

APPLICATION: MA/10/0170 Date: 1 February 2010 Received: 3 February 2010

APPLICANT: Mr C Lohead

LOCATION: 10, NURSERY AVENUE, BEARSTED, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME14 4JS

PARISH: Bearsted

PROPOSAL: Erection of first floor extension, single storey side and rear extension and front porch Erection of first floor extension, single storey side and rear extension and front porch shown on Drawing Nos 29.146.1 received on 03 February 2010.

AGENDA DATE: 18th March 2010

CASE OFFICER: Laura Gregory

- **it is contrary to** views expressed by the Parish Council

POLICIES

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18

South East Plan 2009: CC6, BE1

Village Design Statement: N/A

Government Policy: PPS1

MBC Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (Adopted May 2009)

HISTORY

None

CONSULTATIONS

Bearsted Parish Council: No comments received

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Bradshaw would like the application reported to the Planning Committee for the following reasons

- The proposed first floor front bedroom windows will have an unrestricted view into all the rear living and sleeping accommodation of 11c Yeoman Lane.
- 11C is set about 1metre below Nursery Avenue.
- The ridge height of the proposed application will rise from the present 6.25 metres to 8.25 metres with the result that the 'House' will tower over the Yeoman Lane properties and the adjacent bungalows

- There are two storey houses in the area but they are in Otteridge Road and not near the bungalow properties.
- All of the complaints by the owner of 11C are echoed by the residents at 11D, who are directly opposite the proposal giving no privacy whatsoever to their rear gardens and rear windows and conservatory.
- Looking at the proposal the perceived effect will be of an overpowering block directly overlooking the properties in Yeoman Lane.
- Out of keeping with the street scene

Seven Neighbour Letters received raising the following objections:

- Built on a prominent site, the proposed development for most dwellers in Nursery Avenue both to the south and north will be an intrusive eyesore
- The proposed first floor extension is directly opposite 11d Yeoman lane and will cause a loss of privacy to the neighbours rear garden and conservatory
- Nursery Avenue only consists of single storey bungalows along this respective road and such a building would be visually overbearing.
- Visual appearance of house will look like a tower amongst all the bungalows
- It is an inappropriate design for this part of the village.
- Proposed conversion from a single storey bungalow to a large house would be totally out of keeping with immediate properties which are all single storey bungalows and could create a precedent.
- No allowance for parking

CONSIDERATIONS

Site & Surroundings

- 1.1 The application relates to a site which is located within the defined urban area of Maidstone in the parish of Bearsted and contains 1950s' detached bungalow dwelling which is not subject to any landscape restrictions. Located within an established residential area which characterised by predominantly single storey dwellings, the dwelling is in Nursery Avenue, a street which is characterised by 1950's bungalows, which descends into a cul-de-sac to the south.
- 1.2 Positioned to the north of the cul-de-sac and due to the non linear pattern of the street, the site is set forward of its neighbour, 12 Nursery Avenue and the other dwellings located on the western side of the street. In addition to being set forward to the rest of the dwellings on the western side of the street, the proposal site, like the other dwellings to the north, is of a different design and appearance to the dwellings in the south. The dwellings to the south have hipped roofs with either a projecting hip or gable end and all have weatherboarding on the wall below the main living room window. As such the proposal site appears detached from the dwellings to the south and with the dwellings to the north of the street of different design and appearance,

there appears to be a lack of cohesiveness to this part of the street, creating a mixed street scene.

Proposal

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side extension, single storey side and rear extension and front porch.
- 2.2 The proposed first floor extension would result in an increase in both the eaves and ridge height and would result in three bedrooms, a bathroom and ensuite at first floor level. The eaves height would be increased from 2.7m above ground level to 4.2m and the ridge height would be increased from 6.4m to 8.2m above ground level. A pitched roof dormer window is proposed on the south elevation and this would project to of 900mm depth from the roof plane and, measure 2.1m wide. Tile hanging on the first floor is proposed on all elevations
- 2.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would measure 6.1m deep and 4.2m wide and have an eaves and ridge height of 2.4m and 4.6m. The proposed side extension would measure 4.2m deep and 2.1m wide and have an eaves and ridge height of 2.5m and 3.6m. A detached garage to the rear of the property is to be demolished to make room for the ground floor extensions
- 2.4 The proposed porch canopy would measure 2.3m wide and 900mm depth and would have an eaves and ridge height of 2.4m and 3.5m.

Planning Considerations

- 3.1 The main issue to consider is whether the proposed development is in accordance with the criteria of policy H18 of the Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions. As set out below, there are three issues relating to this policy which need to be considered: Visual Impact, Impact upon Residential Amenity and Parking.

Visual Impact

- 3.2 In terms of visual impact, the area immediately surrounding the site is mixed with bungalows of varied design with two storey dwellings to the east. A consequence of this is that, there is little cohesiveness to this area of the street and therefore no strong pattern of development to preserve or adhere to.
- 3.3 Considering the impact of the proposed increase in the apex of the roof, the land slopes to the south and this has resulted in the roof line of the dwellings being varied, with neither a level nor, regular drop in within the street. With two storey dwellings both to front of the site in Yeoman Lane and to the rear in Otteridge Road and also, to north in Tower Gardens, it is considered that the increased roof apex would not appear significantly obtrusive obstructing regular roof line and, set against a backdrop of two storey dwellings on all elevations, it would not appear visually dominant. Given that the dwelling is approximately 24m forward of the other houses located on the western side

of the street and therefore appears detached from the rest dwellings to the south of the street, the first floor extension would not unbalance a strong pattern of development. Overall, no significant harm to the character of the area would be caused as a result of the development with the removal of an unsightly dormer window on the south elevation serving to improve the appearance of the area.

- 3.4 With regard to the proposed ground floor extensions, these extensions are of acceptable scale and located on the side and rear elevations, they would not have any significant impact upon the character and appearance of the street. The design is considered acceptable with the proposed extensions complimenting the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.
- 3.5 Overall, I consider that due to the mixed character of the area, the proposed extension and resultant visual impact is acceptable.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 3.6 With regard to the impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties objections from the occupiers of the dwellings opposite the site in Yeoman Lane have been received stating that the proposed development would cause them a loss of privacy.
- 3.7 In terms of privacy, it is recognised that as a result of the proposed first floor extension, two of the proposed bedrooms will be located to the front of the dwelling and will subsequently face 11c and 11d Yeoman Lane. However, given that there is a public highway between the site and the opposing dwellings, it is not considered that the development would result in a significant loss of privacy. There would be no loss of light and with the 30m distance; the overbearing impact of the extension is not significant.
- 3.8 Considering the privacy of the neighbour to the rear of the site, given that there will be approximately 40m between the development and 7 Otteridge Road, it is not considered that there would be significant overlooking of this dwelling. Moreover, the overbearing impact of the extension would be significantly reduced and therefore, it is considered that no serious harm to the residential amenity of this dwelling would be caused by the proposed development.
- 3.9 With regard to the impact upon the two adjacent properties, it is not considered that the proposed extension would cause a significant loss of light to 12 Nursery Avenue as that the front wall of the neighbour's dwelling is in line with rear boundary of application site. The proposed dormer window on the south elevation would not look into the rooms of no. 12 or any of the dwellings to the south of the site and as such there would be no loss of privacy. The proposed development would not cause a significant or unacceptable loss of light 8 Nursery Avenue, and would not cause loss of privacy. Whilst the proposed first floor extension would result in 10 Nursery Avenue being approximately 1.8m taller than no. 8, given that there are no windows in the

side elevation of the neighbours dwelling and the garden is to the rear, it is not considered that the proposed first floor extension would significantly overbear onto the adjacent dwelling and cause detrimental loss of outlook.

Parking

- 3.10 Whilst the proposal will result in the loss of a garage and therefore a parking space, it would not result in the addition of any bedrooms to the property or, in any changes to the current level of parking provision provided on the driveway. On this basis, it is not considered that the development would not result in any detrimental highway or parking issues.

Other Issues

- 3.11 With regard to the other issues raised by the neighbours, the visual impact this has already been addressed in the report and there are no further comments to make on this issue. The issue of setting a precedent, each application is judged on its own merits and in accordance with Local Plan policy and what has been permitted elsewhere in the surrounding area does not predetermine future application of for similar development in the same area.

Conclusion

- 4.1 In conclusion, for the reasons stated above, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions. Members are there recommended to approve the application 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. 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 in accordance with policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000

The proposed development, subject to the conditions stated, is considered to comply with the policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and South East Plan 2009) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.