

APPLICATION: MA/09/0138 Date: 30 January 2009 Received: 23 February 2009
APPLICANT: Mr M. Er
LOCATION: 2, KILNDOWN CLOSE, MAIDSTONE, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME16 0PL
PROPOSAL: Installation of softwood cladding on southwest elevation of building and on rear of two storey extension as shown on drawing number(s) 47.09.04 and 47.09.95 received on 20 March 2009.
AGENDA DATE: 30th April 2009
CASE OFFICER: Laura Gregory

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

- Councillor Daley has requested it be reported for the reason set out in the report

POLICIES

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18
Kent & Medway Structure Plan 2006: SP1, QL1
Village Design Statement: N/A
Government Policy: PPS1

HISTORY

MA/08/1848 - Erection of part single storey part two storey side and rear extension and front porch- APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MA/08/1019 - Erection of part single storey part two storey side and rear extension and front porch -WITHDRAWN BY MBC

MA/86/0491 - Erection of side extension (amendment to 85/1683) – APPROVED WITH CONDITION

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Daley has requested that this application is heard at Committee on following grounds:

“The white plastic cladding would be visually harmful to the street scene and would have detrimental impact upon the residential outlook of the property’s which face the site across the road” I understand this is due to the glare from the plastic finish in sunlight

One representation has been received objecting on the following grounds:

Variety of brickwork and tiling on the house is an eyesore

White expanse of the roller shutter doors make it look like a commercial premises and to incorporate yet more white would be totally unacceptable for this residential area

Officer Comment: The roller shutter door does not form part of this application

CONSIDERATIONS

Site Description

The application site is within the Maidstone urban boundary and is not subject to any specific planning policy designations. The property, a semi detached two storey dwelling, is located on relatively spacious corner plot on the junction of Kilndown Close with Hildenborough Crescent, and is set within a residential development that is characterised by a series of semi detached dwellings set back from the road with front gardens and driveways. Set back from the highway by approximately 6.2m, the property has a paved front garden with driveway to the side which has been enclosed by a white roller shutter door measuring 2m in height.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the installation of softwood cladding to the southwest elevation and rear at first floor level.

Background

Members may recall that this site has been presented to the Committee before on 30 October 2008, under application MA/08/1848. The application was for the retrospective development of the two storey rear extension and front porch which had been subject to Enforcement Action but no Notice was served, as an application was subsequently submitted.

The application was approved subject to conditions. Condition 2 of the decision notice stated that:

Within 1 month of the date of this permission, details of a uniform finish on the southwest elevation of the building(s), above the eaves height of the existing porch shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Within 2 months of the written approval of such details, the approved scheme shall be fully implemented at the site and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance the building(s) in accordance with policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and policy QL1 of the Kent & Medway Structure Plan 2006.

The applicant did not submit details of a uniform finish to the south west elevation of the building within the deadline which expired on 30 November 2008. Consequently a new application has now been submitted for a uniform finish to the southwest elevation and rear of the two storey extension, above eaves of the front porch.

Planning Considerations

Considering Councillor Daley's comments, white plastic cladding is now no longer proposed in this application. Soft wood cladding, constructed of cedar, with a varnish finish to match the colour of the brick of the original dwelling is now proposed. Considering the details, it is considered that a wood stain would be more appropriate. The visual impact upon the street scene would be minimal and the character of the area would be enhanced by the proposed works. It is therefore considered that, subject to the condition that the applicant submits samples of the wood cladding with the colour of the stained finish, the proposal is acceptable.

Considering the neighbour's representation and the comment that proposed white cladding would be unacceptable in this residential area, notwithstanding the fact that white plastic cladding is not proposed, this type of cladding has been used on properties within the surrounding area. Nos 17, 19 and 21 Kilndown Close have white plastic cladding installed on their front elevations as do Nos 2 and 4 Hildenborough Crescent. On this basis it is considered that cladding, whether white plastic or not, is not out of character in this residential area and would not be detrimental to the surrounding street scene. With regard to the comments on the roller shutter door, this does not form part of this application and therefore these comments cannot be taken into consideration when determining this application.

Taking into account that to clad a dwelling in softwood does not require planning permission; it is not development and the only reason that this application has been submitted is because the applicants did not comply with a condition imposed on their planning approval, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The timber finish would blend in with the surrounding area and would not cause significant harm to residential amenity.

Conclusion

In conclusion for the reasons stated above, it is recommended that the application be approved subject to the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Subject to the expiry of the consultation period of the amended plans and the receipt of no representations raising new issues, I be given DELEGATED POWERS to 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. Within 1 month of the date of this permission, samples of the proposed cedar cladding and details of the stained finish shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Within 2 months of the written approval of such details, the approved scheme shall be fully implemented at the site and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies H18 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 and QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006.

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.