

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 15/503785/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Two storey front, side and rear extensions as shown on drawing numbers 20B and 21B dated April 2015 (revisions dated 27.08.2015) and RT-MME-120373-02 Rev A; dated October 2015 and drawing 10 and 11; dated October 2014.		
ADDRESS Owls Oak Lenham Road Kingswood Kent ME17 1LX		
RECOMMENDATION		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposal is not considered to be out of character or scale with the existing house and would not result in any material harm to openness of the countryside or the amenities of the adjoining properties.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Contrary to the views of Ulcombe Parish Council		
WARD Headcorn	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Ulcombe	APPLICANT Mr Oliver Greenshields AGENT Wyvern Architects Devizes Ltd
DECISION DUE DATE 27/07/15	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 27/07/15	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 17/06/15
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites): 14/504885/FULL - Single storey extension to front and two storey extension to rear Refused on 25.12.2014 due to the size and scale of the proposed extensions and impact on the original house. The refused scheme proposed significant front and rear extensions and the current application seeks to overcome the reasons for refusal.		

1.0 POLICIES

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H33, ENV28, T13, ENV6
 Government Policy: National Planning Policy Framework
 National Planning Practice Guidance
 MBC Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

2.1 The proposal site is situated along Lenham Road in the parish of Ulcombe. The site comprises of a detached chalet bungalow with a dormer in the roof. There is a separate single storey garage to the west of the property and good sized garden and driveway to the front of the site. To the rear of the property lies a large long garden. The site is situated within a fairly open area which is sparsely developed. The site fronts towards the north and onto Lenham Road and opposite lies what appears to be a woodland area. To the east of the site lie the neighbouring properties of La Corbiere and Wild Acre and to the west lay the properties of Ferndale and Little Ferndale. To the south of the site beyond the rear garden lays a relatively large woodland area. The immediate surrounding area and properties are all residential and are predominantly chalet bungalow type properties situated outside of the village boundary in the open countryside.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Two storey side and rear extensions and single storey front extension; incorporating a garage, carers living accommodation and additional living space and bedrooms.
- 3.2 The two storey side extension would be set below the ridge line of the original house. The extension would measure some 8.7m in width compared to some 13.7m of the original houses. The extension would have a pitched roof with a gabled end to match the existing house. A single bay gable ended garage would project forward of the proposed side extension by some 8m, to accommodate a mobility vehicle. The 8m projection would match the front building line of the existing bungalow. The extensions would be finished in facing brick and tiles to match the existing house.
- 3.3 To the rear 3 two storey gabled extensions are proposed. The pitched roofs of the rear extensions would be set below the main roof of the house to conceal views from the front of the property. The rear extensions would project 4m and 8m from the rear of the house and would be finished in materials to match the existing property.
- 3.4 The house extensions are required to provide additional / altered accommodation for a disabled individual, his family and carers.
- 3.5 The proposal also includes tree works to two large TPO oak trees located within the application site and neighbouring property. It is noted that it was initially proposed to remove these two large oak trees. Following officer site visits the two oak trees were identified as having significant amenity value and a TPO was placed on the entire site to protect the trees.

4.0 Amended Plans

- 4.1 Two sets of amended plans have been received following discussion between the applicant, council officers and arborists. The amendments were made in an attempted to overcome Parish Council, neighbour and the council tree officer objections.
- 4.2 Amended plans for approval are:
- 20B and 21B dated April 2015 (revisions dated 27.08.2015)
 - RT-MME-120373-02 Rev A; dated October 2015
- 4.3 The amendments reduce the width of the side extension and move the development away from the boundary and oak trees.

4.4 Difference between the current scheme and refused application

The current application has been submitted in an attempted to overcome the reasons for refusal of the application 14/504885/FULL. The applicant entered into pre-application discussions with the council to better understand the reasons for refusal and to design a scheme that council officers were in support of.



14/504885/FULL – The previous application proposed a front extension that would have covered the majority of the front aspect of the original dwelling. Extension indicated in grey.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Two neighbouring properties have objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- Extensions would overwhelm and destroy the original form of the house.
- Removal of two oak trees.
- Loss of privacy and overshadowing.
- Loss of gap between the house and side boundary.
- Only single storey extensions should be made to this property.

5.2 **Ulcombe Parish Council:** Wish to see the application refused for the following reasons:

Parish response dated 22 June 2015

- Footprint is larger than the previous application.
- Overlooking – recommends windows are removed.
- Objects to the felling of the two oak trees on the site.
- The extensions would overwhelm and destroy the original house.
- Contrary to policies ENV28 and H33.

Parish response dated 10 August 2015

- The requests from Ulcombe Parish Council to 15/503785/FULL submitted on 22nd June 2015 should be upheld and not ignored.
- On the amended plans, the full length windows to the Juliet balconies are unacceptable. This exacerbates, not resolves, one of the original issues.
- There are extreme concerns regarding the removal or cutting back of the oak tree despite that it has been given a temporary TPO.
- Should the Planning Officer disagree with the Parish Council's decision then they would wish for this application to be referred to the Planning Committee.

5.3 **KCC Archaeology Officer:** No comments to make.

5.4 **Tree Officer:** Raises no objections subject to the works being carried out in accordance with the applicant's tree report.

6.0 APPRAISAL

6.1 The specific policy under the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 relating to residential extensions and additions within the open countryside is Policy H33. Local Plan Policy ENV28, which deals generally with countryside development and protection is also relevant, as is the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted May 2009). These policies are considered to be consistent with the aims of The National Planning Policy Framework.

Visual Impact

6.2 In relation to applications for house extensions within the countryside, The Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted May 2009) advises that:

'In the countryside, all proposals should respect local distinctiveness and be of high quality design in order to maintain character ... An extension should be modest in size, subservient to the original dwelling and should not overwhelm or destroy its original form'.

Planning Committee Report

- 6.3 In addition, policy H33 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 advises that such development should be sympathetically related to the house, extensions should not overwhelm the original house and that taken individually and cumulatively, they should preserve the character and appearance of the countryside.
- 6.4 This application has been submitted in an attempt to overcome the previous reasons for refusal in which it was considered that the extensions to the front of the existing house would constitute poor design and would overwhelm and detract from the character and form of the existing property.
- 6.5 The current application omits extensions that would conceal the front elevation of the original property and instead proposes additions to the side and rear of the existing property. As a result it is considered that the proposal has overcome the principle reason for refusal of the last application and, the original form and character of the property would be successfully retained at the front where it can be readily seen from the road.
- 6.6 The ridge line of the proposed side extension and garage extension would be set below the ridge of the main house creating a modest and subservient relationship with the host property in terms of overall height and scale. As such the extensions would not destroy or overwhelm the original form of the existing house and the use of matching materials would ensure the extension harmonises with the existing house. The width of the extension is fairly large, being greater than half the width of the original house. However, given the overall height and scale of the extensions, coupled by the size of the application plot, it is considered that the extensions would not overwhelm the original character of the house nor would they appear overtly prominent or dominant in the open countryside. In addition, the extensions would be set well back from the road and would replace a smaller detached garage currently located to the side of the house.
- 6.7 The rear extensions would be discreetly located at the rear of the property and would not be visible from the road or any other public vantage points. The rear extensions would be set below the ridge line of the main house and the use of pitched roofs would achieve a subordinate relationship with the main house and ensure the original roof form is not overwhelmed.
- 6.8 The overall footprint of the extensions is fairly large. However, the existing bungalow is situated on a spacious plot with large front and rear garden and, it is considered that the plot size could successfully accommodate the level of development proposed without being cramped or appearing overdeveloped.
- 6.9 Given the overall subservient scale, height and spacious plot size, it is considered that the extensions would not destroy or overwhelm the original form of the existing house, nor would the proposal result in development which individually or cumulatively is visually incongruous within the countryside.
- 6.10 It is acknowledged that the proposal would constitute fairly large extensions in the open countryside (albeit mainly at the rear of the property where the visual harm is reduced), and in coming to an overall conclusion I have afforded weight to the specific requirements of the applicant in this instance.
- 6.11 Overall, it is therefore considered, on balance, that the proposed extensions, by reason of the siting, design, height and scale, are considered not to appear overtly prominent or dominant in the open countryside and would appear as subservient structures in relation to the host property in accordance with policy ENV28 and H33.

Residential Amenity

- 6.13 Due to the degree of separation from the nearest neighbouring dwellings and the set in from the shared boundaries, there would not be any unacceptable impacts in terms of loss of outlook or light.
- 6.14 A number of objections have been received in relation to roof windows proposed in the east facing roof slope. On the amended drawings these windows have either been omitted or set a sufficient height above internal floor levels to prevent overlooking.
- 6.15 The first floor rear opening serving the carer's room would afford a degree of overlooking toward the rear. However, given the orientation, oblique viewing angles, separation distances and boundary screening, I am of the view that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.

Ecology/Trees

- 6.16 The revised layout and design has come about following comments from the council arborist and a requirement to safeguard the two large oak trees. The proposed extensions have been pushed away from the shared boundary and the oak trees and, the council arborist no longer raises any objections subject to the works being carried out in accordance with the latest tree report. The two oak trees are not protected under a TPO and any future pruning (after those set out in the tree report) would require agreement from the council. A walnut tree would be removed from the site which would be regrettable but the loss could be mitigated by replanting a new tree in another location on this spacious plot. I do not consider the loss of this tree is so objectionable to warrant refusal and a replanting condition will be attached to mitigate the loss.
- 6.17 I do not consider that any significantly adverse impact upon biodiversity and nature conservation interests is likely to occur because the extensions would be sited within the domestic garden area, beside the existing house in the large part on previously developed land and ample habitat would remain within the surrounding countryside.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 I therefore consider that this proposal is acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, the NPPF and all other material considerations such as are relevant and recommend conditional approval of the application on this basis.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS to include

- (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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Planning Committee Report

Drawing Nos. 15-106 003 Rev P2; dated 28.07.2015 and 15-106 001 Rev P1 and 15-106 002 Rev P1; received 11.05.2015 and 15-106 002 Rev P2; received 18.06.2015 and Design and Access Statement Revision P1; dated May 2015.

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

- (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building(s) hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

- (4) The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the Arboricultural Report RT-MME-120373-02 Rev A; dated October 2015

Reason: To safeguard existing trees to be retained and to ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development.

- (5) Prior to the commencement of development details of a replacement tree, including the species, size and the proposed location of the tree, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the tree is planted. The tree shall be planted during the first tree planting season (October-February) following the occupation of the building(s). If within a period of five years from the completion of the development, the tree dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, it shall be replaced in the next planting season with another tree of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory setting and external appearance to the development.

Case Officer: Andrew Jolly

- 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.