

APPLICATION: MA/12/1318 Date: 21 June 2012 Received: 16 July 2012

APPLICANT: Mr Lewis Small

LOCATION: 26, FAUCHONS CLOSE, BEARSTED, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME14 4BB

PARISH: Bearsted

PROPOSAL: Erection of a single storey rear extension as shown on Drawings PL/11/04 and SL-12-01 received on 16 July 2012 and amended drawing PL11/03 received 16 August 2012

AGENDA DATE: 20th September 2012

CASE OFFICER: Laura Gregory

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

- An officer of the Local Planning Authority is the applicant

1. POLICIES

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18
- South East Plan 2009: CC1, CC6, BE1
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- SPD Residential Extensions (Adopted May 2009)

2. HISTORY

MA/84/0461 – 26 FAUCHONS CLOSE - Erection of single storey rear extension – APPROVED

3. CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Bearsted Parish Council – No objection/ comments received.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Neighbouring occupiers were notified and one letter of representation has been received. The contents of this letter are summarised below:

- No objections provided that there are no windows facing the neighbours property; the extension is not built on the boundary line and, it is no higher than the existing extension.

5. CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

5.1.1 The application site falls within the defined urban area of Maidstone within the parish of Bearsted. Located off Fauchons Close the site contains a semi detached bungalow and is not subject to any landscape restrictions as designated within the Development Plan. The dwelling has been extended before with a single storey flat roof extension to the rear. This projects approximately 4.8m from the rear wall of the dwelling.

5.1.2 The surrounding street scene is characterised by single storey dwellings from the mid 20th century. The houses are evenly spaced and with a regular building line, set back from the road by approximately 6m. With driveways to the side which lead to detached garages that are set behind the houses, there is a strong and cohesive pattern of development and this defines the street.

5.2 Proposal

5.2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of single storey rear extension to provide a family room. The proposed rear extension would be flat roofed and would measure 4.3m wide, 4m deep and have a height of 2.5m. The proposed extension would be clad in white timber weatherboarding on the front, to match the existing garage and would have brickwork which matches the existing house.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 The specific policy under the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 relating to housing extensions within the urban area is Policy H18. Furthermore, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions (SPD) is also of relevance. The principle for this type of development is acceptable and I will largely consider it against the criteria/guidance set out in policy H18 of the MBWLP and the SPD.

5.4 Visual Amenity Considerations

5.4.1 The proposed extension is single storey and is not considered to be of an excessive height or scale in relation to the host dwelling. Whilst the extension would have a flat roof, this responds to the existing extension and as it is located on rear elevation it would not be visible from the street and therefore would not have detrimental impact upon the wider area. The proposal would be constructed of materials which compliment the appearance of the dwelling and as such, the development would retain a good quality, acceptable finish.

5.5 Residential Amenity Considerations

5.5.1 The nearest ground floor rear opening on the adjoining property serves the neighbour's kitchen. This not considered to be a habitable room and in any case the window is a secondary opening to this room. The extension has been assessed in accordance with the BRE guidelines and whilst it fails the plan test, it passes the elevation test. Therefore I do not consider that a significant or unacceptable loss of light would be caused.

5.5.2 I note with a projection of 4m, the proposed extension would exceed the recommendations adopted within the Council's SPD; in reference to paragraph 4.10 "...Rear extension on semi detached and terraced houses should not project more than 3m from the rear elevation" However, the acceptable depth and height of an extension will be determined by the ground levels and distance from the boundary. The ground is flat and the proposed extension would be set in from the boundary by 500mm and, have a height of 2.5m. Given that the ground levels will remain the same and the extension will be set in from the boundary, I do not consider the proposal would result in a development that would significantly or unacceptably overbear onto the adjacent dwelling.

5.5.3 Following discussion with officers, the plans have been amended so that no new openings would directly face onto the adjoining property neighbour and in any event, in terms of shared boundary treatment there is an existing 1.8m high close boarded fence between the two properties. As such I do not consider the development would cause a loss of privacy.

5.5.4 Overall, the development is considered to be acceptable on this matter and the residential amenity of the adjoining property would remain unharmed by this proposal.

5.6 Parking

5.6.1 No additional bedrooms are proposed within the house and therefore the development will not impact upon the level of parking space provided on the property. No impact on the highway will therefore be caused by this development.

6. **CONCLUSION**

6.1 In conclusion, I consider that due to the limited visual impact the development would have on the building and surrounding area and as it would not impact upon residential amenity, the extension is in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan. With no overriding material considerations which would otherwise warrant a refusal, I recommend that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted shall match those stated on Drawing PL/11.03 and shall be maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and policies CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan 2009.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing PL/11/04 and Drawing PL11/03

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 CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan 2009.

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.