

REFERENCE NO - 19/504088/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing garage. Erection of two storey side extension.		
ADDRESS 71 Roseleigh Avenue, Maidstone, Kent, ME16 0AS		
RECOMMENDATION GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposed development accords with the policies and guidelines relating to domestic extensions.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Applicant is an employee at Maidstone Borough Council therefore the decision cannot be made under delegated powers.		
WARD Allington	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL N/A	APPLICANT Mr P Leeves AGENT Mr Desden Harman
TARGET DECISION DATE 09.10.2019		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 10.09.2019

Relevant Planning History

95/0858 - Erection of 18 no. detached houses with garages

MAIN REPORT

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 The application site comprises a detached 2-storey house located to the south of Roseleigh Avenue. The dwelling is part of a housing development that was approved in 1995 and consists of 18 detached dwelling of various, modern designs. The southern boundary of the application site where the extension is proposed is defined by trees and a close-boarded fence and beyond this is a rear access that serves Cades Place.

2. PROPOSAL

2.01 The application seeks permission to add a two storey side extension to the southern elevation of the existing property. The extension will extend the width of the property by 4.3 metres; it will have a depth of 8.4 metres and will be set in from the principle elevation and original rear elevation by 0.6 metres. The eaves height of the two storey side extension will be 4.85 metres with an overall height of 8.95 metres with a gable roof that will be set down from the original apex by 0.3 metres. Internally, the proposal will provide a living room on the ground floor and two bedrooms at first floor. The proposal seeks to increase the amount of bedrooms from four to five. There will be no proposed windows in the side elevation, only in the front and rear elevation including the installation of bi-fold doors at ground floor.

2.02 The external finishes of the proposal will match the materials used in the existing building.

3. POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017:

DM1 – Principles of good design

DM9 - Residential extensions, conversions and redevelopment within the built up area.

SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006)

Maidstone Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2009)

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

Local Residents:

- 4.01 No representations have been received from local residents as a result of the consultation process.

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.01 No consultation responses have been received as a result of the consultation process.

6. APPRAISAL

Main Issues

- 6.01 The key issues for consideration relate to:
- Design and visual impact of the proposal
 - The potential impact upon the amenities of neighbouring householders.

Design and visual impact

- 6.02 Policy DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2017) is supportive of extensions to dwellings within urban areas provided that the scale, height, form and appearance and siting of the proposal would fit unobtrusively within the existing building and the character of the street scene/or its context. In advising on side extensions, the Residential Extensions SPD (2009) notes that in a street of traditional detached and semi-detached houses, the infilling of the spaces between with two storey extensions could create a terraced appearance at odds with the rhythm of the street scene when the gaps, often with associated landscaping or allowing longer views are important elements. A side extension built flush with the existing front elevation of the house may also affect the symmetry of a pair of semi-detached properties with adverse impact on the street scene.
- 6.03 As the extension is proposed on the southern elevation of the application site where there is no properties in its immediate vicinity, the proposal would not result in a terraced appearance and would not destroy the rhythm of the street scene. Roseleigh Avenue does not have a strong building pattern due to the various properties orientation, siting and various designs.

- 6.04 The proposed two storey side extension has been designed to be proportionate to the existing dwelling and will incorporate a roof form that is complimentary to the original house with a height that is 0.3 metres lower than the ridge line of the main property. As well as the lower roof, the extension will be set back from the principle elevation and the rear elevation which results in a subordinate extension that will not overwhelm or destroy the main dwelling.
- 6.05 The exterior surfaces will be finished in materials matching the existing house and windows will be installed in the front and rear elevations as well as bi-fold doors in the ground floor rear elevation. I do not consider the proposed extension including the windows and bi-fold doors to dominate the appearance of the dwelling and therefore, in my view of these factors, the proposal will appear appropriate in its setting and will not detract from the visual qualities or general character of the street scene or the dwelling itself.

Impact on neighbouring amenities

- 6.06 Policy DM9 specifically states that domestic extensions will be supported provided that the privacy, daylight, sunlight and maintenance of a pleasant outlook of the adjoining residents would be safeguarded. This requirement is also observed in the Residential Extensions SPD (2009) where it is noted that the design of domestic alterations should not result in windows that directly overlook the windows or private amenity spaces of any adjoining properties and should also respect daylight, sunlight and outlook.
- 6.07 In terms of the two storey side extension, due to the siting and orientation of the application site the proposal would not result in any adverse impacts in terms of loss of daylight or outlook in relation to the neighbouring property to the north.
- 6.08 In regards to the properties in Cades Place, the proposal would be approximately 7 metres away from the start of the rear gardens at the nearest point. The southern boundary of the application site has an existing close boarded fence and trees and beyond that, a rear access way that serves the properties in Cades Place. Due to these various elements, I do not consider the proposal to have a detrimental impact in terms of outlook or loss of daylight for the properties in Cades Place.

Other Matters

- 6.09 KCC Highways state within their residential parking standards that a property with 4+ bedrooms should be allocated at least 2 independently accessible spaces within a suburban area. I would consider the amount of space retained on the private forecourt to accommodate 2+ cars and would therefore be in accordance with policy DM9 and KCC Highways recommendation for properties of this size.
- 6.10 There are three Trees with a Preservation Order at the application site. One is located east of the dwelling approximately 10 metres away from the proposed development. The other two trees are located to the west of dwelling, both are approximately 15 metres away from the development therefore, I would consider the proposal to be sufficiently set away from the TPO trees to not result in damage or future pressure to trim back the trees. An informal discussion with the Landscape and Tree officer confirms that it is not necessary to place a condition on the permission to protect the TPO trees due to the distance from the trees to the development and the existing hardstanding that surrounds the dwelling.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.01 The above assessments indicate that the proposed two storey side extension and alterations to 71 Roseleigh Avenue accord with the relevant policies and guidelines on residential extensions. There have been no objections from the neighbouring

householders or any consultees. On balance, this is an acceptable development and approval is therefore recommended subject to conditions.

8. 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/drawings:

Householder Application

19056PL-PP-S-(13)01 REV01 – Site location plans
19056PL-PP-E-(01)01 REV – Existing first floor plans
19056PL-PP-E-(01)00 REV – Existing ground floor plans
19056PL-PP-S-(13)02 REV02 – Existing block plan
19056PL-PP-E-(02)04 REV – Existing west elevations
19056PL-PP-E-(02)02 REV – Existing east elevations
19056PL-PP-E-(02)01 REV – Existing north elevations
19056PL-PP-E-(01)02 REV – Existing roof plan
19056PL-PP-E-(02)03 REV – Existing south elevations
19056PL-PP-P-(03)00 REV – Proposed ground floor
19056PL-PP-P-(03)01 REV – Proposed first floor plan
19056PL-PP-P-(03)02 REV – Proposed roof plan
19056PL-PP-P-(04)01 REV – Proposed north elevation
19056PL-PP-S-(13)03 REV03 – Proposed block plan
19056PL-PP-P-(04)02 REV – Proposed east elevation
19056PL-PP-P-(04)03 REV – Proposed south elevation
19056PL-PP-P-(04)04 REV – Proposed west elevation

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the area.

- 3) The external facing materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

INFORMATIVES

No relevant informatives

Case Officer: Sophie Bowden