

- 3.2 The dwelling is a semi-detached two storey gable fronted property with a small pitched roof extension and a lean-to at the rear of the property. The property also has a large garden area to the rear and side/south of the dwelling. Surrounding the boundaries of the property, other than the adjacent semi-detached property, are open fields.
- 3.3 There is an existing vehicular access and car parking space situated to the side of the property. This is concreted and forms direct access off Old Soar Road.

4. Planning History:

TM/90/11552/FUL grant with conditions 22 March 1990

Installation of biological sewage/effluent treatment unit to serve 4 No. existing dwellings.

TM/11/03048/FL Application Withdrawn 3 January 2012

Two storey side and single storey rear extension. Widen access drive - hard standing for on site parking for 2 cars

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: Objection. The Parish Council holds the same view as for the previous application which was withdrawn (TM/11/03048/FL) i.e.: the extension would dominate the current property and constitute overdevelopment of the site. It would be out of keeping with the character of the cottages. The application is therefore inconsistent with Plaxtol Design Statement page 33 (b) 'Extensions should not detract from the original design of the property and not dominate unless the extensions/alterations are believed to be an improvement on the original' and (c) 'The extension should reflect the style, proportions and character of the existing building ...' This guidance is re-iterated in the recently published Planning Review Document (page 9).
- 5.2 KCC (Highways): I confirm I have no objection to this application. If approved however the applicant will need to formally approach the highway authority with respect to the proposed extended crossover on to the highway. Provision of measures to adequately dispose of surface water runoff may need to be included with these proposals at this location.
- 5.3 Private Representations: 4/4R/0X/0S + Site and Press Notice: 4 Objections have been received as follows:
- The pair of cottages will be spoilt by this development.
 - The proposed design is too big, too high and out of character.
 - Views and light to the rear of the adjoining property could be affected.

- The proposed extension is overbearing.
- This is overdevelopment of the site.
- The pair of properties will be completely unbalanced.
- The original character of the building will be lost.
- The development does not comply with the Plaxtol Village Design Statement.
- The proposed extension is too big and excessive for this property.

6. Determining Issues:

6.1 The relevant planning policies in the determination of this application are:

Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy:

- CP1: Sustainable Development
- CP3: Metropolitan Green Belt
- CP14: Development in the Countryside
- CP24: Achieving a High Quality Environment

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document:

- SQ1: Landscape and Townscape Protection and Enhancement
- DC6: Rural Lanes

Saved Policies of the Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan:

- P4/12 Residential Extensions

Also relevant is national planning guidance in PPG2: Green Belts.

- 6.2 At the time of writing this report, the new National Planning Policy Framework was not yet published. An update to the national planning policy situation as it affects this case will be included in a supplementary report.
- 6.3 Policy CP1 requires new development to result in a high quality sustainable environment and policy CP 24 requires development proposals to be of a high quality and be well designed to respect the site and its surroundings in terms of its scale, layout, siting, character and appearance.

- 6.4 Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP and policy SQ1 of the MDEDPD also require development to respect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and to protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area, respectively.
- 6.5 Policy CP3 allocates areas within the Borough as MGB where National Green Belt policy will apply. Policy CP14 relating to development in the countryside and allows appropriate extensions to an existing dwelling. However, within the Green Belt, inappropriate development which is otherwise acceptable in respect to this policy will still need to be justified by very special circumstances.
- 6.6 The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the MGB and countryside, appearance and size of the dwelling, character of the conservation area and any impact on neighbouring properties amenities.
- 6.7 The existing dwelling is in its original form, other than a rear lean-to extension. This rear extension is to be demolished to accommodate the extensions now proposed. The original building is a modest 80sqm arranged over 2 floors. The proposed extensions add 68.7sqm. Therefore, I consider the proposal would represent inappropriate development in terms of Green Belt policy. As such, very special circumstances need to be justified.
- 6.8 However, this is a case where the host dwelling is relatively small and there is no upstairs bathroom. The addition of extensions to add modern day facilities to a small host dwelling tends to distort the relative size of an extension considered as a percentage rather than in absolute terms.
- 6.9 The proposed side extension is of a traditional form and would provide a satisfactory compact addition to the original building. The proposed two storey element would appear subservient to the main building and the revised scheme would now appear as a secondary extension to the side of the dwelling. The two storey side extension is designed to match the gable end of the host dwelling but at a reduced eaves and ridge height from the original dwelling house. I consider that this element would appear sufficiently subservient to the host building. Consequently, the size, scale and bulk of the proposed extension has been sufficiently reduced, from the original proposal, and would not now harm the appearance of the dwelling. The proposed side extension therefore complies with policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS, policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD and saved policy P4/12 of the Local Plan.
- 6.10 For the above reasons, I also consider that the proposal is in accordance with guidance in the Plaxtol Village Design Statement and its supporting documents.
- 6.11 The proposed two storey side extension also projects beyond the original rear elevation of the dwelling by 2.6 metres, at first floor level. This limited projection therefore has a limited visual impact on the immediate locality. In addition, due to

being set back from the joint boundary it also results in a limited impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining dwelling. This is in accordance with policy CP24 of the TMBCS and saved policy P4/12 of the TMBLP.

- 6.12 The proposed single storey rear extension is also limited in scale, sympathetic in its form and provides a simple sloping roof. This element largely replaces an existing lean to extension at the rear of the property and is of the same depth. The adjoining dwelling also has an existing single storey rear extension, adjacent to the boundary. Given the scale and design, I do not consider that the proposed extension and its projection would harm the outlook from the rear of the neighbouring dwelling or the garden. Again, this element of the proposal is in accordance in guidance in CP24 of the TMBCS and saved policy P4/12 of the TMBLP.
- 6.13 There are no first floor windows proposed within the side flank elevation of the two storey extension that faces the adjoining house. A rooflight is proposed within the roof slope of the single storey rear extension. I therefore do not consider the proposal would harm neighbouring privacy and accords with policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS and saved policy P4/12 of the TMBLP.
- 6.14 For the above reasons, I am also of the opinion that the proposed development is acceptable within a conservation area and its scale and design will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The design of the extension is in keeping with the original dwelling and complements its original features and form. Consequently, the proposal does not have a detrimental impact on the conservation area and is in line with policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD.
- 6.15 The proposal would add an extra bedroom creating a 3 bedroom house. Therefore 2 on-site car parking spaces would be required, as per the Kent Design IGN3 residential parking standards. One space is currently provided for the dwelling on a concrete area to the front of the site, a further two spaces are now proposed. KCC Highways have raised no objection to the proposed car parking area.
- 6.16 Consequently, there is no objection to the proposed car parking area but there is a hedge that runs along the frontage of the application site, which is a familiar feature along this rural lane. Limited information has been submitted with this application in terms of the formation of this parking area. As a result, further details of the proposed car parking area need to be submitted for approval to ensure the rural character of the road is maintained.
- 6.17 In light of the proposal's limited impact on the Green Belt, and on the visual amenity and character of the countryside and conservation area, I recommend that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Approve Planning Permission** in accordance with Block Plan dated 09.02.2012, Existing + Proposed Plans and Elevations 02/12/03 dated 09.02.2012, Location Plan dated 09.02.2012, Design and Access Statement dated 09.02.2012, subject to:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. No development shall take place until details and samples of materials to be used externally have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the visual amenity of the locality.

3. The external brickwork shall be constructed to show a bond to match the existing brickwork.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or visual amenity of the locality.

4. No development shall take place until details of any joinery to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or visual amenity of the locality.

5. No development shall take place until details of the eaves, ridge and verge have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall be carried out in strict accordance with those details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or visual amenity of the locality.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the northern elevation of the building other than as hereby approved, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control any such further development in the interests of amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

7. No development shall take place until details of the construction, surfacing and drainage of the vehicle parking area, to include full details of any retaining walls and boundary treatment as may be required and proposed replacement landscaping, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the parking area is brought into use and shall be so retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a finish to the parking area consistent with the character and appearance of the locality.

Informatives:

- 1 With regard to the construction of a vehicular crossing, the applicant is asked to consult The Community Delivery Manager, Kent County Council, Kent Highway Services, Double Day House, St Michaels Close, Aylesford Tel: 08458 247 800.

Contact: Lucinda Green