
Plaxtol Borough Green And Long Mill	560159 154239	27.09.2005	TM/05/02981/FL
--	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

Proposal: First floor extension, roof alterations and new 2 car detached garage (including demolition of existing) - Resubmission of TM/05/01558/FL (demolition of existing and replacement double garage)

Location: Little Yopps Yopps Green Plaxtol Sevenoaks Kent TN15 0PY
Applicant: Mr + Mrs R Simpson

1. Description:

- 1.1 The proposal is for the extension of Little Yopps at first floor level to the front elevation (over a single storey flat roof), and roof extensions including a pitched roof over an existing two storey flat roof at the rear. A replacement for the existing flat roof double garage is also proposed with a new siting further to the rear of the dwelling with the addition of a pitched roof.
- 1.2 An appeal has been lodged against non-determination of the application. Members must therefore assess the application and conclude what their decision would have been, if the decision could be made at APC2.

2. The Site:

- 2.1 The property as a large square plot with access off Yopps Green, Plaxtol. The dwelling sits relatively centrally within its curtilage. The plot is well screened on all elevations by way of mature boundary planting.
- 2.2 There is an existing flat roof garage to the northwest of the dwelling on the northern boundary. The site has a gravel parking and turning area to the east of the dwelling.

3. Planning History:

- 3.1 TM/05/01558/FL Refused 12.07.2005
First floor extension, roof alterations, demolition of existing and replacement double garage.
- 3.2 TM/97/00409/RD Granted 18.04.01997
Details of roof covering, being cedar shingles to match the existing roof, submitted pursuant to condition 3 of consent ref: TM/94/00767 (two storey rear extension).
- 3.3 TM/94/00767/FL Granted with Conditions 11.08.1994
Erection of two storey rear extension and change of roof tiles to remainder of house.

- 3.4 MK/4/59/714B Granted with Conditions 22.10.1959
Extension to garage.
- 3.5 MK/4/57/65 Granted with Conditions 21.02.1957
Extension of hall and bedroom.
- 3.6 MK/4/55/223 Granted with Conditions 19.05.1955
Addition of sun lounge to 'Little Yopps'.

4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: No objection – please can local materials be used where possible?
- 4.2 KCC (Highways): No objection.
- 4.3 Private Reps (4/0X/0R/0S + Article 8 Notice): No response.

5. Determining Issues:

- 5.1 The site lies within the MGB, the AONB and a SLA. The main determining issues within the case are whether the proposal is “appropriate development” in the context of PPG2 and whether the development would cause harm to the openness and functioning of the MGB, the natural beauty or special character of the area.
- 5.2 PPG2 (Greenbelts) gives provision for extension to a residential dwelling provided it is limited or modest and would not result in a disproportionate extension in relation to the *original* dwellinghouse i.e. the dwellinghouse before any extensions. Therefore, the proposed extension must be assessed on this aspect by adding to earlier extensions to establish acceptability or in respect of the total scale of extensions compared to the 'original dwelling'. This latest proposed development amounts to 'inappropriate development'. Inappropriate development is according to PPG2, damaging in its own right, and should be allowed only if 'very special circumstances' have been advanced that justify setting aside PPG2. In this case no such matters have been promoted except that the building would be 'tidied-up' by the roofing of some flat roofs.
- 5.3 Policy P3/5 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998 (TMBLP), along with policy ENV3 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996 (KSP) seek to protect the AONB from development which may cause harm to the natural beauty of the area.
- 5.4 Policy P3/6 of the TMBLP and ENV4 of the KSP seeks to ensure the long-term protection of the landscape and proposals within a SLA must conserve or enhance the landscape in terms of natural beauty.
- 5.5 The property has been extended by four separate additions since 1948 as outlined within the planning history. The current extensions have resulted in a volume increase of approximately 48%. The proposed extensions (offering up the existing garage volume) would result in a cumulative volume increase of approximately

60%. However other factors, in this case the masking of flat roofs, must also be part of the consideration.

- 5.6 In this case the revisions since the refusal of July 2005 have reduced the bulk somewhat, but still provide for significant impact as a result of the increased roof bulk. In my view the tidying up of the flat roofs, is not sufficiently beneficial a 'very special circumstance' to justify this further 'inappropriate development'.
- 5.7 The proposal would not result in harm to residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy or light in my view.
- 5.8 The proposal would not result in harm to highway issues and accordingly, the KCC Highways manager raises no objection.
- 5.9 In terms of design and external appearance, the proposal would not in my opinion be out of character with the main dwellinghouse, due to the variation of styles and proportions already present on the dwelling. In fact, the new roof would, in places result in an improvement to the design of the roof by providing uniformity and the making of a couple of flat roofs. This would also aid the appearance in this area designated for landscape reasons, but as the site is not widely visible the benefits will not be great. I do not think that the landscape considerations overrides the MGB policy considerations.
- 5.10 Taking all factors into account I feel that in this latest scheme, the visual betterment in design terms still does not, override the strong policy objections against 'inappropriate development' and does not, in my opinion, result in a case of very special circumstances.

6. Recommendation:

- 6.1 **Refuse Planning Permission**, as detailed in letter and schedule of volumes dated 26.09.2005, site location plan date stamped 27.09.2005 and drawing numbers YOP/2/1, 3, 5A, 6, 7, 8 and 9.
- 1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Greenbelt where residential extensions must respect the original dwellinghouse and not result in disproportionate additions. The proposed extension by way of its scale and size and when taken in conjunction with the previous extensions to the house, constitutes inappropriate development within the Metropolitan Greenbelt and no very special circumstances have been put forward in justification. The application is therefore contrary to Policy MGB3 and RS5 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996 and in turn Policy SS9 and HP6 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan (Deposit September 2003). The proposal is also contrary to Policy P2/16 and P6/10 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan and Planning Policy Guidance 2 (Green Belts).

- 2 The proposal does not conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the area or landscape character or the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies P3/5 and P3/6 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998, policies ENV3 and ENV4 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996 and in turn policies E4 and E5 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan (Deposit September 2003).

Contact: Lucy Stainton