

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 17/503233/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of two storey side extension with internal alterations.		
ADDRESS The Willows Buckland Lane Maidstone Kent ME16 0BH		
RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE		
SUMMARY OF REASON FOR REFUSAL The proposal cannot be considered to represent a modest, appropriately designed extension over the original dwelling and for this reason it is considered that the proposal is contrary to saved policy H33 of the 2000 Local Plan, emerging policy DM36 of the submitted version of the Local Plan and adopted SPD – ‘Residential Extensions’.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE - Councillor Harvey wishes to see application reported to Planning Committee if minded to recommend refusal of application		
WARD Bridge	PARISH COUNCIL – N/A	APPLICANT Mr J Jarrett AGENT PT Design
DECISION DUE DATE 18/08/17	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 01/08/17	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 24/07/17
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:		

- 17/500208 - 2 storey addition & minor internal alterations at first floor – Refused
- MA/84/1365 - Single storey side extension with pitched roof over – Approved
- MA/82/0262 – Single storey side extension - Approved
- MA/78/1630 - Alterations to elevations and amended siting of house - Approved
- MA/77/0025 - Dwelling – Approved
- MA/76/0696 - Outline application for 2 dwellings - Refused

MAIN REPORT

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 1.01 ‘The Willows’ is a detached property that is set within its own relatively large plot at the north-eastern end of Buckland Lane. The property is located with other detached properties (including a number of listed properties) within the cul-de-sac and school playing fields also surround the site. For the purposes of both the 2000 and emerging Local Plan, the proposal site is within the designated countryside.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposal is for the erection of a 2-storey extension projecting from the south-western flank of the property and includes alterations to the existing side extension. The proposal would provide the applicants with an additional reception room, games room and would see the property go from a 5-bed property to an 8-bed property. The proposal would use clay tile hanging, render, facing brick and clay roof tiles to match the existing property.

3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ENV28, H33
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- Submitted version of Local Plan (2011-2031): SP17, DM1, DM34, DM36

4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.01 **Local Residents:** No representations received.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.01 **Councillor Harvey:** Referred application to committee for following reasons:

“Applicant has taken into consideration decisions from nearby sites and previous applications on current site; submitting revised designs that take into account reasons for refusal in all relevant cases.

Application site is situated at back of enclave surrounded by buildings which reflect a more modern style of design compared to those at front of enclave which are listed buildings. The revised design for extension is therefore in-keeping with buildings that directly neighbour site and that of the current property.

Houses in enclave are built on large, spacious plots and extension proposed reflects this, leaving property surrounded by large amount of open space.”

6.0 APPRAISAL

Relevant policy/guidance

6.01 In line with saved policy H33 of the 2000 Local Plan and emerging policy DM36 of the submitted version of the Local Plan, the key issues of this proposal are its design and what impact it would have upon the original form of the existing house. The proposal is also under the normal constraints of countryside development under saved policy ENV28 of the 2000 Local Plan and emerging policies SP17 and DM34 of the submitted version of the Local Plan. Please note that in the light of the Local Plan Inspector’s findings that the submission Maidstone Borough Local Plan is sound, it is considered that approaching full weight should be afforded to the Maidstone Borough Local Plan incorporating the Main Modifications in the determination any planning application.

6.02 The adopted Supplementary Planning Document – ‘Residential extensions’ also states;

- *Extensions should be modest in size, subservient to original dwelling and should not overwhelm or destroy its original form.*
- *Extensions should not create separate dwelling or one of a scale and type of accommodation that is capable of being used as separate dwelling.*
- *Extensions should cause no adverse impact on character or openness of countryside.*

Design, siting and appearance

6.03 Whilst the application site is not clearly visible from any public vantage point and the external materials will match the main house, the proposal is a substantial 2-storey extension measuring some 7.8m in height (not including the chimney); when viewed from its south-western elevation the proposal would measure some 12m wide; and its depth would be some 6.3m. The proposal very much appears as an unacceptably large and excessive extension that takes on the appearance of a separate dwelling. Indeed, the proposal would see the existing house sprawl to some 30m in length when viewed from the front elevation; what was a simply formed property would become over complicated with an additional large expanse of roof area at 2-storey height with varying eaves heights and roof types, including a projecting flat roof element; in terms of scale the proposal is not set down from the main ridge height of the existing house; and being set perpendicular to the main house, the proposal would further complicate and destroy the original linear form of the house as well as

creating a large and dominant elevation that would compete with the existing front elevation. With this considered, the proposal is not considered to be of a modest size; it does not sympathetically relate to the existing house; and it would not appear subservient to the house but overwhelm its original form.

- 6.04 It also appears that in cumulatively taking the volume of the proposal and the other extensions on the original dwelling, this would exceed 50% of the total volume of the original house, which is not judged to be modest under the adopted SPD – ‘Residential Extensions’. It should also be noted that the Supplementary Planning Document – ‘Residential Extensions’ clearly states that it is the size of the original building rather than the size of the plot that will be used in assessing the appropriate size of an extension. So, although the residential curtilage of the application site is quite large, the actual property is considered relatively modest in comparison.
- 6.05 The proposal cannot be considered to represent a modest, appropriately designed extension over the original dwelling and for this reason I consider the proposal to be contrary to saved policy H33, emerging policy DM36 and the adopted SPD.

Other considerations

- 6.06 No objection is raised to this proposal in terms of residential amenity and highway safety; and the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the setting of the near-by listed buildings. An application for a similar proposal has been refused under 17/500208 and the changes to the proposal’s scale and design are not considered to have overcome this previous objection.
- 6.07 The comments raised by Councillor Harvey have been considered in making this recommendation. I would also add that each application must be considered on its own merits under current policy/guidance; and whilst what extensions are possible under the property’s permitted development rights is a consideration, this proposal requires planning permission and needs to be appropriately assessed.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 It is considered that the proposal is not acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, the NPPF and all other material considerations such as are relevant. I therefore recommend refusal of this basis.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for following reason:

- (1) The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive scale, design and orientation would not constitute a modest extension and would be an unacceptable and overwhelming addition to the dwelling, contrary to saved policy H33 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, emerging policy DM36 of the submitted version of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2011-2031) and the Residential Extensions DPD (2009).

Case Officer: Kathryn Altieri

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