

APPLICATION: MA/13/1107 Date: 19 June 2013 Received: 19 June 2013

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs T & S Fuller

LOCATION: 14, PLANTATION LANE, BEARSTED, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME14 4BH

PARISH: Bearsted

PROPOSAL: Erection of a part two storey part single storey side and rear extension as shown on plan numbers 1673.01 RevB, 1673.04, 1673.06 RevA and Application Form received 19th June 2013.

AGENDA DATE: 29th August 2013

CASE OFFICER: Kevin Hope

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
- Government Policy: National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document

2. HISTORY

MA/ 81/0887 – Erection of a garage – (Approved)

MA/10/0381 - Erection of a part two storey part single storey side and rear extension – (Approved with conditions)

MA/13/0046 - Application for a non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission MA/10/0381 seeking the omission of the first floor part of the approved development – (Refused)

MA/13/0529 - Application to renew extant planning permission MA/10/0381 (Erection of a part two storey part single storey side and rear extension) in order to extend the time limit for implementing – (Approved with conditions)

3. CONSULTATIONS

Bearsted Parish Council – Raise no objections to this proposal.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

- No neighbour representations have been received.

5. CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

5.1.1 The application site is located on Plantation Lane which is within the defined urban area, in the parish of Bearsted. The application property is one of a pair of semi-detached two-storey dwellings which have an 'art-deco' appearance to the front elevation. The street scene comprises largely of two-storey semi-detached dwellings which vary in scale, design and age. The property is set back from the road by approximately 7m with a front drive and attached garage to the east. The property is screened, to a degree, by an existing hedge on the front boundary. To the rear, the property has a single storey flat roofed rear extension which was constructed under permitted development entitlements. The rear garden faces south and extends approximately 28m with a slightly sloping topography to the south.

5.2 Proposal

5.2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part two storey part single storey side and rear extension. This would replace the existing single-storey rear extension. The proposed two-storey element would project 4.3m from the original rear elevation of the dwelling, would measure 4.8m in width and 6.8m to the ridge. This would also have a hipped roof and an eaves height that would match that of the existing dwelling. The single-storey element would have a part flat roof and part monopitched with a width of 2.6m and projection of 4.3m from the rear elevation. The extension would measure 3.4m in height with an eaves height of 2.4m.

5.2.2 It should be noted that planning permission for a similar development has been previously permitted under MA/10/0381. This current proposal includes minor alterations to the scale of the rear additions together with fenestration changes to the elevations.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 In principle, the proposal is considered acceptable given that it is within the defined urban area. The key policy is H18 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000. This policy states that:-

"EXTENSIONS AND ADDITONS TO RESIDENTIAL PROPERITES WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSAL:

(1) IS OF A SCALE AND DESIGN WHICH DOES NOT OVERWHELM OR DESTROY THE CHARACTER OF THE ORIGINAL PROPERTY; AND

(1) WILL COMPLEMENT THE STREET SCENE AND ADJACENT EXISTING BUILDINGS AND THE CHARACTER OR THE AREA; AND

(2) WILL RESPECT THE AMENITIES OF ADJOINING RESIDENTS REGARDING PRIVACY, DAYLIGHT, SUNLIGHT AND MAINTAINANCE OF A PLEASANT OUTLOOK; AND

(3) ENSURES THAT ADEQUATE CAR PARKING PROVISION WITHIN THE CURTILAG OF THE DWELLING IS PROVIDED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ADOPTED CAR PARKING STANDARDS.

I will therefore consider the proposal against each of the criterion set out in this policy.

The Residential Extensions SPD also provides guidance on rear extensions. This document states that:-

- *"Rear extensions on semi-detached and terraced houses should not project more than 3 metres from the rear elevation.*
- *"The in filling of spaces between dwellings with two-storey extensions could create a terraced appearance at odds with the rhythm of the street scene".*
- *"An extension should not cause any significant loss of daylight or cutting out of sunlight for a significant part of the day to principle rooms".*

I will consider these points under sections 5.4 and 5.5 below.

5.4 Design and Visual Impact

5.4.1 With regard to the impact upon the existing dwelling, the design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing dwelling with the inclusion of a matching rendered finish and window design. It is also noted that the extension would have a lower ridge height than the dwelling with a difference of 1.3m; this would ensure the extension would appear subservient in appearance. Although the extension would project 4.3m from the rear elevation, which is contrary to the guidance stated within the Residential Extensions SPD, I consider that by virtue of its siting and the scale of the existing dwelling, this would not overwhelm the existing form of the dwelling or have a detrimental impact upon its overall visual appearance.

5.4.2 In terms of visual impact upon the street scene, only the two-storey element of the proposed development would be visible, from Plantation Lane through the gap between the dwellings. However, this would be set back from the road by

approximately 15m and consequently would not be visually dominant. Similarly, by virtue of this set back position; a gap of 3m would be retained to much of the side elevation of the property with No16 to the east. Beyond this, there would be a gap of 1.6m between the proposed extension and the side elevation of No16 at first-floor level. I therefore do not consider that this proposal would result in a terraced appearance and would not have a detrimental impact upon the spacing between dwellings or the appearance of the street scene. The nearby listed buildings are located approximately 32m to the north-west of the proposal and would be screened by the front boundary hedging at the site. I therefore do not consider that there would be an impact upon their setting.

5.5 Residential Amenity

5.5.1 With regard to neighbouring amenity, after applying the 45° light test to the proposed extensions, the results show that there would not be a loss of light to No16. Whilst there may be an impact upon the first floor side window, this serves the landing area and is not a habitable room. The single-storey element would be broadly in line with the neighbouring rear extension to the west and therefore would not result in any significant amenity issues to No12. Due to the orientation of the properties with the rear elevations facing south together with the modest scale of the extensions and their proximity to neighbouring properties, I do not consider that there would be a significant loss of outlook or overshadowing of the neighbouring dwellings. In terms of privacy, there are no first floor windows proposed within the additions and therefore I do not consider that there would be an impact upon the privacy of the neighbouring dwellings. There would not be any impact upon the amenity of any other neighbouring property.

5.6 Highways

5.6.1 This development would have no impact upon parking provision at the site, there would remain parking provision for at least three vehicles within the existing front driveway and garage.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 It is therefore considered overall that the proposal is acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and amenity impacts on the local environment and other material considerations. I therefore recommend that the application should be approved 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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;

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:

Plan numbers 1673.01 RevB, 1673.04, 1673.06 RevA and Application Form received 19th June 2013.

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

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 approved without delay.

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.