protect and enhance any on-site biodiversity and geodiversity features where appropriate, or provide mitigation.'
- 6.31 Due to the nature of the proposal and the residential use of the site and the continued residential use, it is not considered appropriate/necessary to require any ecological surveys, however due to the proposed extension extending rearwards and the loss of rear garden it is considered appropriate to request ecological enhancement by way of condition.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.01 The above assessments indicate that the extensions and alterations to 13 Blythe Road accord with the relevant policies and guidelines on residential extensions. On balance, this is an acceptable development and approval is therefore recommended subject to conditions.

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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/drawings:

Householder Application
S001 Site and location plans
E001 Existing floor plans
E002 Existing elevations
P001 A Proposed floor plans (received 24.08.2020)
P002 A Proposed elevations (received 10.09.2020)
S001 A Site and block plan (received 24.08.2020)

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the area.

- 3) The external facing materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

- 4) The extensions hereby approved shall not commence above slab level until details for a scheme for the enhancement of biodiversity on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall consist of the enhancement of biodiversity through either integrated methods into the design and appearance of the extension by means such as swift bricks, bat tube or bricks, or through provision within the site curtilage such as bird boxes, bat boxes, bug hotels, log piles and hedgerow corridors. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of whichever extension is completed first and all features shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To protect and enhance the ecology and biodiversity on the site in the future.

INFORMATIVES

The grant of this permission does not convey any rights of encroachment over the boundary with the adjacent property in terms of foundations, eaves, guttering or external cladding, and any persons wishing to implement this permission should satisfy themselves fully in this respect. Regard should also be had to the provisions of the Neighbour Encroachment and Party Wall Act 1995 which may apply to the project.

Case Officer: Sophie Bowden