

APPENDIX I

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 14/500307/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Ground floor rear extensions, side extension at first floor and roof level, entrance porch, chimney stack, placement of windows and roof-lights, car port and related alterations.		
ADDRESS 2 Boyton Court Cottages Boyton Court Road Sutton Valence Kent ME17 3EG		
RECOMMENDATION		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE The Parish Council wish to see this application refused and are prepared to go to Committee. They believe that this is over development of site, inappropriate design.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE		
WARD Sutton Valence And Langley Ward	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Sutton Valence	APPLICANT Mr And Mrs Graves AGENT Judd Architecture Ltd
DECISION DUE DATE 25/08/14	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 25/08/14	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites): 81/0443- Details of detached bungalow pursuant to 80/391- Granted – 12/5/1981 79/1638- Addition of sitting and bedroom to existing – Granted 15/11/1979		

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to a Semi – detached property located to the west side of Boyton Court Road. Site is within the open country side

and it is within Sutton Valence Parish. The site also falls within a Special Landscape Area. To the rear of this property is a detached outbuilding which is currently located 3m away from the existing property.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for a front extension, single storey rear extension linked with the existing outbuilding, first floor side extension and detached garage.

The proposed front extension would be following dimensions.

Depth – 1.3m
Width – 3.7m
Height – 3.3m

Proposed extension would include a new side access steps.

- 2.2 Proposed first floor side extension would raise the first floor side roof dormer on the second floor. The extension and alterations would be the following dimensions:

Height – 10m pitched roof reducing to 4.7m from the ridge eaves
Width – 4.6m
Depth -6.6m

The proposed side dormer would be 1.6m wide with a height of 2m. The dormer would be located below the proposed roof apex. This would accommodate a dressing room and bathroom.

- 2.3 To the rear of the property a single storey rear extension would be proposed. The extension would have a round circular shape towards the south side of the property which would be 5m deep, reducing to 3m deep adjoining occupier at no 1. This extension proposes to link within the existing side outbuilding.

Dimensions of the rear extension would be the following:

Width – 8.3m
Depth - 5m reducing to 3m.
Height -4.629m

The extension would consist of matching roof tiles and matching bricks and UPVC doors and windows.

- 2.4 To the south side of the site would a proposed detached garage. The garage would have the following dimensions

Width – 5.2m
Depth – 8.3m
Height – 4.855m

The garage would have a pitched roof to accommodate two cars, and additional garden equipment.

3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATION

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: , H33, ENV28, ENV34
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions

4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 3 neighbours consulted- 3 objections received which are summarised as follows:

- The extension would block views and intrude their privacy and block out their light to their property.
- The properties date back to 1850 and it would look out of place with the other properties.
- The development would be too large for the plot the house sits on and placed against attached neighbours.
- The scale and design of the proposed extension would not be in keeping with the existing character of numbers 1 & 2 Boyton Court Cottages.
- There would be significant loss of light and views to the adjoining property
- The proposal would be unsympathetic and ostentatious over development of the footprint plan and elevation for small plot.
- Property has historical record of subsidence and underpinning effect.
- Amended plans submitted have not taken any previous objections into account and therefore in principal the comments received remain unchanged.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 The Parish Council wish to see this application refused and are prepared to go to Committee. They believe that this is over development of site, inappropriate design in a rural area and will have a negative impact and cause loss light to the neighbouring property.

6.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 6.1 Extensions to residential properties in the countryside are primarily assessed under the provisions of policy H33 of the Local Plan, which requires proposals to satisfy the following criteria:
- (a) Be of a scale and design which does not overwhelm or destroy the character of the original property; and
 - (b) Proposal is not poorly designed or unsympathetically related to the existing house Or
 - (c) Result in a development which individually or cumulatively is visually incongruous in the countryside or
 - (d) Result in unacceptable loss of amenity or privacy for adjoining residential property.
- 6.2 In addition, proposals should be in accordance with the considerations and guidelines set out in the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (SPD).
- 6.3 This seeks to secure a high quality of design in new development and central government planning policy and guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6.4 Policies ENV28 and ENV34 deals with the scenic quality and distinctive character of the area and priority is given to the landscape over other planning considerations.

Size, Design and siting

- 6.5 The adopted residential extensions SPD 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.

Impact upon the property and the character of the surrounding area

- 6.6 2 Boyton Court Cottages is located within a rural countryside location; it is attached to 1 Boyton Court Cottage. The character of the surrounding area is mostly made up of open fields with a few agricultural buildings scattered around. The houses within this area are also different styles and sizes; there is no set pattern or similarities.
- 6.7 The design of the proposed rear extension would be curved design with a round velux window. This would not be dissimilar to an oast formation and a large sweeping cone. The proposed extension would be modest in scale and size and would not overwhelm or dominate the existing house. It would also have matching peg tiles and traditional patio doors, to the one existing on the property.

- 6.8 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 or the countryside.
- 6.9 The changes to the side elevation of the property would involve raising the roof of the existing single storey side extension to create a first floor extension and accommodating a side dormer to the property. The first floor side extension would have matching pitched roof to the main property. This roof would be positioned below the main roof the property. In terms of, size and design the proposed extension would be subservient in terms of building footprint and floor space in relation to the existing property. In terms of impact to the country side the infilling of the 1st floor would not result in significant harm to the landscape.
- 6.10 To the front of the property a small porch with pitched roof would be created. This porch would create a small brick wall staircase for a new side entrance into the main house. Beside this staircase a chimney stack would be built for a new fireplace. The chimney stack feature would be erected to the corner of the building. In terms of character this feature would create a traditional style to the existing dwelling, with rag stone fenestration. The proposed extension would extend 1.3m deep and would be 3.3m high at this depth and height the extension would be acceptable within the street scene, the scale would respect the building to which it is attached and would not comprise the visual integrity of the existing dwelling
- 6.11 Objections have been raised by adjoining occupiers stating that the proposed extensions would be an overdevelopment on the existing site. SPD states that extensions within the countryside should be modest in scale and size and should not increase more than 50% in the volume of the dwelling.
- 6.12 While the extensions combined with the side extension would represent a relatively large increase in volume I consider the design to be appropriate and the extensions subservient to the main house. Ultimately they would not result in any significant harm to the openness of the countryside or the Special Landscape Area. Therefore, it is considered that the additional extensions would not harm the character or layout of the wider area.
- 6.13 The proposed garage would be built 9m away from the existing dwelling. It would be positioned 4.5m away from the front of the existing road. Between the road and the proposed garage there are trees and planting, which would screen off the building from the front road. The garage would be finished with timber which would unite with the main house. In terms of the visual appearance of the proposed garage, I consider its scale is modest and would appear subservient to the existing dwelling.

- 6.14 Therefore the proposed extensions and alterations would not harm or significantly affect the character and appearance of the area, or appear visually incongruous in the countryside.

Impact upon the neighbours

- 6.15 To the north side of the site lies neighbouring occupier no 1. This property currently has no extensions. There is a small window closest to the boundary with no 2 which is non-habitable room; this room serves an existing (kitchen). On the boundary line between these properties there is an existing brick built outbuilding.
- 6.16 The proposed single storey rear extension would be 3m deep and it would be linked to outbuilding. The residential extensions SPD normally requires ground floor additions to be limited to 3 metres in depth in this instance the extension would not be because it links with the outbuilding.
- 6.17 Neighbouring occupier no 1 objects to this proposal stating that the extension would impact their window in terms of outlook, daylight and privacy.
- 6.18 Since the application has been submitted there have been amendments made to the proposal in order to reduce the impact to neighbouring occupier. The original plans showed roof that was vertical flank wall in the region of 2.9m high from the external floor level. The new height of the extension is 2.3m with a parapet gutter which is formed with a sloping roof.
- 6.19 In terms of impact the proposed amendments to the single storey rear extension reduces the impact to adjoining occupier in terms of outlook, sunlight and daylight. To assess proper daylight and sunlight test on adjoining occupier a 45 degree angle test is used to check the of loss of daylight and overshadowing. In this instance taking the mid point of the kitchen window from adjoining occupier no 1 both vertical and horizontal 45 degree clearly fails the mid point; therefore the proposal would fail this test. However is a non-habitable room and I also note there is also a door serving this kitchen which provides natural light into the room. It is also important to note that an extension could be erected here under permitted development of a similar size that would also fail the light test. Taking these matters into account I do not consider the extension is objectionable on the grounds of loss of light to the kitchen.
- 6.20 The depth of the front extension has been reduced from 1.6m to 1.386m. The width has been pulled from neighbouring occupier no 1 by 150mm. The height of the extension has also been reduced to lower the mid point of the mono-pitched roof, with the eaves by 224mm. There is also a new flank external steps guarding to match the lower level. The front extension with the orientation being

north would not over shadow or effect the outlook in relation to impact on occupier no 1.

- 6.21 The first floor side alterations and side dormer would face existing countryside fields. There is no dwelling or building to this side of the property therefore no impact demonstrated in relation to outlook, privacy, sunlight and daylight.
- 6.22 The proposed garage would have a hipped to gable roof profile. The size of the garage would be modest in relation to the existing area. It would be built away from adjoining occupiers therefore in relation to impact the garage would demonstrate no harm in terms of outlook, sunlight and daylight.

7 .0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The proposed development by reasons of its scale and design would not overwhelm or destroy the character of the original property. It would not result in any significant harm to the openness of the countryside or the Special Landscape Area. Nor would there be any unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity. The proposals would therefore comply with Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2010.
- 7.2 In the circumstances it is considered that the proposal is worthy of support and that planning permission should be granted as a consequence.

8 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 ,bricks and timber 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 character and appearance is preserved.

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

Drawing No – Roof Plan- 114 REV A
Drawing No – Proposed Front Elevation – 123 REV A
Drawing No – Proposed South Elevation- 116 REV A
Drawing No – Proposed First Floor Plan- 112 REV A
Drawing No – Proposed Front Elevation – 115 REV A
Drawing No- Proposed Ground floor – 111- REV B
Drawing No – Proposed Second Floor- 113 REV A
Drawing No- Proposed Landscape Plan- 118 REV A
Drawing No – Proposed Section – 119 REV A

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: 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.