

APPLICATION: MA/09/0066 Date: 7 January 2009 Received: 19 March 2009

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs D Lord

LOCATION: 11, GREYSTONES ROAD, BEARSTED, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME15 8PD

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two-storey extension as shown on drawing numbers 09/003/01A and 09/003/01 to 09/003/04 received on 16th January 2009.

AGENDA DATE: 30th April 2009

CASE OFFICER: Katie Lazzam

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  
Kent & Medway Structure Plan 2006: QL1  
Village Design Statement: None  
Government Policy: PPS1, PPS3  
Planning Guidance Notes-Residential Extensions. Number 10

### **HISTORY**

87/1393-Modification of the ground floor of the house and the construction of a porch and garage. APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Bearsted Parish Council** were consulted and raised the following objections to the proposal:-

*"The Parish Council understand that the regulations state that when building a two storey side extension there should be a 1.5 metre gap between the new extension and the boundary wall. The new regulations go a bit further with this recommendation by saying that, other than in areas of significant spacing between dwellings, there should normally be a minimum gap of 3 metres between the two properties i.e. between the two buildings.*

*The Council wish to see the application refused on the grounds that if allowed the new extension will create a terracing affect because of breaching the regulations concerning minimum gap recommendations”.*

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Neighbouring occupiers were notified of this application and no objections were received

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Site and surroundings**

The application site relates to a property located at 11 Graystones Road, which lies within the residential area of Bearsted. The property is a semi-detached two-storey bungalow style dwelling, with a gabled roof and an attached single garage. The dwelling is of a chalet style design and has dormers located within both the front and rear roof slopes. The materials used for the property consist of redbrick for the exterior walls and tiling for the roof. The garage is an extension to the property, it is located on the western side of the dwelling and has a flat roof. The dwelling is located on a rectangular shaped plot and the front elevation is 12 metres from the road. As well as the garage there is off road parking for two vehicles to the front. The vicinity is characteristic of a residential area and the street comprises three styles of semi-detached dwellings repeated throughout the street, the buildings are all of a similar style given that they were all constructed at similar times as part of the same development and many of these properties have been extended.

### **Proposal:**

The proposal involves the erection of a two-storey side extension, which would replace the existing garage. It would be 7.6 metres long, it would stretch the length of the dwelling and would be of the same length. The extension would be 2.5 metres wide, and be built up to the property boundary. The extension would be 7 metres high from the highest point, which would be the same eaves and ridge height as the main dwelling. It would also have a gabled roof, following the same form as the existing property. This would include the extension of both the front and rear dormer windows by 2 metres. The materials are proposed to match those of the existing property.

### **Planning Assessment:**

The proposed side extension has not been set down or back from the main dwelling and would be built up to the property boundary, this is not in compliance with the

requirements of the Maidstone Borough Council's Residential Extensions Guidance (Number 10). Notwithstanding this, it is not thought that the scale of the extension would harm the character of the property or overwhelm the existing building, as the side elevation of the property is small scale and the extension would only be 2.5 metres wide, the proposed extension also does not protrude beyond the front or rear building lines. The alterations would be of an acceptable standard, being in-keeping, reflective of the property's design style and following the same form.

Bearsted Parish Council were consulted on the application and objected because the proposal would not comply with regulations which state that when building a two storey side extension there should be a 1.5 metre gap between the new extension and the boundary wall, or the new regulations which state that there should normally be a minimum gap of 3 metres between the two buildings. It was also considered that the extension would create a terracing affect because of breaching the regulations concerning minimum gap recommendations.

The extension would be built up to the property boundary, resulting in a reduction in the spacing between the site and the adjoining property at No.9 of 2.5 metres. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that it would be acceptable in this case, as the dwelling is of a chalet style and is of a lower level than most two-storey properties, being 2.2 metres high from eaves level, the increase in dominance would subsequently not be as significant as a two-storey dwelling. Criteria G1. of the Residential Extensions Guidelines No.10 states that there should be a gap of 1.5 metres between the wall of a two-storey side extension and the property boundary. However it is not considered that this is a two storey extension, as the property is essentially of a bungalow style design. There would also still be a 2.5 metre gap maintained between the buildings, which is only 500mm less than the recommended distance. In addition, although in most cases the spacing has been maintained, the spacing between the dwellings does vary within the street. The meandering building line and variation of design styles within the street also prevents the appearance of a regular building formation or consistent spacing within the street scene. Therefore as a result of the orientation of the properties, it is not considered that the reduction of spacing would be visible from many vantage points and would only be noticeable when standing directly opposite the property. The dwelling is one of three pairs in a row that are of the same design style, the other surrounding properties are of a different design, as the character of the properties vary, there is no consistent visual separation of distances between the properties or strong uniform pattern of development to protect.

On balance it is not considered that the proposed extension would affect the openness of the streetscene, and would not harm views down the street or the visual separation of the dwellings or the character of the street in general. The residential extensions guidelines are recommendations that give guidance for what should normally be acceptable however this is only relevant if there is a demonstrated harm caused as a result of the loss of spacing. Each case should be considered on its own merits and it is considered that in this case the property is not a 'two-storey' dwelling and therefore

does not contravene the distancing recommendation, and does not result in a significantly harmful impact or a terracing affect.

When considering whether the proposal would have any significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, any loss of sunlight/daylight, privacy, and outlook all need to be taken into account. In terms of loss of light, it is not considered that there would be any loss of light to the adjoining property at No.9, as the only window located within the eastern flank elevation is a first floor hallway window which is a non-habitable room. The proposal passes the loss of light calculations in accordance with the BRE Guidelines. In terms of loss of privacy, there are no windows proposed within the western flank elevation, therefore there would be minimal potential for loss of privacy as a result of the development .As a result of the and the orientation of the site and the existing impact from the first floor windows, the proposed first floor rear elevation window would not afford any significant increase in overlooking to the rear garden area of No.9. There is also a garage located to the rear of the properties within the garden of No.9 which partially obscures views of the adjoining site.

Sufficient parking for this location would be provided within the proposed driveway and garage.

For the reasons set out above, it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and with those within the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, and Members are therefore recommended to give this application favourable consideration, subject to the imposition of suitable safeguarding conditions.

## **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 building 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.

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 Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.