
Kings Hill **566971 155029** **20.04.2005** **TM/05/01088/FL**
Kings Hill

Proposal: Extension
Location: 11 Mitchell Road Kings Hill West Malling Kent ME19 4RF
Applicant: Mr Shannon

1. Description:

- 1.1 The proposal is for a very similar side extension to one that was refused planning permission by the Area 2 Planning Committee on 15 September 2004 under ref. TM/04/00650/FL. The only readily apparent differences between this and the last scheme relate to the size and position of windows in the proposed extension. The ground floor of the extension would also be sub-divided between a double garage to the front and a playroom to the rear. The previous scheme contained a workshop to the rear of the garage. 2 additional bedrooms would occupy the first floor of the extension. One of the existing bedrooms would become, in part, an en-suite with the remainder becoming a corridor serving the two additional bedrooms.
- 1.2 The applicant has now also confirmed that he will soon be taking care of an elderly relative who has multifocal osteoarthritis, who would occupy one of the existing bedrooms at first floor level. The applicant has verbally confirmed that the relative is his mother.
- 1.3 The previous scheme was refused permission on the following grounds:
- "The proposed extension, would, by virtue of its scale, bulk, form and design, appear out of keeping with the host property and would detract from the character and visual amenities of the streetscene. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policy P4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local plan 1998."*

2. The Site:

- 2.1 The site lies within the settlement confines of Kings Hill on the west side of Mitchell Road. The site is bounded by other residential properties.

3. Planning History:

- 3.1 TM/04/00650/FL Refused 15.09.2005
Demolition of existing double garage and erection of side extension with garage on ground floor.

4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: No objections.

4.2 KCC (Highways): In this instance, three car parking spaces can be provided to accord with current standards. I therefore raise no objections to this application.

4.3 Private reps: 8/0X/0S/5R. The reasons for objecting are:

- The application is not materially different to the one refused permission under TM/04/00650/FL.
- The proposal would have a negative impact upon the character of the neighbourhood.
- Additional overlooking of neighbouring gardens.
- The house would have an overbearing presence in the street due to the size of the proposed extension.

5. Determining Issues:

5.1 The main determining issues with this application are whether the amendments to the design of the building and the need to care for the applicant's mother overcome/outweigh the previous reason to refuse permission for the demolition of the garage and construction of a two storey side extension to this property.

5.2 As has been stated in paragraph 1.1 of this report, the proposed development is remarkably similar in terms of its size, form and design as that which was previously refused permission under TM/04/00650/FL. The main physical differences relate to the size of the windows on the front elevation and the inclusion of French doors and a Juliet balcony at first floor level on the north east elevation of the extension. These very minor physical alterations are superficial and do not, in my opinion address the reason why permission was previously refused.

5.3 I note that the applicant will shortly be caring for his mother who has multifocal osteoarthritis. However, personal reasons such as this very rarely outweigh a planning objection to a proposed development. Furthermore, the dwelling is a generously sized four bedroom house that currently provides a reasonable level of accommodation. It is highly likely that due to the size of the existing property and its plot that further accommodation could indeed be provided for the applicant's mother that would not entail introducing such a large amount of additional bulk to the building. A single storey rear extension could, I believe, be provided that meets both the applicant's and planning requirements. I, therefore, do not consider that the personal circumstances of the applicant should outweigh the harm caused to the character of the street scene by this proposal.

5.4 The proposal also now includes a first floor window and Juliet balcony that would be situated in the north east elevation of the extension. This did not form part of the previous proposal and would look towards the rear garden of no 12 Mitchell

Road. However, due the layout/orientation of the application site and no.12, and the distance between these two properties, I do not consider that this window would cause an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.

Similarly, like the previous scheme the other first floor windows would not cause additional loss of privacy to the other neighbouring residential properties.

5.5 The proposal would not change the level of car parking within the site. Kent Highways has not objected to this proposal.

5.6 In light of the above, I recommend that planning permission be refused for the same reason as before.

6. Recommendation:

6.1 **Refuse Planning Permission** as detailed in letters dated 21.03.2005 and 24.03.2005, plan nos. RS/2005/3, 4, 5 and site location plans date stamped 06.04.2005, for the following reason:

1 The proposed extension would, by virtue of its scale, bulk, form and design, appear out of keeping with the host property and would detract from the character and visual amenities of the streetscene. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policy P4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998.

Contact: Matthew Broome