

APPLICATION: MA/13/0131 Date: 24 January 2013 Received: 24 January 2013

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Mark Westbrook

LOCATION: ROSEACRE VIEW, 2, ROSEACRE LANE, BEARSTED, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME14 4HY

PARISH: Bearsted

PROPOSAL: Erection of part single storey and part two storey side and rear extension (resubmission of MA/12/0838) as shown on drawing nos. 10-1136-LP2, SP2 and 201 received 24/01/13.

AGENDA DATE: 4th April 2013

CASE OFFICER: Kathryn Altieri

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

- It is contrary to views expressed by the Parish Council.

## **1. POLICIES**

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18
- Government Policy: National Planning Policy Framework
- Supplementary Planning Document – ‘Residential Extensions’

## **2. HISTORY**

- MA/12/0838 – Erection of part single storey and part two storey side and rear extension – approved
- MA/88/0502 - Two storey extension – approved/granted with conditions

## **3. CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 **Bearsted Parish Council:** Wish to see the application refused and reported to Planning Committee;

*"We consider that the increased depth of this proposed extension will cause further harm to the residential amenity of 4 Roseacre Lane by increasing the overshadowing of its rear garden."*

## **4. REPRESENTATIONS**

4.1 4 Roseacre Lane has objected on the grounds of loss of light.

## **5. CONSIDERATIONS**

### **5.1 Site description**

5.1.1 The application site relates to 2 Roseacre Lane, a detached property that is set back some 15m from the road. This property is noticeably set up higher than the road, and to the front of the site there is a private driveway and a soft landscaped amenity area. The applicant's property is also noticeably set further back than the terrace of houses to the immediate north of the site.

5.1.2 The site is some 50m to the north of the junction with Ashford Road and the surrounding area largely consists of residential properties of differing scale, design and age, including Grade II listed buildings to the north and south of the site (6, 8, 10 Roseacre Lane and 111 Ashford Road). The application site is within the designated urban area as shown by the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000.

### **5.2 Proposal**

5.2.1 This application is for an amendment to previous approval MA/12/0838 that was for the erection of a part single storey and part two storey side and rear extension, to provide the occupants with a larger kitchen/dining area and larger bathroom. The proposed amendment to what was previously approved under MA/12/0838 is as follows;

- The single storey element would project a further 900mm from the rear flank of the original property. This element would have a very shallow pitched roof (almost flat), it would stand some 2.4m in height, and it would measure some 5m in width.

5.2.2 It should be made clear that this application is only concerned in assessing the merits of this proposed amendment. The rest of the development has already been granted approval under planning application MA/12/0838.

### **5.3 Principle of development**

5.3.1 The most relevant policy under the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 relating to householder development of this type within the urban area is still Policy H18; and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – 'Residential Extensions' is also of relevance. I will consider the proposal against the criteria set out in this policy and guidance.

## **5.4 Residential amenity**

- 5.4.1 The nearest neighbour to the proposal would be 4 Roseacre Lane. I am of the view that the proposed 900mm extension of the single storey element approved under MA/12/0838 would still not result in a development that would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupants of this property. Indeed, the proposed amendment with its modest projection and low height would be well screened from this neighbour by the existing ragstone wall; it would remain set in 0.5m from this shared boundary; and it would be located more than 10m away from the rear elevation of this neighbouring property.
- 5.4.2 The proposed amendment, given its modest scale and location, would not have a significant adverse impact on the occupants of 2a Roseacre Lane or any other near-by property.
- 5.4.3 I am therefore of the view that this proposal, because of its scale, design and location, would not have an overwhelming impact on, or have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of any neighbour, in terms of loss of privacy, outlook, light and overshadowing.

## **5.5 Visual impact**

- 5.5.1 Given the modest 900mm increase in the depth of the single storey element of the proposal, I am satisfied that it would remain subordinate and not overwhelm or destroy the character of the existing property. Moreover, given the modest amendment's location, it would not appear significantly visible from any public vantage point and therefore would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

## **5.6 Other matters**

- 5.6.1 The proposed amendment, because of its modest scale, location and nature, would not have a significant impact on parking provision (or generate any need), or highway safety.
- 5.6.2 Given the modest scale of the proposed amendment, and its location to the rear of the property, I am satisfied that it would not have a detrimental impact upon the character and setting of the near-by Grade II listed buildings.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 The concerns raised by Bearsted Parish Council and the occupants of 4 Roseacre Lane have been dealt with in the main body of this report. Please note that Bearsted Parish Council did not previously comment on planning approval MA/12/0838.

6.2 It is therefore considered that the proposal is still acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document – 'Residential Extensions', and all other material considerations such as are relevant. I therefore recommend conditional approval of the application on this basis.

## **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 shown on application form and drawing no. 10-1136-201 received 24/01/13;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. This is in accordance with policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:  
10-1136-201 received 24/01/13;

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. This is in accordance with policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Note to Applicant:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. MBC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.

Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.

As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

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 there is no overriding material consideration to indicate a refusal of planning consent.