

APPLICATION: MA/10/0037 Date: 12 January 2010 Received: 12 January 2010

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs A & S Castle

LOCATION: THE BARN, LITTLE WADD FARM, GRANDSHORE LANE, FRITTENDEN, CRANBROOK, KENT, TN17 2BZ

PARISH: Staplehurst

PROPOSAL: Planning application for erection of single storey extension to garage with glazed link to main dwelling to provide additional living accommodation and insertion of window to front elevation (re-submission of MA/09/1614) as shown on drawing number(s) 549.TP1/A to TP5/A and supported by a Planning Statement received on 12 January 2010.

AGENDA DATE: 29th April 2010

CASE OFFICER: Janice Tan

The recommendation for this application is being reported to Committee for decision because:

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

## **1. POLICIES**

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ENV28, H33, ENV45

The South East Plan 2009 : SP1, CC1, CC6, C4

Village Design Statement: N/A

Government Policy: PPS1, PPS3, PPS7

Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009

Maidstone Planning Guidance Notes, No. 9, Converting Rural Buildings 1996

## **1. HISTORY**

MA/09/1614 - Planning application for erection of single storey extension to garage with glazed link to main dwelling to provide additional living accommodation – WITHDRAWN

MA/02/2091 - Conversion of barn to one dwelling and erection of detached garage (amendment to permission MA/92/0930) – approved with conditions

MA/92/0930 - Conversion of barn to dwelling – approved with conditions

## **2. CONSULTATIONS**

- 3.1 Staplehurst Parish Council** wish to see the application approved and requested that it be referred to Maidstone Borough Council Planning Committee.
- 3.2 Maidstone Borough Council Conservation Officer** recommended that the application be refused. The proposed extension is of a substantial size and would have a far greater visual impact than the existing small detached garage and is contrary to guidance given in Maidstone Borough Council Planning Guidance Notes, No. 9 Converting Rural Buildings section 6.4 which states that extensions should not be permitted to converted traditional barns.

## **3. REPRESENTATIONS**

- 4.1 Two representations of support were received stating that the proposal would not have an impact on the immediate neighbours.

## **4. CONSIDERATIONS**

### **5.1 Site and surroundings**

- 5.1.1 The application concerns an unlisted traditional barn converted to residential use, located within a former farmstead in the countryside with no specific landscape designation as defined in the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000. The former farmstead is located at the northern end and on the eastern side of Grandshore Lane. It comprises four traditional buildings in residential use with associated outbuildings.
- 5.1.2 The application site contains a former barn which was granted planning permission in 2003 to convert to residential use and a new detached garage. The site is bounded to the west and northeast by shared vehicular accesses which are also public footpaths, KM320 and KM323 respectively. The vehicle accesses serve the dwellings of Little Wadd Farm and The Oast which lie to the northeast of the application site, and the detached garage in the rear garden of the application dwelling (The Barn). To the east of the application site is an agricultural field and to the south is Little Wadd Farmhouse, a two-storey farmhouse.
- 5.1.3 The converted barn is of a traditional form with timber feather-edged weatherboarding above a brick plinth and a Kent peg tiled roof. It has a front garden with a natural pond and a rear garden with an associated outbuilding. The outbuilding is a one and a half bay garage which accommodates a single car and a central heating boiler and is new a building. It was erected under the

same planning permission to convert the barn under MA/02/2091. This outbuilding is approximately 7.5m to the east of the dwelling with external materials matching the materials of the converted barn and replaces an internal garage within the barn structure on a previous scheme. The new garage was permitted following the revised scheme for the barn conversion reviewed by the Conservation Officer. He considered that the removal of the internal garage will preserve more of the oak frame of the barn and require less external and internal changes. In addition to this the garage would not be visible from a public highway as it would be screened by existing buildings in the former farmstead and therefore would not be visually incongruous in the countryside location.

## **5.2 Proposal**

- 5.2.1 The current application is a re-submission of a previous application which was withdrawn in 2009 and is the same scheme as previously submitted.
- 5.2.2 The proposal is for the erection of a single storey garage extension on the western side of the detached garage located 7m from the rear building line of the converted barn. The development would provide accommodation for a study/guest bedroom and a WC/shower with a glazed lobby which connects the garage extension to the converted barn.
- 5.2.3 The footprint of the garage extension would be 7m by 4m and the glazed link connecting it to the converted barn would be 1.8m by 3m on plan.
- 5.2.4 The ridge height of the proposed garage extension would be 4m high, 600mm higher than the ridge height of the existing detached garage, and would almost match the eaves height of the converted barn. The ridge length of the garage extension would be 8m long and would run at right angles to the length of the converted barn. The proposed glazed link that connects the garage extension to the barn would have a ridge length of 1.6m and would be 600mm lower than the ridge height of the proposed garage extension.

## **5.3 Policy background**

- 5.3.1 The application relates to the extension of a rural building that has been converted to residential use and is located in the countryside. Policies ENV28 and H33 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 are relevant and consideration should be given to the Maidstone Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009 as a material consideration..
- 5.3.2 Policy ENV28 restricts development in the countryside to certain types of development that are essential for a rural location and to support the rural

economy. It makes exceptions to the conversion of traditional agricultural buildings of value to residential use under Policy ENV45 and Policy H33 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 which relates to house extensions in the countryside. The aforementioned policies emphasise that development should not harm the character and appearance of the countryside or the amenities of surrounding occupiers.

5.3.3 In addition, Policy H33 requires residential extensions in the countryside to not overwhelm or destroy the original form of the existing house and when taken individually and cumulatively should not be visually incongruous in the countryside. Extensions should also be well designed and sympathetically related to the existing house.

5.3.4 The Maidstone Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted in 2009 explains, in section 5.14, that extensions to traditional farm buildings that have been converted to residential use should not normally be permitted where it would have an unacceptable impact on the original form and character of the building. It stresses that when consent is granted to convert traditional agricultural buildings to residential use, the Council seeks to preserve the original simple form and character of the traditional farm building.

## **5.4 Planning Assessment**

5.4.1 The main issues of concern are whether the design and bulk of the extension would preserve the original form and character of the traditional barn that has been converted to residential use. These are assessed in relation to the proposed development as follows:

### *5.4.2 Impact on converted building*

5.4.3 The garage extension has been designed to be in keeping with the vernacular style of the barn in terms of materials. The development would significantly alter the simple rectilinear floor plan of the barn building to an L-shaped floor plan that would not reflect the simple traditional form of the converted barn. This would fundamentally change the character of the barn and harm the simple form sought to be preserved through the original conversion. The Conservation Officer supports this view and has recommended the application be refused.

5.4.4 Given that the garage was approved as a new building when planning permission was granted to convert the barn into a dwelling in 2003 (for the reasons explained in section 5.1.3), the resultant bulk of the cumulative extensions to the original barn attached to the original barn should include the retained garage building as an extension since the proposal now attaches it to the main barn.

5.4.5 The cumulative extensions to the barn would comprise the retained garage, its proposed extension and the glazed link which would create a 11.6m long extension wing attached perpendicularly to the eastern end of the barn. The length of the wing is just over half the length of the original barn which is 19.5m in length.

5.4.6 Although the extension wing would be single storey with a ridge height no higher than the eaves height of the barn, it is substantially larger than the existing detached one and a half bay garage resulting in a development which would have a far greater visual impact than the existing modest sized detached garage. The fact that it is attached to the converted barn is unacceptable in principle as it would destroy the simple rectilinear form of the original barn. A smaller extension attached to the original barn would also be unacceptable.

5.4.7 The visual harm is further reinforced in that it would be attached to the converted barn which is contrary to advice given in Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009.

#### *5.4.8 Impact on the countryside*

5.4.9 When the bulk and height of the development together with the retained garage are seen against the converted barn and the adjacent buildings within the former farmstead and the nearby public footpaths which are also vehicular accesses to the property, the development would appear visually incongruous in the countryside.

#### *5.4.10 Other considerations*

5.4.11 The proposed development being single storey would not harm the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight privacy and outlook. It would not also have an impact on the existing parking provision of the dwelling given that the accommodation provided in the proposed extension would be for a study/guest bedroom which would be used ancillary to the main house.

## **5. Conclusion**

6.1 The converted barn is a traditional agricultural building of a simple form and character worthy of protection. To extend the garage to attach to the converted barn would not be acceptable in principle because it would not preserve the traditional simple form of the converted barn and cause harm to its character.

6.2 The proposed extensions to the converted barn by virtue of its bulk, mass and design when taken individually and cumulatively to include the retained garage

would fail to preserve the original character and form of the traditional barn resulting in a development that would harm the distinctive character of the stead and be visually incongruous in the surrounding countryside, contrary to policies of the development plan and guidance given in Maidstone Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009.

## **7      RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension to the converted barn by virtue of its bulk and design when taken individually and cumulatively would fail to preserve the original character and simple form of the traditional barn resulting in a development that would harm the distinctive character of the farmstead and be visually incongruous in the surrounding countryside, contrary to policies SP1 and CC1 of the South East Plan 2009 and policies ENV28 and H33 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and advice in the Maidstone Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009.