

APPLICATION: MA/13/1405 Date: 10 August 2013 Received: 16 August 2013

APPLICANT: Mrs Nicki Burch

LOCATION: 8, PEVEREL DRIVE, THURNHAM, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME14 4PS

PARISH: Thurnham

PROPOSAL: Conversion of rear part of garage and erection of a first floor side extension as shown on plan number BA/13/17/01 Rev01 and Application Form received 12th August 2013.

AGENDA DATE: 31st October 2013

CASE OFFICER: Kevin Hope

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

- The recommendation is contrary to the views of the parish council.

## **1. POLICIES**

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18
- Government Policy: National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document

## **2. HISTORY**

54/0257/MK2 – Erection of 55 dwellings – Refused

73/0633/MK2 – Erection of dwellings – Refused

MA/82/1454 - Outline application residential development – Refused

MA/83/1582 - Outline Application for residential development (approximately 136 dwellings) – Approved with conditions

MA/85/0922 - Erection of 129 dwellings and construction of ancillary roads - Approved

### **3. CONSULTATIONS**

**Thurnham Parish Council** – Wish to see the application refused with the following comments:-

“Wish to raise objections as we feel that the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring property and it is too close”.

### **4. REPRESENTATIONS**

- No neighbour representations have been received.

### **5. CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **5.1 Site Description**

5.1.1 The application site comprises a rectangular shaped residential plot located within the urban boundary and within the parish of Bearsted. Peverel Drive itself forms part of a residential development of 1980's construction comprising a number of housing types including both detached and semi detached properties. As a result, the streetscene is varied with differences in fenestration between the house types. The spacing between dwellings is also inconsistent although for many this space is dictated by attached garages to the side. The building line is also inconsistent which broadly follows the line of the road itself.

5.1.2 The application dwelling itself is a two storey detached property of red brick construction and with an attached garage to the side. The dwelling has a pitched detail above a first floor bay window and is of red brick construction.

#### **5.2 Proposal**

5.2.1 Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the rear part of the garage and the erection of a first floor side extension. The first floor extension would project approximately 2.6m from the existing side elevation of the dwelling and would extend some 7m in overall length. The eaves height of the dwelling would be maintained although the proposed ridge height would be set down by approximately 0.6m.

5.2.2 The proposed part garage conversion involves internal separation of half of the garage to create an additional room and incorporate additional living space. One garage space would remain together with the garage door to the front.

#### **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*
- (2) WILL COMPLEMENT THE STREET SCENE AND ADJACENT EXISTING BUILDINGS AND THE CHARACTER OR THE AREA; AND*
- (3) WILL RESPECT THE AMENITIES OF ADJOINING RESIDENTS REGARDING PRIVACY, DAYLIGHT, SUNLIGHT AND MAINTAINANCE OF A PLEASANT OUTLOOK; AND*
- (4) 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:-

- "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".*
- "The Borough Council will permit extensions and additions to residential properties provided that the proposal will complement the street scene and adjacent existing buildings and the character of the area"*

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

## **5.4 Design and Visual Impact**

5.4.1 In terms of this proposal and its visual impact, clearly the extension would be prominent within the street. However, the first floor extension includes a significant set down to its ridge height from the dwelling itself of 0.6m which ensures the extension relates well to the existing form. Whilst there is not a set back to the front elevation, I consider that the extension would achieve a clear subservient appearance. The fenestration design of the dwelling is also

maintained together with the eaves height which again enhances the appearance of the development. The application form submitted states that tile hanging would be used to the extension, which, currently forms part of the existing front elevation. I therefore consider this to be appropriate and would help to break up the appearance of the frontage of the property. The proposed garage conversion would only involve an internal separation to create an additional living space as well as fenestration changes to the rear. A modest roof lantern is also proposed to the existing flat roof which has no impact. Overall, I consider that this proposal is well related to the host dwelling and would not cause significant harm to its character or appearance. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with criterion 1 of policy H18.

- 5.4.2 In terms of visual impact upon the street scene, most notably the neighbouring dwelling to the north (No6) is of a different house type which includes a similar appearance to this proposal. Importantly, the spacing between the two properties is approximately 1.5m. Whilst this is less than the advised 3m set out within the Residential Extensions SPD, this spacing already exists within the street. Whilst I acknowledge that this would create a closer appearance between these dwellings, I do not consider that this would be detrimental to the overall character or appearance of the street which includes a number of housing types with differing spaces between them. In my view, the existing articulation within the front elevation of these properties contributes to the layered appearance and by virtue of this, I do not consider that this proposal would result in a terraced appearance within the street. As such, there would not be a detrimental impact upon the spacing between dwellings or the appearance of the street scene and the proposal is therefore in accordance with criterion 2 of policy H18.

## **5.5 Residential Amenity**

- 5.5.1 With regard to neighbouring amenity, due to the siting of the extension to the side of the dwelling and its modest scale, I do not consider that there would be a significant amenity impact upon the neighbouring dwellings as a result. This includes a loss of light, privacy, overshadowing or outlook. Comments raised by the parish council concern the impact upon the first floor side window to No10. However, it appears that this serves a bathroom which is not a habitable room. Therefore, I do not consider the impact upon this window hold significant weight.

## **5.6 Highways**

- 5.6.1 With regard to the impact upon the parking provision at this property, at present two vehicles could be accommodated within the garage with one space within the drive. With the proposed conversion of part of the garage, this provision would be reduced to one space within the garage retaining the driveway space. I therefore consider this level of provision to be a suitable level of off street

parking for an urban area location and is unlikely to result in on road parking or significant highways issues.

## **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 extension 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 number BA/13/17/01 Rev01 and Application Form received 12th August 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 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 are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.