

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 14/0214		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL erection of a two storey rear extension		
ADDRESS High Farm, West Street, Lenham, Maidstone, Kent, ME17 2EP		
RECOMMENDATION : APPROVED SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE The recommendation for this application is being reported to Committee for decision because: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Parish Council objects to the proposal, it would change the character of the Listed Building.		
WARD Harrietsham And Lenham Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Lenham	APPLICANT Mr J Hubbard AGENT James Collett Chartered Surveyor
DECISION DUE DATE 06/04/14	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 06/04/14	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites): 01/0857 - An application for listed building consent for amendments to approved scheme (MA/97/0215) – Granted - 01-Aug-2001 01/0857/C01 - An application for listed building consent for amendments- Granted - 01-Nov-2001 01/0857/C02 - An application for listed building consent for amendments- Granted- 29-Nov-2001 01/0857/C04- An application for listed building consent for amendments- Granted - 01-Nov-2001 01/0857/C05- An application for listed building consent for amendments- Granted - 07-Jun-2002 01/0858- Amendments to approved scheme (MA/97/0226 for extensions and alterations to farmhouse), for insertion of first floor rooflights and relocation of windows- Granted- 13-Aug-2001 02/0753- Demolition of existing store/shed and erection of garage- Granted - 19-Jun-2002		

02/0850- An application for listed building consent to demolish an existing outbuilding- Granted - 02-Jul-2002

04/1351 - Erection of side extension to existing garage/workshop to provide 2 No stables – Granted- 09-Sep-2004

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 The property is grade two listed building located to the west side of West Street. The property is located close to the village of Lenham which is situated approximately 10 miles towards the east of Maidstone town centre. The site area of the property is 0.44 acres mainly level. Along the north eastern boundary there is large hedge row dividing the garden from the neighbouring property. Towards the south west boundaries there are various hedge rows separating the garden from the agricultural land.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for two storey rear extension. The proposed two storey rear extension would measure the following dimensions:
- Depth – 5m
Width- 6.6m
Height – 8.8m
- 2.2 The extension would be constructed from matching brickwork. Where tiles are removed this would be reused on the flank elevation to minimise visual impact. The proposed roof would be clay plain tiles to match the existing roof of the property. Windows would be doubled glazed timber casements with glazing bars similar to the existing fenestration.
- 2.3 The proposed extension on the ground floor would accommodate bathroom and part of the existing dining room. The first floor extension would provide two additional bedrooms to the property.

3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATION

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18 , ENV28 , H33
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions

- 3.1 The determination of this proposal is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. It is important that any proposed development to a listed building gives special regard to the desirability of preserving its historic character.

4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 1 neighbour consulted- 2 objections received which is summarised as follows:
- The proposal would have negative impact on the visual appearance of the area, causing more traffic and pollution problems
 - The noise and pollution would cause more traffic within the existing neighbourhood.
 - The bulk and design of the proposed extension would be out of scale with the historic building.
 - The proposed ridge line and east flank wall do not show the extensions as being subservient to the historic form.
 - The appearance of the proposed extension would alter the pairs of buildings.
 - Windows on the north east side flank wall would impact upon the privacy of the adjoining property.
 - Would result in the loss of historic fabric of the building

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 Lenham Parish Council – Wish to object to planning application as they feel the height of the proposed extension would have an impact on adjoining properties and would also change the character and appearance of the property considerably.
- 5.2 Conservation officer - Raises no objection to the proposal however would prefer to keep the new ground floor accommodation in the form of a separate room. Wholesale removal of the internal wall will result in a significant change to the internal character of the original property. The existing portions of the property would be lost. The issues raised by the conservation officer have now been resolved by the applicant and show the original wall of the property being retained in parts.

6.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 6.1 There are no saved policies within the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2000 which directly relate to listed buildings, however the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) addresses 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' at Section 12.

- 6.2 Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that it should be recognised that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resources and they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance; with paragraph 132 stating that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, with the guidance recognising that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Paragraph 133 states that permission should be refused where a proposed development leads to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; and where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Size, Design and siting

- 6.3 The adopted residential extensions SPD require that the scale, proportion and height of extensions should be subordinate to the original house and fit unobtrusively with the building and its setting.
- 6.4 *Impact upon the property and the character of the surrounding area*

The Conservation Officer finds the design and scale of the proposal to be acceptable, and raises few comments on the new ground floor accommodation stating that the wholesale removal of the existing wall would significantly change the internal character of the property. While the fabric and the material to be removed may be modern 19th Century joinery. The current internal door would appear to reflect the position of the original door. The solution would be to move the proposed WC to the other side of the extension. The new drawings reflect these changes and conservation officer is satisfied with the amendments.

- 6.5 Given the size, design and siting of the proposed extension at the rear of the house, it is considered that it will appear to subordinate to the existing house. In addition the separation distance between adjoining properties will remain the same. To the east side lies occupier Honeywood Farm the distance between these properties is approximately 7m. Honeywood Farm currently has an existing two storey rear extension that was granted under reference 84/0536.
- 6.6 The proposed pitched roof on the first floor extension would be built behind the existing main roof of the property. The extension would not be seen from the main street scene and therefore would not affect or harm the character of the property towards the front

elevation. In relation to the size and sitting objections have been raised that the extension would be bulky and out of scale with the historic building.

6.7 The existing building currently has total floor area of 214.2m². In relation to the existing building the proposed extension would only be 66m² this development would be a modest sized development. The existing property also has large surroundings that are 0.44 acres of rural settlement therefore, it is not considered that the additional extension will result in a material overdevelopment of the site, or harm the character or layout of the wider area. The proposed extension would be well built using matching materials to reflect the historical buildings

6.8 *Impact upon the neighbours*

Objections to the proposal also revolve around the material loss of privacy, to adjoining properties. The residential extensions SPD normally requires ground floor additions to be limited to 3 metres in depth and 1st floor additions to be set well off the common boundary with an adjoining property unless site circumstances permit otherwise. In this instance proposed two storey rear extension would be 5m deep. The extension would be built in an open space part of the garden away from adjoining occupiers. The closest neighbouring occupier (Honeywood farm) would be 7m away. The proposed extension would set in 2m away from adjoining neighbouring boundary.

6.9 The extension and the external alterations to the property would propose two side windows on the main property towards the north side which would be obscured glazed. The additional new windows on the first floor towards the south of the property would face no immediate adjoining occupiers. Therefore the issues raised by adjoining occupier in relation to overlooking would not demonstrate such an issue.

6.9.1 *Highways*

The property already has off street parking for in excess of three cars in the front garden. This already meets Kent Highways parking requirements and the proposed addition will not therefore add materially to this. In the circumstances there is considered to be no objection to the proposal on highway or parking grounds.

7.0 OTHER MATTERS

Concerns raised relating to the impact on the extension causing pollution are noted. However this is not a material planning consideration and as such cannot be taken into account in the determination of this application.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 The objections expressed by the Parish Council and the neighbours have been dealt with in the main body of this report.
- 8.2 The proposed addition by reasons of its size, design and siting, will appear as a subordinate addition reflecting the intentions of the residential extensions SPD while having no material impact on the outlook or amenity of adjoining properties.
- 8.3 The proposed extension would be of appropriate scale and quality to suit a grade two listed building as it will contribute towards its surroundings in visual and amenity terms while adding new elements of built form
- 8.4 Furthermore the siting of the property in a developed frontage in a rural settlement means that the addition will not result in an overdevelopment of the site or have any material impact on the character or layout of the locality.
- 8.5 In the circumstances it is considered that the proposal is worthy of support and that planning permission should be granted as a consequence.

9.0 -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: To comply with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas 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 plain clay roof tiles, clay hung tiles and bricks to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling 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 the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance is preserved.

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

Site and Block Plan - Drawing No - 12945/P1
Proposed Elevations - Drawing No - 12945/P5
Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No - 12945/P4

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

4. The development shall commence until full details of the following matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-

- a) New external joinery in the form of large scale drawings.
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

Reason: To ensure the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the area. is preserved.

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:
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.

Case Officer: Ravi Rehal

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.
The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.