

## REPORT SUMMARY

<b>REFERENCE NO:</b> 17/502457/FULL			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL:</b> Demolition of existing garage and front extension, erection of new two storey side extension and single storey front extension, and addition of Shiplap cladding to first floor elevations.			
<b>ADDRESS:</b> 2 Qusted Way, Harrietsham, Maidstone, Kent, ME17 1JG			
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions			
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL:</b> The development proposals are in line with planning policies and residential guidance and as a result the recommendation is to grant permission subject to conditions			
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:</b> The applicant is Councillor Janetta Sams.			
<b>WARD:</b> Harrietsham and Lenham	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Harrietsham	<b>APPLICANT:</b> Mr. and Mrs. Thomas obo Cllr Janetta Sams <b>AGENT:</b> Home Design Network Ltd.	
<b>DECISION DUE DATE:</b> 03.07.2017	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE:</b> 07.06.2017	<b>OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE:</b> 23.05.2017	
<b>RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (Inc. appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):</b>			
<b>App No</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
64/0063/MK2	Residential development	PER	05.12.1964
75/0702	Single storey extension	PER	06.08.1975

## MAIN REPORT

### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 This application site is located on the northwest Qusted Way, which is within the village settlement of Harrietsham. There are semi-detached properties on this road constructed in a similar style, and some modern, detached properties adjacent to the application site.
- 1.02 The site comprises a two storey detached dwelling with a shallow pitched roof that is set back behind the common building line of adjacent properties. A single storey integral garage with a flat roof is located to the side of the main property extending forward of the main dwelling. The site levels are relatively even.
- 1.03 Other than being within the village settlement of Harrietsham, there are no site specific policies that are relevant to this application.

### 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposal is for the demolition of an existing garage and front extension, and the erection of a two storey side extension and single storey front extension.

- 2.02 The two storey side extension would have a width of 3.3 metres, a depth of 6.8 metres, and eaves height of 5.0 metres and a ridge height of 6.7 metres. The single storey front extension would have a width of 10.3 metres, a depth of 2.3 metres, and eaves height of 2.3 metres and a ridge height of 3.5 metres. Shiplap cladding will be applied to the first floor elevation.

### **3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- Supplementary Planning Documents: Residential Extensions
- Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan Publication (submission version) February 2016; DM1, DM8

- 3.01 Paragraph 216 of the NPPF sets out the factors which influence the weight to be given to emerging LP policies – preparation stage, extent of unresolved objections and consistency with the NPPF.

- 3.02 Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2016) was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 20 May 2016. The Local Plan Inspector issued his Report on the Examination of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan on 27 July 2017. The Report is accompanied by an appendix containing the Main Modifications. The Inspector concludes that, with the incorporation of the Main Modifications, the submission Maidstone Borough Local Plan is sound. The adoption of the Local Plan will be considered at the next meeting of the Council on 27 September 2017.

- 3.03 In these circumstances, it is considered that approaching full weight should be afforded to the Maidstone Borough Local Plan incorporating the Main Modifications in the determination of the current application.

### **4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 4.1 The planning application has been advertised with individual letters sent to adjoining properties, and a site notice. No response has been received.

### **5.0 CONSULTATIONS**

*(Please note that summaries of consultation responses are set out below with the response discussed in more detail in the main report where considered necessary)*

- 5.01 **Harrietsham Parish Council:** No objection

### **6.0 APPRAISAL**

#### **Main Issues**

- 6.01 The key material considerations relate to:
- Impact on the application property;
  - Impact on the character of the surrounding area;
  - Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
  - Highways and parking considerations.
- 6.02 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the Development Plan consists of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan

2000 and the Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan Publication (submission version) February 2016.

- 6.03 The application site is located within the larger village settlement of Harrietsham. Policy DM8 of the emerging Plan states that within the defined boundaries of larger villages, proposals for residential extensions will be permitted which meet certain criteria. The extension has to be acceptable within the surrounding context; it has to retain boundary treatment; the extension should not have an adverse impact on neighbouring residents and the proposal should provide sufficient parking.

Impact on the application property

- 6.04 The application property was originally constructed in the 1960's as a simply designed, two storey structure with a shallow pitched roof. In 1975 an application was granted for a single storey, flat roofed, front and side extension. The extension currently proposed would seek to demolish these additions.

- 6.05 The front extension, in addition to being reduced in depth, would have a lean-to roof along the width of the front elevation. The front entrance would be highlighted by positioning a gable roof structure over the opening. The two storey extension would be set back from the front footprint of the property providing a break-line in the frontage. This break line would serve to identify the original size of the property, so that the extension reads as an addition. The design would comply with the Local Plan policies and residential design guidance.

Impact on the character of the surrounding area

- 6.06 Proposals should have high quality design and respond positively to, and enhance the character of the area. Particular regard will be paid to scale, height, materials, detailing, mass, bulk, articulation, and site coverage, incorporating a high quality modern design approach (emerging policy DM 1).

- 6.07 There are several properties with a similar floor and site area within close proximity to the application site. The proposed extensions would be subservient to the host property, and would be constructed in materials which would match the existing building in addition to being appropriate to the character of the surrounding area.

- 6.08 The single storey garage extension was 3.8 metres wide, and the two storey replacement would be 3.3 metres wide. The front extension would be increased to the full width of the property however; it would be reduced in depth by 0.7 metres. The flat roof would be replaced with a lean-to roof, which would be acceptable in terms of Local Plan policies and guidance. For these reasons, the proposed development would be considered acceptable in the context of the locality.

Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 6.09 The NPPF sets out that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning should seek a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of buildings.

- 6.10 The nearest neighbouring property to the proposed development is Redbank, which is located to the northeast of the application site. The proposals would be sited 2.0 metres from the boundary at the closest point, and 7 metres from the flank wall of the neighbouring property.

- 6.11 The two storey and single storey extensions would be subservient to the existing property. The application would have no windows at first floor level and one window

servicing the utility room and patio doors to the bedroom at ground floor. There are no windows on the flank wall of Redbank. The 1.8 metre close boarded fencing bounding the property would provide an acceptable level of screening, and a condition could be attached preventing the insertion of any new openings at first floor level and above. For these reasons, any issues in terms of amenity with regard to this property would be minimised.

- 6.12 No 4 Quested Way has several windows on the flank wall of the property comprising a landing window and two bathroom windows on the first floor and a hall window on the ground floor. However, the application site would have no new windows on the flank wall facing it. The two storey extension would be largely obscured from this neighbour by the footprint of the existing property. The single storey extension would be a modest size and height located some 1.5 metres from the boundary with No 4. As such, any impact on the neighbour with regard to amenity issues would be minimised.

Highways and parking considerations.

- 6.13 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. There would be sufficient parking provided on site and the proposal would not harm highway safety.

**7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.01 For the reasons set out in this report, the development proposals are in line with planning policies and residential guidance and as a result the recommendation is to grant permission subject to conditions.

**8.0 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 the 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 plans:

Dwg No 0182.11	Proposed Ground Floor Plan Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.12	Proposed First Floor Plan Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.13	Proposed Loft Floor Plan Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.14	Proposed Front Elevation (SE) Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.15	Proposed Rear Elevation (NW) Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.16	Proposed Side Elevation (NE) Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.17	Proposed Rear Elevation (SW) Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.18	Proposed Roof Plan Rec. 08 May 2017
Dwg No 0182.19	Proposed Site/Block Plan Rec. 08 May 2017

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

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

4. No additional windows, doors, voids or other openings shall be inserted, placed or formed at any time above ground floor level in the northeast and southwest facing walls of the building hereby permitted;

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

Case Officer: Jocelyn Miller

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.