

14/REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 14/0398			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a first floor extension, roof extension and creation of rear balcony.			
ADDRESS 649, Loose Road, Loose, Maidstone, Kent, ME15 9UT			
RECOMMENDATION - Approve subject to conditions			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION It is considered that the proposal is not contrary to the provisions of the development plan and there are no other material considerations which would warrant refusal of planning permission.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE The application is being reported to the planning committee as the recommendation is contrary to the views of Loose Parish Council.			
WARD Loose	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Loose	APPLICANT Miss Samantha Fellows AGENT Seymour Rogers Associates	
DECISION DUE DATE 05/05/14	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 05/05/14	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 24/03/14 and 12/09/14	
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
63/0033/MK3	House with garage and the widening of the existing vehicular access	Approved with conditions	March 1963
MA/00/0148	Alterations and extensions to form single dwelling, including driveway, gates, new curtilage and landscaping.	Approved with conditions	June 2000
^			
ENF/13084	Business Use	No Breach	April 2014

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 The application site comprises a detached dwelling located within the urban boundary of Maidstone and within the residential area of Loose. The site comprises a rectangular shaped site with vehicular parking to the front accessed directly from Loose Road. The dwelling is part two storey, part single storey with a projecting gable end roof extension which includes a higher ridge height projecting to both the front and rear. There is a line of established trees to the front boundary of the site providing significant screening from the street. This is a characteristic of the front boundaries on this side of Loose Road.

1.02 The surrounding area comprises dwellings of a variety of styles, ages and designs. The pattern of development is also inconsistent. To the rear of the site is a modest separate dwelling accessed via an independent driveway running along the southern boundary of the site.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.01 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor extension and roof extension.

2.02 The first floor extension would measure some 8.9m in width to be inline with the flank elevation of the dwelling. This would also have a depth of 7.9m. The proposed roof extension would create a hipped roof linking to the existing gable end addition maintaining the existing eaves height of approximately 5m and creating a ridge height of some 7.4m.

2.03 Following discussions with the applicant and agent, the rear balcony element of the proposal has been removed and revised plans to illustrate this change are expected and will be presented at the committee meeting.

3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION

	Existing	Proposed
Site Area (ha)	0.081	
Approximate Ridge Height (m)	6.5m	7.4m
Approximate Eaves Height (m)	5m	5m
Approximate Depth (m)	9.3m	7.9m
Approximate Width (m)	8.9m	8.9m
No. of Storeys	1 & 2	2

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Development Plan: H18

Supplementary Planning Documents: MBC Residential Extensions SPD 2009

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

Two Neighbour representations have been received raising a number of issues including the scale of the development proposed, its visual impact upon the area, a loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings and that the materials proposed are unsuitable.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Loose Parish Council - Wish to see the application refused for the following reasons:-

- "It is felt that this is a substantial extension and the addition of a balcony and extra windows will overlook other neighbouring properties particularly to the rear.
- It is felt that there is a privacy issue not just No649a but also 651 and 647 Loose Road.
- The raising of the roof seems unnecessary and the overall look with the use of UPVC weatherboarding will have a detrimental impact on the streetscene due to the increase in height and scale of the proposed alterations".

7.0 CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

7.01 In general, extensions to dwellings are acceptable in principle within the urban area, however, they should be appropriate in their relationship to the host dwelling, their scale and visual impact, impact upon neighbouring amenity and impact upon parking.

7.02 Therefore, the principle of this development is acceptable; it is then a case of the suitability of the proposal in its impact and design.

7.03 The council's Residential Extensions SPD 2009 provides some further guidance on such residential extensions as below:-

- *"The scale and form of an extension should fit unobtrusively with the building and its setting and be compatible with the surrounding properties.*
- *An extension should not dominate the original building or the locality, and should be subservient to the original dwelling".*

7.04 This proposal will be assessed against the criterion on policy H18 as well as the guidance within the Residential Extensions SPD.

Visual Impact

7.05 In terms of the visual impact of the proposal, the extension would respect the existing flank elevations of the dwelling and would comprise a modest first floor addition. It is noted that this is a large extension which will

significantly increase the ridge height of the dwelling and in particular, the single storey section, although in my view, the resulting ridge height would be comparable to neighbouring properties and would be in proportion with the form of the dwelling as a whole. This is also relative to the existing two storey element of the dwelling. I also consider that this would be an improvement to the appearance of the dwelling and have a greater sense of balance between the elevations and roof. The depth of the extension is also modest respecting the projecting gable end two storey projection as the dominant feature of the building. A number of comments have been raised concerning the materials proposed under this application. It is stated within the application form that this would comprise matching brickwork with UPVC weatherboarding. Whilst the weatherboarding is not a feature within the immediate streetscene, I do not consider this would be inappropriate in an urban residential area which comprises many different materials. Having said that, a condition will be imposed to require details and samples of the materials prior to the commencement of the development to ensure they are of an appropriate appearance and quality.

- 7.06 I am therefore of the view that the design proposed relates well to the existing form and scale of the dwelling and would not result in any significant harm to its appearance or character.
- 7.07 In terms of the impact upon the street scene, although visible to a degree, the proposed extensions would not be significantly prominent due to the existing line of trees to the front boundary. I also consider the design of this proposal is acceptable in the context of the street, which would create an attractive dwelling within Loose Road which comprises dwellings various styles and ages. Indeed, most of the surrounding dwellings are two storey in scale and therefore, the proposed extensions and resulting two storey scale with raised ridge height, would not be out of keeping with this character. I am therefore of the view that this proposal would not cause significant harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding streetscene or locality.

Residential Amenity

- 7.08 In terms of neighbouring amenity, I do consider that the balcony shown on the submitted plans is inappropriate and would afford 180° views leading to an impact upon the privacy of neighbours. Therefore, the balcony has been removed from the proposal and revised plans to illustrate this will be presented at the committee. The remaining extension comprises rear facing windows and would not afford any views over and above the existing rear facing windows within the two storey element and as such, I do not consider that there would be a loss of privacy. A condition will also be imposed to ensure that the balcony cannot be constructed at a later date without planning permission. Furthermore, the scale and design of the extension would not result in any significant loss of light, outlook or overshadowing of any neighbours. I therefore consider that there would not be any significant harm to the amenity of any neighbouring properties.

Highways

- 7.09 In terms of the highways impact, the existing garage to the side would be retained together with its associated driveway. This would continue to provide sufficient parking provision for this property ensuring there would not be any significant harm to highways safety.

Landscaping

- 7.10 With regard to landscaping, no existing landscaping or tree planting would be lost as a result of this proposal. Some established tree planting exists along the front boundary and I do not consider it would be reasonable in this case to request additional planting within this site.

Other Matters

- 7.11 Due to the maintained nature of this urban area residential site and the nature of this proposal, I do not consider there would be any significant ecological impact as a result of this development.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.01 Taking all of the above into account, it is concluded, that the proposal complies with Development Plan Policy and I therefore recommend approval.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following Conditions:-

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 building(s) 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 rear facing roof area of the dwelling shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority;

Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjoining properties and to protect the privacy of the occupiers.

Planning Committee Report

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

Plan numbers WD/01/649/14, WD/02/649/14 and Application Form received 11th March 2014.

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

INFORMATIVES

N/A

Case Officer: Kevin Hope

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.