

APPLICATION: MA/10/0963 Date: 3 June 2010 Received: 7 June 2010

APPLICANT: Mr S Dudson

LOCATION: BRAMBLE COTTAGE, GOUDHURST ROAD, MARDEN, TONBRIDGE, KENT, TN12 9NB

PARISH: Marden

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side and rear extension as shown on the site location plan and drawing numbers 2/1007/5 & 2/1007/6 received on 07/06/10.

AGENDA DATE: 23rd September 2010

CASE OFFICER: Angela Welsford

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by Marden Parish Council

POLICIES

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

Government Policy: PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development;
PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas;

Other: Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted May 2009).

1.0 HISTORY

- 1.1 MA/09/2350 Erection of part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension
APPROVED
- 1.2 MA/08/0537 Conversion of garage to study
APPROVED
- 1.3 MK3/73/0621 Two-storey rear extension
APPROVED
- 1.4 Planning permission MA/09/2350 has not yet expired and can still be implemented. The only difference between this and the current proposal is the two-storey side extension now proposed at the southern end.

2.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 2.1 MARDEN PARISH COUNCIL: Wish to see the application refused and request the application is reported to the Planning Committee for the following planning reason – overdevelopment in the open countryside.

3.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 One comment received from the occupiers of the neighbouring property to the south, "Lambourne House", stating that they have no objections to the proposal.

4.0 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

4.1 Site and Surroundings

- 4.1.1 This application relates to a detached dwelling located in open countryside in Marden parish.
- 4.1.2 The site is found on the western side of Goudhurst Road, within a small cluster of residential properties and with agricultural land to the rear. Although the area on the opposite (eastern) side of Goudhurst Road falls within the Low Weald Special Landscape Area as defined on the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 proposals map, the site itself is not covered by any other specific designations. There are some listed buildings to the north, but these would not be affected by the development due to its nature, position and the degree of separation (approximately 30m at the closest point).
- 4.1.3 The dwelling is constructed from brick with a tile-hung first-floor and clay plain tiled roof. It features a gable at the southern end and a full-hip at the northern end. It comprises a main two-storey range running parallel with Goudhurst Road with a single-storey lean-to element behind this, and a two-storey rear cross-wing at the northern end, permitted under reference MK3/73/0621. There is also a lean-to conservatory and a detached single garage at the southern side.
- 4.1.4 The neighbouring dwelling to the south is "Lambourne House", which has been extended by way of a two-storey side extension the flank wall of which is set approximately 8.5m from the application site's southern boundary. The neighbouring dwelling to the north is "Love's Farmhouse", which is Grade II listed and is approximately 30m from the application building.

4.2 The Proposal

- 4.2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension. This would effectively be in an L-shape, wrapping around the side (south) and rear (west) elevations of the building.

- 4.2.2 It should be noted that the rear element of the proposed extension has already been approved under reference MA/09/2350. That permission is still capable of being implemented. This is a part two-storey, part single-storey extension – as the existing building has a staggered rear elevation, projecting further at ground floor level, the extension would also have a staggered rear elevation, also projecting further at ground floor level. It would project a maximum of 2.4m from the current ground floor rear building line of the lean-to. At first floor level it would project a maximum of 3.8m from the current rear building line. The ridge would run north to south and would form a pitched roof with a valley between it and the existing roof.
- 4.2.3 As stated, this part of the current proposal has already been approved. There is no difference between this part of the proposal and the approved scheme MA/09/2350.
- 4.2.4 The only difference between this current proposal and the approved scheme MA/09/2350 is the proposed two-storey side element. This would project 3.1m from the existing south flank elevation of the dwelling, and would extend the full depth of the building to the rear of the approved rear extension. The roof would continue the twin pitched roof form created by the approved rear extension. The southern end of each of the two sections of roof would be fully-hipped. The first floor south flank elevation would be tile-hung, as would the first floor front elevation, which would be a continuation of the existing facade.
- 4.2.5 The existing conservatory and detached garage would be removed to facilitate the development.

4.3 **Planning Considerations**

- 4.3.1 The key issue for consideration in this case is the visual impact of the proposal, both on the application dwelling itself, and on the open countryside within which it is set. As the rear element of the extension has already been approved, and can still be built, this impact must be principally considered in terms of the difference between the two schemes, namely the two-storey side element.

Visual Impact on the Dwelling and Surrounding Area

- 4.3.2 The existing building has an asymmetrical facade, with a gable at the southern end and a full-hip at the northern end. The proposal would add a hipped section at the southern end and effectively rebalance the facade and give it symmetry in terms of its proportions and window and door positions. Consequently, although the two-storey side element would not be set back from the main facade and would not have a dropped ridgeline, as recommended in the Council's adopted residential extensions SPD, in this particular case, I do not consider that it would cause harm to the character or appearance of the existing building, but rather would improve its appearance.

- 4.3.3 Furthermore, the width of the two-storey side element would be visually modest as, at 3.1m, it would be just less than 1/3 of the width of the existing building (9.5m). As such, it would not overwhelm the character of the original building or result in a disproportionately wide facade that would look incongruous. Moreover, the rear element of the proposal would not be visible from public vantage points as it would be screened by the existing building and the proposed two-storey side extension, so it would have no additional visual impact over and above that of the side extension. This element, I would remind Members, has already been approved.
- 4.3.4 Purely in terms of additional volume, when taken cumulatively with the existing two-storey rear extension permitted under MK3/73/0621 the proposals would approximately double the size of the original building, which is not in accordance with the 50% increase recommended in the Council's adopted SPD. However, nevertheless, I do not consider that the development would appear visually immodest as it would only increase the width of the dwelling by less than 1/3 and none of the rear extension would be visible in public views from Goudhurst Road. As such, there would not be any material harm to the form and character of the original building or to the openness of the countryside.
- 4.3.5 Indeed, a gap of approximately 10m would still remain at first floor between "Lambourne House" and "Bramble Cottage" following erection of the proposed extensions, and thus the open character of the countryside would be maintained.
- 4.3.6 I therefore conclude that there would not be any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the countryside.

Impact on the Neighbours

- 4.3.7 The closest neighbouring dwelling, "Lambourne House", which has itself been extended by way of a two-storey side extension, is positioned approximately 8.5m to the south of the application site and as such would not, in my view, be significantly affected in terms of light or overbearing impact. No side-facing windows are proposed that might cause a loss of privacy, and any inserted in the future would have to be obscure-glazed with only high-level openings to be classed as permitted development and so be exempt from planning permission. Proposed front and rear-facing windows would afford similar views as existing. The occupiers of "Lambourne House" have commented that they have no objection to the proposal. No other dwellings are in a position to be significantly affected. I therefore conclude that the impact on the neighbours would be acceptable.

Landscaping

- 4.3.8 There is a small conifer to the fore of the development area and a larger one to the rear which could potentially be affected by the development, but neither of these is an indigenous species or considered to be of significant amenity value

within the locality to warrant protection by a Tree Preservation Order. There is also a tree of ornamental species in the garden of "Lambourne House" which slightly overhangs the boundary, although this is unlikely to be significantly affected by the proposal, which would be set in approximately 1.7m from that boundary. On balance, therefore, I consider the impact on trees/landscaping to be acceptable.

Ecology

4.3.9 As the development area is already developed, being the site of the existing conservatory and detached garage, I do not consider that there are any ecological impacts to take into account. I have no evidence to suggest that any protected species would be adversely affected by these proposals.

4.4 Conclusion

4.4.1 I have considered all other relevant planning matters, including any raised as a result of public consultation and, taking all of the above into account, conclude that the proposals comply with Development Plan Policy, the aims of the Council's adopted residential extensions guidelines and Central Government Guidance, and that there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal. I therefore recommend that Members grant approval with conditions as set out below.

5.0 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 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 Policies ENV28 & H33 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.