

**East Malling &  
Larkfield**  
Larkfield North

**569755 159519 20 July 2009**

**TM/09/01812/FL**

---

Proposal: Two storey side extension to form 2 bedroom annexe and new single garage to side  
Location: 6 Jerome Road Larkfield Aylesford Kent ME20 6UR  
Applicant: Mr I Dunster

---

**1. Description:**

- 1.1 This proposal involves the construction of a two storey side extension 4.15m in width and running the depth of the house with a pitched roof the same height as the existing house. The extension has been described as an annex and the agent has stated that it would be occupied by elderly relatives.
- 1.2 The existing garage would be removed and a replacement single garage constructed adjoining the extension. The garage would be set back 4.3m from the front of the extension and would incorporate a low pitched roof. Three off street parking places would be provided at the front of the site.

**2. Reason for reporting to Committee:**

- 2.1 The application is being reported at the request of Cllr Thornewell, who has made comments about the potential for a separate dwelling and the effect on the street and open character of the area.

**3. The Site:**

- 3.1 The application site currently forms the side garden of number 6 Jerome Road. The area was originally open from approximately the side wall of the existing house to the road that runs along the flank boundary (Christie Drive), with the area being partially enclosed following permission to construct a fence in 1988. The area is now enclosed by a conifer hedge and a fence. The site slopes down towards the north along Christie Drive, a road that is characterised by single storey bungalows.
- 3.2 The application site forms part of an open plan estate within the urban confines of Larkfield. The existing dwelling and the neighbouring two storey houses form a staggered building line at the entrance to the estate.

**4. Planning History:**

TM/71/11031/OLD Refuse 20 May 1971

Erection of dwellings.

TM/75/10391/FUL Application Withdrawn 21 October 1975

Residential development (171 houses).

TM/82/10922/REM Grant 3 July 1978

Approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline permission TM/74/27 in respect of 118 houses, bungalows, garages (Area 1).

TM/92/00431/FL Grant with Conditions 28 July 1992

Extension to form garage and conversion of existing garage to family room.

TM/08/00432/FL Refuse 11 April 2008

3 bed detached dwelling.

TM/08/02101/FL Refuse 29 August 2008

Proposed dwelling.

TM/08/03009/FL Refuse 11 December 2008

Appeal Dismissed 4 June 2009

Dwelling adjacent to current property.

## **5. Consultees:**

- 5.1 PC: Consider the proposal would still adversely affect the street scene and open plan character of this residential area.
- 5.2 KCC (Highways): No objections as a replacement single garage is proposed and a suitable level of off street parking would be provided to serve the site as a whole. It is recommended that standard safeguarding conditions are attached.
- 5.3 Private Reps: 7/0X/1R/0S. At the time of preparing the report one letter of representation has been received and comments made about the extension not comprising a true annex and the addition being occupied as a separate dwelling. It is also considered that the development will blight this open corner and create an overbearing and claustrophobic feel to the bungalow to the rear due to the difference in levels.

## **6. Determining Issues:**

- 6.1 The application is considered largely in relation to Core Strategy policy CP24 which concerns the need to ensure a high standard of design that should not be detrimental to the built environment. The policy states that new development must

through its siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings.

- 6.2 The site is within the urban confines of Larkfield and as such there is a presumption in favour of new residential development subject to compliance with all relevant policies and subject to matters of detail.
- 6.3 It is also necessary to consider the recent planning history of the site. The site has been subject to previous refusals for a detached two storey, three bedroom house, a three bedroom detached chalet bungalow and a detached bungalow. The last application was also the subject of an appeal which was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. The main consideration in each case was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. With the previous schemes it was noted that the development proposed would differ from surrounding development considerably in terms of its scale and because of its prominent position at the entrance to the estate. It was noted that each of those proposals, in different ways, somewhat would fail to integrate with or complement the neighbouring dwellings and would detract from the overall appearance of the area.
- 6.4 The current application proposes the demolition of the existing garage and construction of an extension 4.15m in width. Adjoining this would be the single garage, giving a combined width of 7.4m from the western side of number 6. The proposed extension would be in the same style as number 6 and from a design point of view there are no objections provided it would be finished in appropriate materials.
- 6.5 It is clear from the submitted plans that the proposed annex could easily be used as a separate self-contained dwelling, as there is no internal link to number 6. Also, in my view, the level of accommodation provided, with no shared facilities, goes beyond that normally associated with an annex. Nevertheless there is, in principle, no policy objection to the creation of a separate dwelling as the site falls within the urban area, where such proposals are acceptable in general terms.
- 6.6 I have noted the concerns that have been expressed about the potential impact on the character of the area. The reasons for refusal of earlier schemes related to the detriment to the character of the street scene and the area as a whole. The current proposal differs from previous schemes by reason of its siting, being attached to number 6. As a result the two storey element would not extend so far into the garden area to the side of number 6 and would not occupy such a prominent position. The extension would have a less dominant appearance and as a result would not have an unduly harmful impact on the open character of the area, such as to justify a reason for refusal, in my view.
- 6.7 The neighbours concerns about impact on their own private amenity have also been given detailed consideration. It is noted that there is a distance of approximately 14.6m from the rear of number 6 to the side boundary with number

2 Christie Drive. Number 2 is set slightly away from the boundary so that there is a distance of at least 16m between the two properties. This distance would remain practically the same with the currently proposed extension. It is noted that this relationship and degree of separation is similar to those found elsewhere in the vicinity of the application site on other neighbouring sites. It is concluded that there would be no undue loss of amenity for the occupants of number 2 Christie Drive such as to justify withholding consent.

6.8 In the light of the above I consider that the current scheme overcomes the previous reasons for refusal that related to the impact on the character of the street scene and the surrounding area and that it is acceptable in terms of policy CP24. I do not believe it necessary to condition the “annex” to be ancillary living accommodation as the proposal could, be occupied as a self-contained dwelling without compromising planning policy. It is therefore recommended that permission is granted.

## **7. Recommendation:**

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Other VALIDATION CHECKLIST dated 20.07.2009, Existing Plans 6-JEROME-ROAD-01 A dated 20.07.2009, Elevations 6-JEROME-ROAD-02 A dated 20.07.2009, Floor Plan 6-JEROME-ROAD-03 A dated 20.07.2009, Elevations 6-JEROME-ROAD-04 A dated 20.07.2009, 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. All materials used externally shall match those of the existing building.

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

3. 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 roof of the building 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 the amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

4. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space. (P004)

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking or garaging of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

5. The garage(s) shown on the submitted plan shall be kept available at all times for the parking of private motor vehicles. (P009)

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking or garaging of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

Contact: Hilary Johnson