

## REPORT SUMMARY

<b>REFERENCE NO - 14/504538/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Erection of single storey front, side and rear extensions and new roof.			
<b>ADDRESS</b> Little Birling Ware Street Weaving Kent ME14 5LA			
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Approval subject to conditions			
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b> The proposed single storey front, side and rear extensions and new roof to the existing single storey dwelling are considered acceptable in terms of scale, design and appearance, impact on the character and appearance of the host building, impact in the street scene along Ware Street, and impact on the visual amenities of the locality generally. The proposed extensions and new roof to the single storey dwelling are considered acceptable in the context of the neighbouring built development along Ware Street. There are no unacceptable unneighbourly impacts or highway safety issues as a result of the proposed development and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.			
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> The application is contrary to views expressed by the Parish Council.			
<b>WARD</b> Detling And Thurnham Ward	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Thurnham	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr P And Mrs C Newstead <b>AGENT</b> Mr Paul Fowler	
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 29/12/14	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 29/12/14	<b>OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE</b> 20/11/14	
<b>RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):</b>			
<b>App No</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
MA/76/1619	Single storey rear extension.	Approved	04/03/77

## MAIN REPORT

### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application site is located on the south-west side of Ware Street, approximately 90 metres to the south-east of the junction of Hockers Lane with Ware Street, and the site comprises a detached single-storey dwelling with pitched hip ended roof and an angled sided front bay window. The single storey dwelling has a flat roofed single storey rear extension and a detached garage to the rear with access drive off Ware Street running along the north-western side of the dwelling. The access drive ramps up from Ware Street and the existing dwelling is elevated in relation to road level outside the site. The single storey dwelling has a rendered/pebbledashed finish with a concrete tiled roof. The property is adjoined by the detached chalet type bungalows with first floor accommodation set predominantly within the roof space at Leyfield Lodge to the south-east and High Bank to the north-west. A detached property, The Retreat, adjoins in a backland location to the rear (south) of the site. This section of Ware Street consists of predominantly detached properties of varying designs, including bungalows, chalet type bungalows, and the occasional full two-storey

dwelling. The properties are generally relatively well set back from the road frontage and elevated in relation to the road level outside the site.

- 1.02 The site forms part of a predominantly residential area and is part of the urban area of Maidstone as defined on the Proposals Map to the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan. The land on the opposite side of Ware Street to the north is outside the defined urban area and forms part of the open countryside and a defined Special Landscape Area.

## **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.01 The application proposes the erection of single storey extensions to the front, side and rear of the existing single storey dwelling, and the construction of a new roof to the dwelling covering the proposed extensions and the existing dwelling. The existing single storey rear extension and detached rear garage are to be removed in the proposals.
- 2.02 The existing dwelling has a staggered front building line and the proposed single storey front extension extends between 1.25 metres and 1.9 metres beyond the existing main front wall and 0.775 metres beyond the line of the existing front bay window. The proposed front extension extends across the full width of the existing dwelling. The front part of the proposed single storey side extension also projects beyond the existing front building line to the property but is recessed 0.5 metres back from the proposed front wall to the front extension. The proposed front extension incorporates a more or less central front entrance door to the property with small gable fronted canopy above. The proposed new pitched roof to the property finishes in a gable end above the proposed front extension.
- 2.03 The proposed single storey side extension infills the gap between the existing north - western side wall of the single-storey dwelling and the side boundary common with the neighbouring detached property at High Bank. As noted above, the proposed side extension is recessed 0.5 metres back from the proposed front wall to the front extension. The side extension extends to a depth of 6.8 metres along the common side boundary with the neighbouring property at High Bank and incorporates a pitched hip ended roof which appears subordinate to main new pitched gable ended roof to the main extended building.
- 2.04 The proposed single storey rear extension extends 8.25 metres into the rear garden from the line of the original rear wall to the property, extends 4.175 metres beyond the rear wall of the existing single storey rear extension which is to be removed, and extends across the full width of the original back wall to the property. The proposed new pitched roof to the property finishes in a gable end above the proposed rear extension.
- 2.05 With regards to the proposed new roof, the existing single storey dwelling has a pitched hip ended main roof, a subordinate hip ended roof over the front bay window projection, and a flat roof to the existing single storey rear extension. As noted above, the proposed new pitched roof covers the proposed extensions and the existing dwelling. The main part of the new roof covers the existing dwelling and the proposed front and rear extensions and incorporates gable ends above the front and rear extensions. A subordinate pitched hip ended roof is proposed to the north-western side of the main new gable ended roof above the proposed side extension. The existing pitched hip ended roof to the property has a roof ridge height of 5.3 metres and an eaves height of 2.45 metres and the main part of the proposed new roof raises the ridge line to 6 metres and the eaves height to 2.85 metres.

- 2.06 Whereas the existing single-storey dwelling has a rendered/pebbledashed finish externally at present, the new external front, rear and north-western side walls are shown in the submitted plans to be stock brickwork, the front gable to the new roof is shown to be tile hung, and new tiles are proposed to the new roof.
- 2.07 The submitted plans show the proposed extensions to the property to provide enlarged kitchen/dining and living room facilities to the dwelling, enlarge two existing bedrooms, incorporate a study and small utility room within the existing floorspace, and provide an attached garage to the side.

### 3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION

	Existing	Proposed	Change (+/-)
Site Area (ha)	0.074 ha	0.074 ha	No change
Approximate Ridge Height (m)	5.3m	6.0m	+ 0.7m
Approximate Eaves Height (m)	2.45m	2.85m	+ 0.4m
Approximate Depth (m)	12m	16.8m	+ 4.8m
Approximate Width (m)	8.9m	11.45m	+ 2.55m
No. of Storeys	1	1	No change
Net Floor Area	70 sq. m	132 sq. m	+ 62 sq. m
Parking Spaces	4	4	No change
No. of Residential Units	1	1	No change
No. of Affordable Units	0	0	No change

### 4.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 4.01 The site forms part of the urban area of Maidstone as defined on the Proposals Map to the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan.
- 4.02 No overriding planning constraints have been identified which would make the principle of extending the existing single storey dwelling unacceptable from a planning point of view.

### 5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)  
Development Plan: Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000): Policy H18  
Supplementary Planning Documents: Residential Extensions (Adopted 2009)  
Draft Local Plan policies: DM4, DM8

### 6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.01 Eight neighbouring properties were consulted by letter on the application. A site notice was displayed. No responses/representations on the application have been received from neighbours.

### 7.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 7.01 **Thurnham Parish Council:** Object to this application as they feel that the side extension is too close to the neighbouring property. Comment further that they have no

objections to the front and rear extensions. Request that the objection is reported to the planning committee meeting.

- 7.02 **KCC Public Rights of Way Officer (Maidstone):** Comments that the proposed development site is in the vicinity of Public Right of Way KH119 but notes that this development does not directly affect the Right of Way. In light of this the Rights of Way Officer has no objection to the application.

## **8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS**

- 8.1 The application is accompanied by a site location plan, a drawing showing an existing site plan and existing ground floor plan, a drawing showing existing front, rear and side elevations, and a drawing titled Proposed Plans & Elevations dated October 2014 showing a proposed site plan, proposed floor plan and proposed front, rear and side elevations. A Design and Access Statement has been submitted

## **9.0 APPRAISAL**

- 9.01 The key issues with this case are the scale, design and appearance of the proposed extensions and new roof to the property and the impact on the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene along Ware Street, and the character, appearance and visual amenities of the locality generally; the impact on neighbouring property; and, the impact on highway safety.

### **Scale, design and appearance**

- 9.02 Policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan states that extensions and additions to residential properties will be permitted provided that the proposal is of a scale and design which does not overwhelm or destroy the character of the original property; and, will complement the street scene and adjacent existing buildings and the character of the area.
- 9.03 The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions requires that the scale, proportion and height of extensions should be subordinate to the original house and fit unobtrusively with the building and its setting. The SPD states that a range of devices are available to subordinate an extension such as set backs, lower roofs, changes in materials or detailing. The SPD states that the extension should normally be roofed to match the existing building in shape and that where visible from public view, a flat roof extension would not normally be allowed.
- 9.04 With regards to front extensions the SPD states that front extensions can have an adverse effect on the street scene because of their prominence on the front elevation. The SPD further states that front extensions may be acceptable in a street where (amongst other situations) there is already considerable variety in the building line, there is a strong tradition of projecting elements such as gables facing the street, and it is an extension to a detached house, where there is no strong visual relationship with adjoining properties. The SPD states that where an extension is acceptable, the roof should match the roof of the original house in style in order to complement the existing building and the character of the area.
- 9.05 With regards to side extensions the SPD states that a single storey extension to the side of a property should normally be acceptable if it does not have a significant adverse impact on the nature of space between buildings. The SPD states that the use of, for example, a set back from the front elevation of the original house and lower roof can assist in assimilating the development where it is desirable that the form,

proportions or symmetry of the original building are respected; the rhythm of buildings in a street follows a regular form or buildings are regularly spaced; a close match of materials is not available; or there is a need to break down the mass of the resultant building. The SPD states that a side extension should be subordinate to the original building.

- 9.06 The SPD acknowledges that rear extensions have least impact on the street scene and in terms of respecting existing building lines and the pattern of buildings and spaces between them, rear extensions are preferable to those on the side or front extensions. The SPD acknowledges that amenity considerations are important factors in determining the appropriateness of the depth of any rear extension. The SPD states that the acceptable depth and height of a rear extension will be determined by the ground levels, distance from the boundaries and also the size of the neighbouring garden/amenity space.
- 9.07 With regards to roof extensions the SPD states that increasing the roof height of a dwelling by altering the eaves height or the pitch of the roof can have a detrimental impact on the dwelling and street scene and should be avoided. The SPD states that large dormers/roof extensions requiring planning permission, which are disproportionate to the house, will not be allowed.
- 9.08 The proposed single storey front and rear extensions to the existing single storey dwelling more than double the building footprint of the original dwelling, the proposed front extension brings the existing building forward in the street scene, and the proposed new roof with gable ends to the front and rear increases the ridge height of the existing hip ended pitched roof by 0.7 metres and the eaves height by 0.4 metres. The proposed new gable ended roof represents a significant increase in the bulk and massing of the existing hip ended roof to the property and the new roof together with the proposed front, side and rear extensions represent a significant increase in the size and scale of the existing dwelling on the site. For these reasons the proposed extensions and new roof to the property are not considered to be subordinate to the original dwelling and do significantly change the appearance of the existing dwelling.
- 9.09 This section of Ware Street consists of predominantly detached properties of varying designs, including bungalows, chalet type bungalows, and the occasional full two-storey dwelling. The properties are generally relatively well set back from the road frontage and elevated in relation to the road level outside the site. The current application property is a detached single storey dwelling with pitched hip ended roof and the adjoining properties either side are chalet type bungalows with first floor accommodation set predominantly within the roof spaces. The application property is slightly set back in relation to the main front building lines of the properties either side and has a lower roof line. The proposed front extension to the application property will generally reflect the existing front building lines of the properties either side and the new higher roof ridge line to the property will remain below that of the properties either side with the new higher roof eaves line reflecting that of the neighbouring property to the south-east at Leyfield Lodge but remaining below that of the neighbouring property to the north-west at High Bank. The proposed brick finish to the front extension with tile hung gable to the new roof above is considered appropriate in the context of the varied property types and designs along the road. The proposed single storey side extension to the application property is set back in relation to the front wall of the proposed front extension and has a subordinate hip ended roof line in relation to main section of the proposed new gable ended roof. The proposed single storey rear extension to the application property does not extend significantly further into the rear garden than the rear addition to the neighbouring property at High Bank.

- 9.10 In the context of the two chalet type bungalows either side of the application property and the varied property types and designs along this section of the road generally, it is not considered that the resulting enlarged dwelling would appear as overdominant or visually incongruous or be harmful to the visual amenities of the locality. The design and appearance of the extensions to the property and new roof are in themselves considered appropriate. The property is well set back from the frontage to Ware Street, is elevated in relation to the road level outside the site, and there is vegetation along the frontage to Ware Street which all limit the impact of the property in the street scene along the road and public views of the property from the road.
- 9.11 The proposed single storey side extension infills the gap between the existing north - western side wall of the single-storey dwelling and the side boundary common with the neighbouring detached property at High Bank. With regards to the close relationship of the proposed side extension to the neighbouring chalet type bungalow at High Bank, it must be noted that the extension and neighbouring property will share a similar front building line, the application property is at a slightly lower level, the extension will have a hipped roof line whereas the neighbouring chalet bungalow type property is predominantly gable fronted, and the extension will have a lower roof eaves line to that of the roof to the neighbouring property. Given the varied property types and designs along this section of the road generally and the absence of a regular pattern and rhythm of gaps between the detached properties along the road with some properties having been built/extended up to the side boundaries, and in light of the design variations between the side extension and neighbouring property identified above, it is not considered that the proposed side extension would appear as an incongruous link with the neighbouring property. As noted above, the impact of the property in the street scene along the Ware Street and in public views of the property from the road is limited.
- 9.12 Overall in the context of neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the resulting enlarged single storey dwelling on the site would appear as visually incongruous or be harmful to the character and/or visual amenities of the locality. In terms of scale, design and appearance, it is not considered that there is any overriding conflict between the proposed additions and new raised roof to the property and the above Local Plan policies and adopted SPD guidance.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 9.13 Policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan states that extensions and additions to residential properties will be permitted provided that the proposal will respect the amenities of adjoining residents regarding privacy, daylight, sunlight and maintenance of a pleasant outlook. Further detailed guidance on these amenity considerations is set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions. The SPD states that extensions should not cause significant harm to the amenity of adjoining occupiers. The SPD states that for reasons of potential impact on a neighbour's outlook or amenity space and the potential loss of light or privacy, the size of an extension at the back of a property needs careful consideration.
- 9.14 The proposed single storey side extension adjoins the common side boundary with the neighbouring chalet type bungalow at High Bank to the north-west. The submitted plans show the proposed side extension to have an eaves height of 2.85 metres along the boundary with the pitched hip ended roof sloping up away from the boundary to an overall height of 5.4 metres. The neighbouring property at High Bank has a ground floor bathroom window in its side wall facing the proposed side extension. Whilst there will be some enclosing impact from the proposed side extension along the common

side boundary with the neighbouring property at High Bank, no windows to habitable rooms are affected. The proposed single storey rear extension extends 8.25 metres into the rear garden from the line of the original rear wall to the property. The submitted plans show the proposed rear extension to be set in 2.6 metres from the common side boundary with the neighbouring property at High Bank. The existing detached garage building to the rear of the application property is to be removed as part of the proposals. The existing garage building is sited along the common side boundary with the neighbouring property at High Bank and extends along the common side boundary to a not dissimilar depth as the proposed rear extension. Whilst the pitched gable ended roof line of the proposed rear extension is higher than the flat roof of the existing rear garage, the extension is set in from the common side boundary, as opposed to the existing garage being sited along the boundary, and the pitched roof slopes up away from the side boundary. It is not considered that the proposed rear extension has a more significant impact on the neighbouring property at High Bank than the existing rear garage to be removed.

- 9.15 The proposed single storey front extension extends 1.9 metres adjacent to the common side boundary with the neighbouring property to the south-east at Leyfield Lodge and the proposed single storey rear extension extends to a depth of 4.2 metres adjacent to the common side boundary with that property beyond the existing single storey rear extension to the property. The submitted plans show the proposed front and rear extensions to be sited 0.6 metres in from the boundary fence along the common side boundary with the neighbouring property at Leyfield Lodge. The combined depth of the existing and proposed rear extensions is 8.25 metres into the rear garden from the original rear wall to the property. The submitted plans show the proposed rear extension to extend to a depth of 7 metres beyond the adjacent part of the rear wall of the neighbouring property at Leyfield Lodge. The submitted plans show that a separation gap of 3 metres will be maintained between the side walls of the proposed front and rear extensions and the side wall and closest part of the rear wall to the neighbouring property at Leyfield Lodge. The plans show that the pitched gable ended roof to the proposed front and rear extensions has an eaves height of 2.85 metres adjacent to the common side boundary with the roof sloping up away from the common boundary to a ridge height of 6 metres. Whilst it is considered that there will be some increased sense of enclosure along the common side boundary with the neighbouring property at Leyfield Lodge as a result of the proposed front and rear extensions, the neighbouring property has no side wall windows serving habitable rooms to the dwelling and it is considered that the 3 metre minimum separation distance from the closest part of the rear wall to that dwelling will prevent any unacceptable unneighbourly impacts on the main ground floor windows to the rear elevation of that neighbouring property.
- 9.16 The proposed front, side and rear extensions are single storey only. Two rooflight windows are proposed in the south-east facing side roof slope to the new roof. These rooflight windows are at high level in relation to the ground floor rooms to the application property they serve. It is not considered that the proposed extensions and new roof to the property raise any overlooking or loss of privacy issues with the neighbouring properties either side.
- 9.17 Other neighbouring properties are sufficiently distanced from the application property to prevent any unneighbourly impacts as a result of the proposals. Overall, the proposals are not considered to be contrary to the above Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan policies or SPD guidance which seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

## **Highways**

- 9.18 The Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions states that extensions to properties result in increased built form and reduced space around a building and that the Council will seek to retain adequate off-street parking spaces (and also turning space within the curtilage where there is access onto a classified road) without diminishing the quality of front garden areas or the street scene.
- 9.19 The property in this case has an existing detached garage to the rear and an access drive of Ware Street running along the north-western side of the dwelling. The existing detached garage is to be removed as part of the proposals and a new garage provided in the proposed single storey side extension. The front access drive and front forecourt parking/vehicle manoeuvring hardstanding area are retained in the proposals. Apart from a new modest sized study room and a small utility room, the proposed extensions to the property provide enlarged kitchen/dining and living room facilities to the dwelling and enlarge two existing bedrooms only. There is no increase in the number of bedrooms to the property. The scale of development proposed (front, side and rear extensions and new roof to an existing dwelling) is not such that the development is likely to generate any significant increase in parking requirements at the property or vehicle movements to and from the site. Given that the existing garage to the property is to be replaced and the existing access drive and front forecourt hardstanding largely retained, it is not considered that the proposals conflict with the above SPD guidance with regards to parking provision and highway safety.

## **10.0 CONCLUSION**

- 10.01 The application proposes the erection of front, side and rear extensions and a new roof to an existing single storey dwelling located in a predominantly residential area within the main urban area of Maidstone as defined on the Proposals Map to the Local Plan. There are no overriding planning constraints which would make the principle of extending the existing dwelling unacceptable from a planning point of view.
- 10.02 With regards to the objection from Thurnham Parish Council on the grounds that they feel the proposed side extension is too close to the neighbouring property, the objection is largely addressed in the main body of the report under the heading Scale, design and appearance (Para. 9.11). Whilst the proposed single storey side extension infills the gap between the side wall of the application property and the side wall to the neighbouring chalet type bungalow at High Bank, it is considered that in light of the varied property types and designs along this section of the road and the absence of a regular pattern and rhythm of gaps between the detached properties along the road with some properties having been built/extended up to the side boundaries, and in light of the variations in design between the proposed side extension and the neighbouring property, it is not considered that the proposed side extension would appear as an incongruous link with the neighbouring property. The impact of the property in the street scene along the Ware Street and in public views of the property from the road is limited. The proposed side extension does not have an unacceptable unneighbourly impact on the neighbouring property at High Bank.
- 10.03 Whilst the proposed front, side and rear extensions and a new roof to the existing single storey dwelling result in a significant increase in the size and scale of the existing dwelling, the proposed significant enlargement of the dwelling is considered acceptable in the context of the existing larger chalet type bungalow dwellings either side and the varied property types along this section of Ware Street generally.
- 10.04 The proposed extensions and new roof to the property, subject to the recommended conditions, are considered acceptable in terms of design and appearance, impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the visual amenities of the



locality generally, including the street scene along Ware Street, impact on neighbouring property, and highway safety. The proposals are considered to comply with the provisions of Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and the policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000) and all other material considerations. In the circumstances the grant of conditional planning permission can be recommended.

**11.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT** 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) No development shall take place until full details, including samples, of the external surfacing materials to be used on the new roof and single-storey front, side and rear extensions to the existing building hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details of external surfacing materials;

Reason: To ensure the character and appearance of the building are safeguarded and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality generally.

- (3) The garage shown on the approved plan (Drawing titled Proposed Plans & Elevations dated October 2014 received 09.10.14) shall be retained and kept available for parking purposes in connection with the dwelling. No development, whether permitted by a Development Order or not, shall be carried out in any position which would preclude access by motor cars to the garage parking;

Reason: To ensure adequate provision is made and retained for off street parking for the dwelling to prevent obstruction of the adjoining highway and safeguard the amenities of the area.

- (4) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the approved plan, drawing titled Proposed Plans & Elevations dated October 2014 received 09.10.2014;

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

**INFORMATIVES**

to Applicant: APPROVAL

The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering pre-application advice.

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.

Case Officer: Jon Barnes

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.