

APPLICATION: MA/10/0913 Date: 25 May 2010 Received: 27 May 2010  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs R James  
LOCATION: 2, FORGE LANE, HEADCORN, ASHFORD, KENT, TN27 9QQ  
PARISH: Headcorn  
PROPOSAL: Erection of a single storey extension to the south elevation and a single storey extension to the north elevation and re-siting of vehicular access as shown on plan numbers 1003/1, 1003/2, site location plan and application form received 26th May 2010.  
AGENDA DATE: 12th August 2010  
CASE OFFICER: Kevin Hope

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by Headcorn Parish Council

### **1. POLICIES**

Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: H18, ENV34  
Village Design Statement: N/A  
Government Policy: PPS1, PPS3,  
Other: MBC Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009

### **2. HISTORY**

58/0188/MK2 – construction of a residential development

58/0188A/MK2 – Amendments to previously approved residential development

### **3. CONSULTATIONS**

**Headcorn Parish Council** – Have recommended refusal on the following grounds:-

- “The size and scale of the proposed extension would lead to significant loss of light to the neighbour’s prime living accommodation on their southern boundary”.

**Conservation Officer** – Raised no objections and the following comments:-

- "A standard materials condition would be appropriate to protect the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings nearby".

#### **4. REPRESENTATIONS**

Three objection letters have been received raising the following points:-

- Loss of light of neighbouring property
- Overshadowing of neighbouring property
- Proximity of proposal to existing oil tank within neighbouring curtilage
- The siting of the proposed vehicular access

#### **5. CONSIDERATIONS**

##### **5.1 Site Description**

5.1.1 The application site consists of a square shaped residential plot located within the parish and village boundary of Headcorn and within a Special Landscape Area. A designation which includes all of Headcorn village. The site is located opposite a number of Grade II listed buildings and lies just outside of the Headcorn Conservation Area which begins approximately 6m to the south of the site. The plot is occupied by a single storey detached bungalow which is set back from Forge Lane by approximately 11m. The property currently has a garden area to the front with an access and driveway to the southern side of the dwelling providing parking provision for at least two vehicles. The property has a small area of garden to the rear which measures approximately 4m in length and 21m in width.

5.1.2 The boundary treatments at the site consist of 1.8m high close boarded fencing to the southern and eastern boundaries, 1.8m high panel fencing and the southern wall of the neighbouring garage to the northern boundary and a 1m high boundary wall to the western boundary.

5.1.3 The surrounding area comprises of a mixture of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings which vary in design, scale and age.

##### **5.2 Proposal**

5.2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey extension to the south elevation to provide an en-suite, a single storey extension to the north elevation to provide an attached garage and family room and re-siting of vehicular access.

- 5.2.2 The proposed extension to the south elevation would measure 2.5m in length, would project 2.6m from the existing south elevation and would have a ridge height of approximately 3.4m.
- 5.2.3 The proposed extension to the north elevation would measure approximately 11.9m in length, would project 4.25m from the existing north elevation and would have a ridge height of approximately 4.1m.
- 5.2.4 Both proposed extensions would have a hipped roof and a matching eaves height to the existing dwelling. It is also proposed to re-site the existing access to be adjacent with the northern boundary of the site together with associated parking/turning area.

### **5.3 Principle of Development**

- 5.3.1 In principle, the proposal is considered acceptable given that it is within the defined village boundary of Headcorn. The key policy is H18 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000. This policy states that:-

*"EXTENSIONS AND ADDITONS TO RESIDENTIAL PROPERITES WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSAL:*

- (1) IS OF A SCALE AND DESIGN WHICH DOES NOT OVERWHELM OR DESTROY THE CHARACTER OF THE ORIGINAL PROPERTY; AND*
- (1) WILL COMPLEMENT THE STREET SCENE AND ADJACENT EXISTING BUILDINGS AND THE CHARACTER OR THE AREA; AND*
- (2) WILL RESPECT THE AMENITIES OF ADJOINING RESIDENTS REGARDING PRIVACY, DAYLIGHT, SUNLIGHT AND MAINTAINANCE OF A PLEASANT OUTLOOK; AND*
- (3) ENSURES THAT ADEQUATE CAR PARKING PROVISION WITHIN THE CURTILAG OF THE DWELLING IS PROVIDED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ADOPTED CAR PARKING STANDARDS.*

- 5.3.2 I will therefore consider the proposal against each of the criterion set out in this policy under sections 5.4 and 5.5 below.

- 5.3.3 The Residential Extensions SPD also provides guidance on side extensions. This document states that:-

- *"a side extension should be subordinate to the original dwelling".*
- *"a single storey extension to the side of a property should normally be acceptable if it does not have a significant adverse impact on the nature of space between dwellings".*
- *"a minimum of 3m between the side wall of a two storey side extension and the adjoining property for the full height of the extension is normally desirable".*

- *"a set back from the front elevation of the original house and lower roof can assist in assimilating the development where it is desirable that the form, proportions or symmetry of the original building are respected".*

5.3.4 I will consider these points under sections 5.4 and 5.5 below.

## **5.4 Visual Impact and Design**

- 5.4.1 With regard to the impact upon the existing dwelling, it is considered that the proposal would have a subordinate visual appearance by virtue of its lower ridge height by approximately 1m, matching eaves height and hipped roof design. Furthermore, the proposal would also be in keeping with the existing dwelling by virtue of its scale and matching materials to be used in its construction. Although the proposal would not be set back from the existing projecting front elevation as stated within the Residential Extensions SPD, it is considered that this would not harm its visual appearance and would still appear subordinate. It is noted that the proposal would provide a sizeable addition to the floorspace of the dwelling; however it is considered that by virtue of the design principles as stated above, the proposal would not overwhelm the existing dwelling or harm its visual appearance and would be in accordance with criterion 1 of policy H18 and the guidance stated within the Residential Extensions SPD.
- 5.4.2 With regard to the impact upon the streetscene, it is noted that a distance of approximately 11m would be retained between the dwelling and the street. This would ensure the proposal would not appear visually dominant or of a greater prominence within the street. In addition, by virtue of its design and subordinate visual appearance, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the streetscene. The proposed re-sited access would be in front of the proposed extension to the north elevation; this would be adjacent to the access to the neighbouring property and would not appear out of keeping within the street. By virtue of its location and its design, the proposal would have no impact upon the character or appearance of the adjacent Headcorn Conservation Area. Overall this proposal would therefore be in accordance with criterion 2 of policy H18 and the guidance stated within the Residential Extensions SPD.

## **5.5 Residential Amenity**

- 5.5.1 With regard to the impact upon neighbouring residential amenity, a number of representations have been received raising issues including a potential loss of light and overshadowing of the adjoining property No4. The submitted plans show that the proposed extension to the north elevation would be sited approximately 1.1m from the site's northern boundary, in addition to this, there would be a distance of approximately 4.4m between the rear

conservatory of No4 and the northern boundary of the application site. After conducting a BRE 45° light test in accordance with the 'BRE Guide to Good Practice', it is considered that the proposed extension to the north elevation would not cause a significant loss of light or overshadowing to No4 Forge Lane by virtue of this distance.

- 5.5.2 The representations received have also raised comments regarding the proximity of the proposed northern elevation extension to an oil tank located within the curtilage of the neighbouring dwelling to the north (No4). This is considered to be a civil matter and not a planning consideration that can be considered during this application.

## **5.6 Highways**

- 5.6.1 With regard to the comments received concerning the location of the proposed re-sited access, it is considered that this location being adjacent to the existing access to the neighbouring property would provide a sufficient level of visibility and would be acceptable. The access drive would lead to a proposed parking/turning area located to the front of the dwelling providing access to the proposed garage. This would provide parking provision for at least three vehicles which is considered acceptable.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 It is therefore considered overall that the proposal is acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and amenity impacts on the local environment and other material considerations. There would be no unacceptable adverse impact upon the neighbouring property to the north (No4), I therefore recommend that the application should be approved subject to the following conditions.

## **7. 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 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 extensions 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 there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.