

APPLICATION: MA/13/0870 Date: 16 May 2013 Received: 30 May 2013

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs James Macey

LOCATION: 1, EDWIN VILLAS, GOUDHURST ROAD, MARDEN, TONBRIDGE, KENT, TN12 9JX

PARISH: Marden

PROPOSAL: Erection of first floor side extension as shown on the site location plan received 17th May 2013 and drawing numbers 2/1021a, 2/1012/2 and 2/1021/3 received 15th July 2013.

AGENDA DATE: 29th August 2013

CASE OFFICER: Catherine Slade

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by **Marden Parish Council** who have requested that the application be reported to Planning Committee.

1. **POLICIES**

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18, T13
- Village Design Statement: Marden Design Statement 2001
- Other: Residential Extensions Development Plan Document 2009
- Government Policy: National Planning Policy Framework 2012

2. **HISTORY**

None.

3. **CONSULTATIONS**

- 3.1 **Marden Parish Council** wished to see the application as originally submitted refused on the following grounds:
- 3.2 *"Councillors wish to recommend refusal on the grounds that although not necessarily concerned about the principle of an extension Councillors felt this particular application had an adverse impact on the character of the building together with the loss of symmetry between the host and the attached dwelling*

together with 3 and 4 Edwin Villas and therefore adverse impact on the street scene."

3.3 Following receipt of amended plans the following comments were received:

3.4 *"Councillors wished to recommend refusal as felt this amendment was highly detrimental to the character of the properties and street scene. These dwellings are in a prominent position on the main road through Marden."*

3.5 The parish council reiterated their previous comments.

3.6 The **Maidstone Borough Council Conservation Officer** raised no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission and approval of materials.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Two representations were received, which raised the following concerns:

- Design and impact on the streetscene and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties.
- Harm to residential amenity by way of loss of light/overshadowing, loss of privacy/overlooking, and noise through party walls.

4.2 Concern was also raised in respect of the number of applications for new dwellings in and around Marden, querying the need for the current development in this context.

5. CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

5.1.1 The application relates to a site located in the defined village settlement of Marden. The site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling of "Cox" style, with front and rear gardens. The site is located in a visually prominent location on the outside of a 90° bend in Goudhurst Road immediately to the north of the village hall. The site has no specific designations in the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 but is located approximately 25m to the south of the boundary of the Marden Conservation Area.

5.1.2 The proposal site has an existing vehicular access to Goudhurst Road, the B2079, and off road parking for one vehicle to the front of the main dwellinghouse.

5.1.3 The surrounding area predominantly comprises semi-detached properties, although the village hall and Marden Primary School are located to the south of the site. The properties are largely Victorian or pre-war although they differ in detailed design and scale.

5.2 Proposal

5.2.1 The proposed development is the erection of a first floor side extension, as shown on drawing numbers 2/2012/2 and 2/2012/3.

5.2.2 The proposed development would result in the introduction of a dual pitched first floor side extension. The proposed extension would extend above the original single storey element to the building and incorporate the existing first floor side extension. The proposed extension would extend the full depth of the main two storey dwelling having a depth of 8.4m, although the existing two storey front bay would project beyond it. There would be no increase in the footprint of the building.

5.2.3 The extension would have a pitched roof form with a valley between, and would have eaves heights of 5.25m, continuing those of the main dwellinghouse. The ridge heights of the extension would be 7.9m, being set down from those of the original dwelling by 0.5m.

5.2.4 The scheme before Members has been the subject of negotiation between the case officer and the applicants; the application as originally submitted sought planning permission for a 11.9m flat roofed first floor side and rear extension which would have wrapped around the rear of the dwelling presenting an unattractive two storey slab of flank elevation in views from the south.

5.2.5 The proposal would provide two additional bedrooms and a wet room.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 Extensions to residential properties in locations such as this which fall within defined settlements are primarily assessed under the provisions of policy H18 of the Local Plan, which requires proposals to be of an appropriate scale and design; to complement the streetscene and surrounding area; to maintain residential amenity; and provide adequate car parking within the site.

5.3.2 Applications for residential extensions are also subject to assessment against the policies set out in the Maidstone Borough Council Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which require extensions to dwellings within defined settlements to be of high quality and to respect the existing

pattern of built development and the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties.

- 5.3.3 This policy and SPD are in accordance with central government planning policy and guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 which seeks to secure a high quality of design in new development.

5.4 Design and Visual Impact

- 5.4.1 The proposed extension to the dwellinghouse is considered to be well related to the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse, in accordance with Development Plan policy. The extension would be set down in relation to the main dwelling, and as such is considered to be subservient to the original property. Whilst the comments of the parish council and objectors are noted in respect of the design and impact of the development on the symmetry of the pair of dwellings and the streetscene, the proposal represents a sensitive addition to a Cox style building which is considered to be acceptable in the context of this village centre streetscape, the use of the dual pitch form in particular taking visual cues from the gabling of surrounding buildings including other dwellings and the village hall.
- 5.4.2 Whilst it is agreed that the proposal would inevitably have some impact on the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, this is the case in considering all first floor or two storey side extensions to such properties. In this case the proposal is in accordance with the guidance set out in the Maidstone Borough Council Residential Extensions SPD, in being set down and maintaining a visual gap in the streetscene, and it is not considered that the visual impact in respect of symmetry is significantly adverse.
- 5.4.3 The Maidstone Borough Council Conservation Officer raises no objection to the proposal in respect of the impact on views of the conservation area, a view with which I concur. The officer has requested the imposition of a condition requiring the submission and approval of materials, and in the circumstances of this case this is considered to be reasonable and necessary.
- 5.4.4 For these reasons, it is therefore considered that, subject to the condition detailed above, there is no objection to the proposal on the grounds of design or visual impact.

5.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 5.5.1 The spatial relationship between the proposed extension and the neighbouring residential properties is such that it is not considered that any harm to residential amenity would result from the proposal by way of loss of

light/overshadowing or loss of privacy/overlooking, and it is not considered necessary in the circumstances of this case to impose a condition requiring the proposed first floor side window to be obscure glazed and fixed.

- 5.5.2 Whilst objection has been raised in regard to noise through party walls, the proposal would not result in any extension of the existing party wall, and in any case it would not be reasonable to refuse the application on the grounds of noise that might result from the lawful use of the property as a dwellinghouse.
- 5.5.3 For these reasons, it is therefore considered that there is no objection to the proposal on the grounds of impact on residential amenity.

5.6 Other Matters

- 5.6.1 The proposal would not result in any changes to the existing access arrangement or provision of onsite parking provision. The proposal would result in a net increase in two bedrooms, however the existing provision of onsite car parking (which would remain unchanged) and the village centre location of the site are such that it is not considered that there is any objection to the proposal on the grounds of highway safety.
- 5.6.2 The proposal would have no implications for landscaping or ecological assets, and is not in a location recorded by the Environment Agency to flood.
- 5.6.3 Whilst the concerns relating to the need of the development in the context of existing consents and current applications for residential development are noted, this is not adequate justification for refusing a current application which accords with local and national planning policy.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 For the reasons set out above, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000), the Maidstone Borough Council Residential Extensions SPD and national planning policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, having regard to all other material considerations, and it is therefore recommended for approval subject to 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 development shall not commence until, written details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development 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.

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

drawing numbers 2/1021a, 2/1012/2 and 2/1021/3 received 15th July 2013;

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained.

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 applicant/agent was advised of minor changes required to the application and these were agreed.

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 the South East Plan 2009) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.