

APPLICATION: MA/10/1262 Date: 15 July 2010 Received: 18 May 2011

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs P & F Healey

LOCATION: SUNNYCOTE, HIGH STREET, MARDEN, TONBRIDGE, KENT, TN12 9DR

PARISH: Marden

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension as shown on the site location plan and window cross sections received on 19/07/10 and the proposed plans and elevations received on 18/05/11, and as described in the Design and Access Statement, the Assessment of the significance and interest of Sunnycote etc... and the Tree Survey & Arboricultural Implications Assessment by Duramen Consulting, all received on 18/05/11.

AGENDA DATE: 22nd September 2011

CASE OFFICER: Angela Welsford

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by Marden Parish Council

1. POLICIES

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18
- The South East Plan RSS 2009: BE1, BE6
- Government Policy: PPS1, PPS5, PPS7
- Other: Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009.

2. HISTORY

MA/99/1089 – Side conservatory – APPROVED

MA/99/0379 - Side conservatory – REFUSED

MA/93/1572 – Attached double garage – APPROVED

3. CONSULTATIONS

3.1 MARDEN PARISH COUNCIL

3.1.1 *09/08/10* - Wishes to see the application refused and request the application is reported to the Planning Committee for the planning reasons set out below:-

- (a) harm character of the conservation area;
- (b) harm character of existing dwelling;
- (c) harm the setting the of neighbouring Grade II* listed building;
- (d) the design does not reflect the existing proportion of the building; and
- (e) no attempt has been made to match the ground floor window proportions to existing.

3.1.2 *Following submission of amended plans.*

03/06/11 - Wishes to see the application refused and request the application is reported to the Planning Committee for the planning reasons set out below:-

Whilst Cllrs noted some changes to their previous comments (ie item (e) had been amended) Cllrs wished their previous recommendation of refusal and reasons be reiterated: "Cllrs recommend refusal on the following grounds:

- (a) harm character of the conservation area;
- (b) harm character of existing dwelling;
- (c) harm the setting the of neighbouring Grade II* listed building;
- (d) the design does not reflect the existing proportion of the building."

3.2 CONSERVATION OFFICER

3.2.1 *17/08/10* - Application is unacceptable in the absence of a Heritage Statement assessing the significance of Sunnycote and its contribution to the character and interest of the conservation area, plus the impact of the proposals on that significance. Concern raised regarding the scale of the side addition and design of the rear addition.

3.2.2 *21/06/11* - Revised proposals now put forward are appropriate in their scale and design, allowing the symmetry of the original house to still be read and to remain dominant. Recommend no objection is raised subject to conditions re samples of materials and large scale details of the proposed windows. (*Case officer comment – The Conservation Officer has subsequently verbally confirmed that the window details received in July 2010 are sufficient, so only material samples are required.*)

3.3 LANDSCAPE OFFICER

- 3.3.1 07/09/10 – Application is unacceptable as insufficient information has been submitted to fully assess the impact of the proposals on the adjacent trees. Further information, including a tree survey detailing tree species, sizes and root protection area is required.
- 3.3.2 15/07/11 - No objection is raised subject to a condition requiring submission and approval of a Tree Protection Plan to ensure that the Yew Tree in the adjacent garden is not damaged during demolition and construction works. Welcomes proposal to have a Victorian formal garden as suggested in 'response to context' section of the Design and Access Statement, but notes that under 'landscaping' of the same document, it states that the frontage will remain unaltered. This should be clarified by a standard condition requiring the submission of a detailed landscaping scheme.

4. CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The application site is located within Marden village conservation area, adjacent to a Grade II* listed property, "White Lyon House", and opposite the Grade II listed "Bridge House".
- 4.1.2 It is a residential plot containing a substantial late Victorian dwelling, known as "Sunnycote", with painted, cement-rendered elevations beneath a fully hipped plain-tiled roof. A key characteristic of the building is the symmetry of its original main facade, although in recent years a double garage (MA/93/1572) and a conservatory (MA/99/1089) have been added, one at either side. There is also a single storey rear addition housing the current kitchen.
- 4.1.3 The street-scene in this historic village centre location is very mixed in terms of scale, design, age and spacing. There is a mature yew tree in the adjoining front corner of "White Lyon House". Although the plans state that this is subject of a Tree Preservation Order, that is not the case, as has been confirmed by the Landscape Officer. It is, however, protected by virtue of being in the conservation area.

4.2 **The Proposal**

- 4.2.1 The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
- 4.2.2 The two storey extension would replace the conservatory on the eastern side of the building. It would be set back approximately 1m from the front building line

to preserve the symmetry of the original main faced, and would have a footprint of approximately 4.5m (wide) by 7m (deep). The eaves would match those of the original building, but the ridge line would be approximately 0.5m lower due to the shallower depth of the extension.

- 4.2.3 The single storey extension would replace the existing kitchen extension and also run partially across the rear of the proposed two storey extension. It would have a footprint of approximately 8.25m (wide) by 4.9m (deep) and would feature a fully-hipped roof.

4.3 **Background**

- 4.3.1 The application was originally submitted in July 2010, but was subsequently put on hold from early September of that year pending submission of a Heritage Statement in accordance with the requirements of PPS5 and a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment. Those reports were received in May 2011, plus, during the interim, the applicants also amended the scheme in line with the Conservation Officer's advice and to take account of the concerns raised by Marden Parish Council.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.4 **Visual Impact/Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Street-scene**

- 4.4.1 It is my view that the scale and design of the proposed two storey extension are entirely appropriate, and would enable the symmetry of the original house to be preserved and remain dominant. The scheme has been amended in line with advice from the case officer and Conservation Officer to ensure that this would be the case. The original part of the house is a two-and-a-half bay building. The proportions of the extension have been amended so that the width matches the width of one of the original bays, whilst the set-back of 1m from the front building line and the lower ridge line, which follows advice in the Council's adopted residential extensions guidelines, will ensure that it remains subservient. Similarly, the fenestration pattern and proportions reflect those of the host building, which again follows advice in the SPD, whilst a 'flattened' bay window has been used on the ground floor so as not to detract from the dominance of the bay windows on the main facade. The overall effect, in my view is a proposal which relates well to the character and design of the host building and allows its original symmetry to still be read and remain dominant.
- 4.4.2 For these same reasons, and due to its varied nature, the character and appearance of the street-scene will not be harmed by the two storey extension.

4.4.3 The single storey rear extension would be subordinately sited at the rear of the building/two storey extension, where it would not have a significant impact on the character of either the host building or the street-scene as it would be screened from public view. Nevertheless, it is appropriately scaled and designed, and would represent a visual improvement on the existing poor quality kitchen extension.

4.4.4 In summary, due to the scale and design of the proposals and the character of the area, I conclude that the development complies with the Development Plan and the adopted supplementary planning guidance on residential extensions in respect of its visual impact.

4.5 **Impact on Heritage Assets**

4.5.1 The site falls within Marden Conservation Area, and it is close to Grade II* and Grade II listed buildings. PPS5 requires the impact on the significance of these heritage assets to be assessed.

4.5.2 In part, this has already been covered in the preceding section, which dealt with the visual impact of the proposals on the character of the host dwelling and the street-scene. In addition, the applicants have submitted an extensive heritage statement which assesses the significance and interest of "Sunnycote" and the contribution it makes to the character and interest of the conservation area, as well as the impact of the proposals on that significance. This charts the development of the property over the preceding 140 years, and highlights some unsympathetic alterations that would be removed/rectified by the current proposals, such as the UPVC conservatory and poor quality kitchen extension, and the textured cement render and plasticized paint which would be replaced with smooth lime render to match that on the proposed extensions. These improvements will in turn enhance the contribution that the building makes to the conservation area.

4.5.3 Furthermore, as discussed in the preceding section, the proposals have been amended such that they are now considered appropriate in terms of their scale and design, and would appear subordinate to the original part of the building such that the symmetry which is considered a key feature of its character will be preserved and still remain dominant.

4.5.4 In these circumstances, I consider the impact of the proposals on the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings to be acceptable and that no harm would be caused to their significance. I note that the Conservation Officer does not raise objection subject to a condition ensuring appropriate materials are used.

4.6 Impact on Trees

- 4.6.1 A Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment has been submitted in respect of the trees adjoining the boundary in "White Lyon House." This shows that, other than for the mature yew (category B) beside the front boundary, all the root protection areas are entirely within the garden of the adjacent property, and concludes that the proposed development should have no arboricultural impact, although protection should be provided for the yew during demolition and construction. The Landscape Officer agrees with this report, and does not raise objection subject to an appropriate condition securing that protection.
- 4.6.2 He has also commented that, in this heritage setting, the proposal to have a Victorian formal garden, as mentioned in the Design and Access Statement, is to be welcomed, but notes that the same document mentions elsewhere that the frontage will remain unaltered. This matter should be clarified by the submission of a detailed landscaping scheme.

4.7 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 4.7.1 The separation distance between the proposed extensions and "White Lyon House" would be approximately 13-14m, and consequently I do not consider that there would be any significant impact on the daylight, sunlight or outlook of the occupiers of that property.
- 4.7.2 Only one flank window is proposed facing "White Lyon House." This would be a secondary window serving the new living room (ground floor level), and given the fact that there is a 1.8m high close boarded fence marking the boundary, I do not consider that it would have any significant impact on the privacy of the neighbours.
- 4.7.3 There are no other neighbouring properties near enough to "Sunnycote" to be significantly affected by the proposals.

5. OTHER MATTERS

- 5.1 Although an additional bedroom is proposed, I consider there to be sufficient parking provision within the property boundary to serve the extended dwelling and note its sustainable village centre location.
- 5.2 Much of the development area is either already occupied by existing extensions to be demolished, or otherwise hard-surfaced/close-cropped domestic lawn. In view of these points and due to the nature and scale of the proposal, I do not consider that there would be any significant impact upon ecology.

6. CONCLUSION

- 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.

7. 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:

site location plan and window cross sections received on 19/07/10 and the proposed plans and elevations received on 18/05/11;

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 Policies BE1 & BE6 of The South East Plan RSS 2009, and the Central Government advice contained in PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment.

3. The development shall not commence until written details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be constructed using the approved materials;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 and Policies BE1 & BE6 of The South East Plan RSS 2009, and the Central Government advice contained in PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment.

4. The development shall not commence until a Tree Protection Plan to ensure that the Yew Tree (T6) in the adjacent garden is not damaged during demolition and

construction works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the appropriate tree protection shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

Reason: To safeguard the existing yew tree, which is considered to be of significant amenity value within the locality, in accordance with Policy ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

5. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, using indigenous species which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, and a programme for the approved scheme's implementation and long term management. The scheme shall be designed using the principles established in the Council's adopted Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Guidelines;

Reason: No such details have been submitted and in the interests of amenity and ensuring a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000.

6. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first use of the extensions hereby permitted or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development in accordance with Policy ENV6 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 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 the South East Plan 2009) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.