

APPLICATION: MA/10/1472 Date: 21 August 2010 Received: 25 August 2010
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs N & A Furlong
LOCATION: 4, YARROW COURT, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME14 5FQ
PARISH: Thurnham
PROPOSAL: Erection of a first floor side extension, shown on a site location plan, site plan, floor plan and elevations received on 25/08/10.
AGENDA DATE: 14th October 2010
CASE OFFICER: Louise Welsford

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.
Government Policy: PPS1.

1. HISTORY

1.1 The only relevant history for the site is:

00/0818 Single storey side extension - Approved

1.2 The only other history for the site relates to the erection of the estate around the 1990s.

2. CONSULTATIONS

2.1 **Thurnham Parish Council:** wishes to see the application refused for the following reasons:

“Thurnham Parish Council feels that the elevational treatment ruins a well proportioned house and there will be a loss of amenity. The existing ground floor extension is acceptable in view of its modest scale. However we feel that the proposals in general are unacceptable and ugly and only give modest improvement to the living accommodation.

The Parish Council would have no objections to a properly designed extension which extends the roof line and preserves the half hip gable end.

In conclusion the Parish Council objects to the proposals in their current form”.

2.2 **Boxley Parish Council:** Do not wish to object.

3. REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring property, objecting upon the following grounds:
- loss of light / overshadowing
 - visual appearance / dominance
 - noise, dust and disturbance from the construction phase.

CONSIDERATIONS

4. Site and situation

- 4.1 This application relates to a detached, modern (1990s) dwelling, which is located within the urban area of Maidstone. It is constructed of red and yellow brick, under a concrete tiled roof. The house is located within Thurnham parish, but the plot straddles the boundary of Thurnham and Boxley parishes. The street is a cul-de-sac made up of detached properties of no fixed design, layout or spacing.
- 4.2 No 4 Yarrow Court is set back from the turning head of the road by some 25m. To the south east of the property lie the rear gardens of dwellings in Peverel Drive. The subject dwelling is positioned at an angle of 90 degrees to those houses.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side extension. There is an existing single storey side extension to the south east elevation and it is proposed to increase the eaves and ridge height of the extension to create accommodation (dressing room, en-suite and store) within the roofspace. The roof would remain hipped. Approximate measurements are:

Existing eaves height 2.7m
Proposed eaves height 3.7m
Existing ridge height 4.5m
Proposed ridge height 6.5m

6. Planning considerations

- 6.1 There are two key issues arising from this case. These are the visual impact of the development and its impact upon residential amenity for the occupiers of properties in Peverel Drive.

7. Visual Impact

- 7.1 In my opinion, the proposal would generally be in keeping with the design of the existing house. Detailing to the corners of the building would be continued to match that existing and arches would be added above ground floor windows to match existing windows. The design of the roof would be similar to that of the existing single storey element – it would simply be increased in height. The ridge would be set down from the main ridge by almost 2m, and due to its height, hipped roof and width, the extension would appear subservient to the existing house and would not dominate it.
- 7.2 The form of the main house, including the form of its roof, would be preserved. Its proportions would not be significantly altered, because the extension would be no wider than the existing extension.
- 7.3 The elevations are not symmetrical and, as stated, detailing (for example, windows and quoins) would be in keeping with existing detailing. Materials are also stated to match the existing materials (brick and concrete tiles).
- 7.4 The part of the building which is to be extended is not at all prominent in the street, because the house is set back from the road by around 25m. The extension would be added to the side of the house which is furthest from the road.
- 7.5 I conclude that the extension would be subordinate to the existing house, in keeping with its appearance and visually acceptable within the street. It would have no significant adverse effect upon visual amenity.

8. Residential Amenity

- 8.1 The proposed extension would be located around 0.5m from the boundary with numbers 42 & 44 Peverel Drive, which back onto the site. The proposal would be located around 10m from the rear elevations of those properties and would increase the height and massing of development close to their rear boundary. The site is a maximum of approximately 0.5m higher than land upon the other side of the boundary to the south east.

- 8.2 However, the eaves height would only be increased by around 1m, the roof would be hipped and it would slope away from those properties. Also, the extension would not run the entire length of either property's boundary - the boundary between numbers 42 and 44 Peverel Drive is positioned part way along the side elevation of no 4 Yarrow Court, so the extension would be adjacent to part of those properties, but not adjacent to their whole garden.
- 8.3 A loss of light test has been undertaken in accordance with a method referred to in the British Research Establishment Report "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight" and this does not indicate a significant loss of light to the properties in Peverel Drive. Also, the development would take place to the north west of the boundary with the Peverel Drive houses, and this orientation would limit the impact in terms of light and overshadowing. Moreover, the development would appear against the backdrop of the existing house, which is of greater height and mass.
- 8.4 Considering all of the above, I conclude that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of light to, overshadowing of, or overbearing impact upon, the occupiers of any property in Peverel Drive. No other neighbouring property would be significantly affected in this way, due to the distances involved.
- 8.5 The development would not result in a significant loss of privacy for any neighbouring property, because front and rear rooflights would be in the same planes as existing windows and the side rooflight would be obscure glazed with an opening restrictor limiting the opening to 100mm.

9. Other issues

- 9.1 No additional bedrooms are proposed and the proposal would not affect the parking provision.
- 9.2 Noise, dust and disturbance from the construction phase are not material planning considerations.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1 The extension is clearly subordinate to the existing dwelling and in keeping with its design.
- 10.2 The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the streetscene and would not result in significant harm to residential amenity for any neighbouring property. Approval is therefore recommended.

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 Policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, and PPS1.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan, site plan, proposed plan and elevations received on 25/08/10;

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 H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, and PPS1

4. The rooflight to the side elevation serving the en-suite shall be obscure glazed and the opening shall be restricted to 100mm, as shown upon the proposed floor plan, prior to the first use of the building hereby permitted and shall be maintained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

Reason: In the interests of privacy and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, and PPS1.

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.