

APPLICATION: MA/10/0786 Date: 5 May 2010 Received: 12 July 2010

APPLICANT: Mr A French

LOCATION: 13, VALE ROAD, LOOSE, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME15 0EP

PARISH: Loose

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension as shown on drawing number 2112/1/- received on 07/05/10 and drawing number 2112/2/B received on 12/07/10.

AGENDA DATE: 12th August 2010

CASE OFFICER: Angela Welsford

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by Loose Parish Council

1. POLICIES

- 1.1 Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H33, ENV28, ENV32.
- 1.2 Government Policy: PPS1, PPS7.
- 1.3 Other: Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009.

2. HISTORY

- 2.1 There is no planning history for this site.
- 2.2 However, a very similar development was permitted at No 9 Vale Road, (but without the 1.2m wide first floor side element), under reference MA/09/1792; and No 11 has a similar two storey rear extension.

3. CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 LOOSE PARISH COUNCIL wishes to see the application refused and reported to the Planning Committee on the following grounds:-

“The Loose Parish Council Planning Committee have carefully considered the plans and identified that property lies just outside the conservation area. It was agreed that the extension was unsympathetic, and it was felt that it

would take away the special character of the cottage, and would not enhance the street scene.”

- 3.2 The case officer has contacted the Parish Council and explained that the proposal complies with the Council’s adopted Residential Extensions Guidelines and Development Plan Policy (see considerations section below). However, the following comments have subsequently been received:

“Following your telephone call, and in relation to a further meeting of the 5th July. The Loose Parish Council planning committee wish to uphold their decision of the 7th June, for the application to be refused and request that it should go to planning committee.”

4. CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The Site

- 4.1.1 The application site contains a semi-detached dwelling and associated garden. It is located in the open countryside, in the parish of Loose and also falls within the Southern Anti-Coalescence Belt.
- 4.1.2 The application building is one of eight dwellings which back onto an orchard, their main garden areas being to the east, across an access track.
- 4.1.3 A public footpath runs in a northerly direction from Vale Road along the bottom these gardens before turning westwards at the corner of the garden of No 14 and running along the northern boundary of that property and the orchard to the rear. Vale Road is a private road from just beyond the point where the public footpath leaves it.

4.2 The Proposal

- 4.2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, and a single storey rear extension. The proposal would effectively wrap around the existing building in an L-shape. The plans also show two parking spaces to be created in the garden area opposite the dwelling.
- 4.2.2 The ground floor of the side extension would have a footprint of 2.2m wide x 5.3m deep. The first-floor element would project 1.2m from the flank wall of the dwelling and be 3.4m deep. At the rear, at ground floor level the extension would increase the depth of the existing single storey rear element by 0.7m. The first floor rear element would project 2.1m from the rear building line and be set in approximately 3.4m from the common boundary with the attached neighbour, No 14 Vale Road.

ISSUES

4.3 Visual Impact

- 4.3.1 I consider the key issues to relate to the visual impact of the proposal on the character of the dwelling and the resultant impact on the rural street scene within which it is set.
- 4.3.2 The Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted May 2009) states that extensions to rural dwellings should be “modest” and sets out three indicators against which proposals should be assessed in this respect – the impact on the character of the countryside; the impact on the form and appearance of the original building; and the scale of the extension.
- 4.3.3 In this connection it is my view that the proposal would be of a scale and design which would not overwhelm the existing building or destroy its character. It would be modest both in terms of additional actual volume, which would be significantly below the 50% guideline set out in the adopted Residential Extensions Guidelines, and also visually inasmuch as the first floor side extension would only project 1.2m from the flank wall of the building and 2.1m from the rear building line. These dimensions are clearly modest in relation to a building of approximately 5.5m wide x 7.2m deep. Furthermore, the 5.8m degree of set back of the first floor element from the front facade of the dwelling would further reduce the impact of the proposal and ensure that it appears subordinate to the original dwelling. The single storey element would also be set back approximately 4m from the main front building line.
- 4.3.4 A 1.7m gap would remain at first floor level between the extension and the boundary with No 12 (non-attached), which has a single storey detached garage closest to the application site, such that a space approaching 5m would remain between the buildings at first floor level. This clearly exceeds the 3m recommended in the Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.
- 4.3.5 The rear elements are also considered modest.
- 4.3.6 None of the proposals would be readily visible in public views due to the private nature of Vale Road at this point and the fairly well vegetated nature of the public footpath to the north. I therefore conclude that the proposed additions to the house would not harm the form or appearance of the original building, nor the character or appearance of the countryside, or erode its openness, due to their scale, design and positioning. This meets the requirements of the Council’s adopted Residential Extensions Guidelines and Local Plan Policy H18. The proposal is not contrary to the aims of the Southern Anti-coalescence Belt designation.

4.4 **Residential Amenity**

4.4.1 Turning to residential amenity, there would be no significant loss of privacy, due to the fact that all proposed new openings would face front and rear and afford much the same views as existing openings.

4.4.2 I do not consider that any property would experience a significant loss of light or overbearing impact, due to the height and modest design of the proposal, the depth of the first floor rear element (only approximately 2.1m from the main rear building line) and the set in from the boundaries of the two storey rear extension by approximately 3.4m from No 14 (to the north) and 1.7m to No 12 (to the south). Although No 12 has a ground floor flank window facing the site, this is currently shielded by its own detached garage so there would be no material effect.

4.5 **Parking**

4.5.1 The plans show two additional parking spaces to be created adjacent to the existing space in the garden area opposite the dwelling. Most of the dwellings in the row have parking spaces in this area, and the proposed spaces would not be prominent in any key public views of the landscape. Subject to a condition regarding the type of surface to be used, I consider that the parking bays would not harm the visual amenity of the countryside.

4.6 **Conclusion**

4.6.1 I have considered all other relevant planning matters, including any raised as a result of public consultation, and taking all of the above into account, conclude that the proposals comply with Development Plan Policy, the aims of the Council's adopted residential extensions guidelines and Central Government Guidance, and that consequently the application should be approved with conditions as set out below.

5. 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 extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policies ENV28 & H33 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000.

3. No development relating to the car parking area shall take place until written details of the colour and type of surfacing material to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed using the approved material in the approved colour;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to preserve the character and appearance of the countryside in accordance with Policies H33 and ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and the advice given in PPS7.

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 there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.