

APPLICATION: MA/11/1154 Date: 6 July 2011 Received: 15 July 2011

APPLICANT: Mr S Nagar

LOCATION: 44, PARK WAY, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME15 7DN

PARISH: Maidstone

PROPOSAL: Erection of a rear conservatory, first floor lean-to extension over existing garage, single storey front extension to garage, front canopy and extension to drive - amended scheme to MA/10/1295 to include garage extension, front canopy and additional parking space shown on a site location plan received on 11/07/11, and drawing no.s M1991.10/05 received on 15/07/11 and M1991.10/02 Rev B received on 01/08/11.

AGENDA DATE: 1st September 2011

CASE OFFICER: Louise Welsford

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

- the applicant's wife is an officer of the Council.

POLICIES

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18.

South East Plan 2009: BE1.

Government Policy: PPS1.

Supplementary Planning Guidance document "Residential Extensions".

1.0 HISTORY

- 1.1 MA/10/1295 Erection of a rear conservatory and first floor lean-to extension over existing garage – Approved. This application was taken to Committee, and the principle of the side extension and conservatory has therefore already been agreed. There has been no significant change in policy since then in relation to this application. (The South East Plan has come back into effect, but this does not contain a significant change in policy in respect of this development).

2.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 2.1 **Parish Council:** Not applicable.

3.0 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 None received to date.

CONSIDERATIONS

4. SITE AND SITUATION

4.1 This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling, which is located upon the south side of Park Way, in the urban area of Maidstone. The house is constructed of facing brickwork and render, under a plain tiled roof. There is a low wall to the front of the site.

4.2 The road is a fairly wide street of generally 1930s character. Dwellings are a mixture of mainly detached and semi-detached properties, mostly being of two storeys in height, although there are some bungalows. Spacing between dwellings is not wholly fixed and there are no strong uniform patterns to the street in general. A number of properties have large areas of hardstanding to their frontages and this is quite characteristic of the street.

5. PROPOSAL

5.1 Planning permission was granted under reference MA/10/1295 for the erection of a first floor side extension and a rear conservatory. The first floor side extension takes the form of a catslide extension to the main roof, over the existing garage. This development is under construction.

5.2 Planning permission is now sought for an amended scheme. In addition to the previously approved side extension and conservatory, an extension to the front of the existing garage is proposed, a canopy over the existing front door and an extension to the existing driveway to provide a further parking space. The front extension/canopy would be approximately 1m deep, and would be constructed in materials to match the existing house. The parking space would be finished in tarmac.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6. Visual Impact/Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Street-scene

6.1 As stated at the previous report (and for the reasons stated in the previous report), the conservatory and side extension would be visually acceptable in this location and these items remain as previously approved. A copy of the previous Committee report is attached as an appendix. As there has been no significant change in policy in respect of this development, there is no need to re-visit this.

- 6.2 The front extension to the garage and canopy would be of a modest scale, being only approximately 1m deep, and would have a lean-to roof, which would be sympathetic to the existing house. Due to the scale and design of the front additions, they would appear subordinate to the existing building.
- 6.3 The building line would not be affected by the proposal, because the front additions would be in line with the existing bay window. In any case, there are other properties within the road which have front extensions sited forward of the subject dwelling and proposed additions.
- 6.4 The additional parking space would not cause visual harm in this location, because this is an urban site, with a number of surrounding properties having high levels of hardsurfacing to their frontages, so the proposal would not be out of character with its surroundings. A number of surrounding properties have tarmac drives and other urban materials, such as concrete. Moreover, the additional parking space would be likely to constitute permitted development, (as I understand that a soakaway has been constructed and the drive would drain within the curtilage of the site) and not require planning permission. Tarmac is not out of character in this location.
- 6.5 Due to the scale and design of the proposal and the character of the area, I conclude that the development complies with the Development Plan and the supplementary planning guidance on residential extensions in respect of its visual impact.

7. Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 7.1 The proposed side extension would not cause a significant loss of residential amenity for any neighbouring property, due to its design and positioning. Due to the design and height of the conservatory, it is considered that it would not cause a significant loss of light to, overshadowing of, or overbearing impact upon, any neighbouring property. The proposed conservatory would not cause a significant loss of privacy for any neighbouring property, because it would be sited upon an existing patio and would give substantially the same views which could be gained from the existing garden area. There is a close boarded fence to the western boundary. As there has been no significant change in policy in respect of this development, there is no need to re-visit these issues. They are discussed in more detail in the previous Committee report (see appendix).
- 7.2 Due to their scale and siting, the front extension and canopy would not cause a significant loss of residential amenity for any neighbouring property. The extension to the drive would not cause a significant loss of residential amenity (in terms of noise and disturbance), again because of its siting.
- 7.3 In summary, due to the design, positioning and scale of the proposal, I conclude that the development complies with the Development Plan and the supplementary planning guidance on residential extensions in respect of its impact upon residential amenity.

8.0 Other issues

- 8.1 No additional bedrooms are proposed and the proposal would not affect the parking provision, because three off road parking spaces would remain – one in the garage and two upon the drive. (The length of the drive in front of the garage would be decreased, but an additional space is being provided to mitigate for this).
- 8.2 No trees would be lost to accommodate the amendments and the nature of the proposal and location of the site are such that it would have no significant impact upon ecology.

9.0 Conclusion

- 9.1 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 bricks, render and tiles to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions 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 received on 11/07/11, and drawing no.s M1991.10/05 received on 15/07/11 and M1991.10/02 Rev B received on 01/08/11;

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.

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