

APPLICATION: MA/12/1575 Date: 29 August 2012 Received: 29 August 2012

APPLICANT: Mr N Newton

LOCATION: EAST FIELD, MAIDSTONE ROAD, MARDEN, TONBRIDGE, KENT,
TN12 9AE

PARISH: Marden

PROPOSAL: Single storey side extension as shown on drawing numbers
1244NN-PP-02, 1244NN-PP-03, 1244NN-PP-05, 1244NN-PP-06,
1244NN-PP-07 & 1244NN-PP-08 received on 29/08/12.

AGENDA DATE: 21st February 2013

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.

1. POLICIES

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ENV28, H33
- South East Plan 2009: CC1, CC2, CC4, CC6, C4
- Government Policy: The National Planning Policy Framework.
- Other: Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted May 2009).

2. HISTORY

MA/10/2124	Conversion of existing roof void to create habitable rooms including 1 high level roof light to each side elevation and 3 roof lights to rear elevation – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
MA/01/0300	Erection of 1 detached dwelling with access onto Maidstone Road (resubmission of MA/00/2031) – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
MA/00/2031	Erection of 1 detached dwelling with access onto Maidstone Road – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

3. CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 **Marden Parish Council** wish to see the application refused due to the adverse impact on the existing dwelling caused by the pattern, size, form and appearance of the proposed extension.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 No representations have been received from local residents.

5. CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

- 5.1.1 This application relates to a substantial, detached, two-storey dwelling in Marden. It has red brick elevations with some first floor tile-hanging and a plain tiled roof.
- 5.1.2 It was constructed as a back-land development on land adjoining 'Little Southons' (to the south) under planning permission MA/01/0300. All permitted development rights for extensions/alterations to the dwelling, erection of outbuildings within its curtilage and erection of fencing remain intact.
- 5.1.3 Although on the Local Plan proposals map the site falls just outside of the Marden village envelope and is therefore classed as being in open countryside, in reality the property feels very much a part of Marden village, with access off of Maidstone Road between 'Vinery House' and 4 Princes Villas (both of which fall within the settlement boundary), plus it is seen as being part of the village and in conjunction with dwellings located inside the settlement boundary when viewed from the field to the rear, which is owned by Marden Parish Council.

5.2 Proposal

- 5.2.1 Planning permission is sought to erect a single storey side extension to form a garden room.
- 5.2.2 This would be positioned on the north side of the dwelling and attached to its north-east corner by way of a flat-roofed link with footprint of 2.4m x 2.7m approximately. The main part of the extension would have a footprint of approximately 9.9m wide by 5.6m deep and would generally stand 2.8m high with a parapet wall on the northern and western sides. The flat roof would feature two lantern roof lights, and the rear (east) elevation two sets of six-panel sliding glass doors, with a further three-panel set on the link section.

5.2.3 The bricks used would match those of the existing dwelling.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 Modest extensions to existing dwellings are permissible under Local Plan Policy H33 provided that they are acceptable in terms of their scale, design and impact on the form of the host dwelling, their impact on the surrounding area and their impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. These matters will now be considered below.

5.4 Visual Impact

5.4.1 The proposed extension would not have any significant visual impact on the surrounding area.

5.4.2 The application building is set back approximately 62m from Maidstone Road at the end of a private drive and behind other properties on the road frontage, such that only the first floor is really visible, at a distance, in public views. In addition, the extension would be set back approximately 9m from the front elevation and has been designed with a flat/parapet roof, and consequently I do not consider that it would be visible in public views from Maidstone Road or have any significant impact on the character of the building as seen from there.

5.4.3 The railway line, to the north, is in a cutting at this point, so would not afford public views of the site, plus the northern boundary is well-vegetated and provides ample screening in any case.

5.4.4 The field to the rear of the property is understood to be owned by Marden Parish Council. The applicant states that it was purchased from a former owner of 'Little Southons' in 2006/7, but no planning permission has ever been granted for its use as an area of public open space as opposed to an extension of the neighbouring garden, and that it has restricted access, including no dogs, as defined by the Parish Council. I have checked the planning history and can confirm that no such planning permission has been granted. This field is the only "public" vantage point from which the extension would be visible. The design of the extension is not considered to be good. Nevertheless, although it would almost be the same width as the host building, the extension would still appear clearly subordinate due to its single storey nature and the considerable amount of glazing on the east-facing elevation which would give it a less solid, more light-weight appearance. In addition, the link element would be set in 2.6m from the main rear wall of the extension, which would help create a visual break with the dwelling and provide an element of relief between the two built forms. Moreover, I do not consider the pattern of glazing on this elevation to be out of keeping with the host building, which itself exhibits two sets of four-panel,

full-height glazing and a fully-glazed conservatory across its rear elevation. In view of these points, despite its design, I do not consider that the extension would cause any material harm to the original form or character of the host dwelling or its surroundings.

5.4.5 It is also noted that the property has its permitted development rights intact and has not previously been extended. This means that, in terms of the fall-back position, a building of the same, or even greater, footprint and only marginally reduced height could be achieved in this position without the need for planning permission simply by omitting a link to the house. It also means that the applicant could remove the existing low wooden criss-cross fencing on the rear boundary and, without planning permission, erect a 2m high solid fence that would prevent views from the "public" vantage point of the field.

5.4.6 The building is not listed and does not fall within a particularly sensitive location such as a conservation area or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I believe the extension would be of an appropriately subordinate scale in relation to the substantial host building and, on considering the points set out in the preceding paragraphs, do not consider that it would cause material harm to its form or character or the character and appearance of the surroundings sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission that could be sustained at appeal. I also note that a very similar development could be achieved as permitted development. On balance, therefore, I find the visual impact of the proposal to be acceptable.

5.5 Residential Amenity

5.5.1 The extension would be in the region of 40m from 'Southon House' and 'Vinery House' (to the west), and in the case of the latter would be screened by the applicant's own pitched-roofed double garage. It would also be screened from 'Little Southons' (to the south) by the application dwelling. In these circumstances, and in view of its relatively low height, I do not consider that there would be any significantly detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight, sunlight, privacy or outlook.

5.6 Highways

5.6.1 The development would not affect access or parking arrangements at the property, nor generate a need for additional parking spaces.

5.7 Landscaping

5.7.1 The proposed location of the extension is predominantly laid to lawn, with some encroachment into an existing shrub bed. The loss of vegetation would be

minimal, and the remainder of the large garden is well-planted. No significant trees would be affected.

5.8 Other Matters

- 5.8.1 In view of the proximity to the house, the close-cropped lawn and the domestic nature of the planting that would be affected, I do not consider that there would be any significant impact on ecology, nor that any ecological measures will be necessary.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Taking all of the above into account, I conclude that the proposal complies 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 planning permission subject to the conditions set out below.

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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing numbers 1244NN-PP-02, 1244NN-PP-03, 1244NN-PP-05, 1244NN-PP-06, 1244NN-PP-07 & 1244NN-PP-08 received on 29/08/12;

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies ENV28 & H33 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000 and C4 of The South East Plan RSS 2009.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development 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 and C4 of The South East Plan RSS 2009.

Note to applicant:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. MBC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.

Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.

As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

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 the South East Plan 2009) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.