

**East Malling &
Larkfield**
Larkfield North

569755 159519 13 October 2009

TM/09/02576/FL

Proposal: Part two/part single storey side extension (resubmission)
Location: 6 Jerome Road Larkfield Aylesford Kent ME20 6UR
Applicant: Mr Dunster

1. Description:

1.1 The proposal involves the construction of a part two/part single storey side extension being 3.8m in width and 8.95m in depth. The extension would replace an existing attached garage and the new structure would project approximately 1.2m beyond the front elevation of the dwelling and in line with the existing canopy. A utility room would also be provided at ground floor level with a fifth bedroom and en suite above. Three off street parking spaces would be provided to the front of the site.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

2.1 At the request of a Local Member who considers that, in view of the continuing objections and previous history of refusals and an appeal decision, there should be an opportunity to debate the application at Committee.

3. The Site:

3.1 Number 6 is a detached house set on the north side of Jerome Road within the urban confines of the area. The site forms part of an open plan estate and slopes down slightly from the front towards the bungalows in Christie Drive at the rear. Number 6 and the neighbouring two storey houses form a staggered building line along the Jerome Road frontage.

4. Planning History:

TM/71/11031/OLD Refuse 20 May 1971

Erection of dwellings.

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/88/10087/FUL Grant with Conditions 3 July 1988

Erection of 2 metre high fence within 2 metres of boundary as variation of condition (xii) attached to TM/74/0027.

TM/88/11186/FUL	Grant	19 September 1988
Garden shed to side.		
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 Appeal Dismissed	11 December 2008 4 June 2009
Dwelling adjacent to current property		
TM/09/01812/FL	Refuse	24 August 2009
Two storey side extension to form 2 bedroom annexe and new single garage to side		
TM/09/02368/FL	Awaiting determination	
Move fence from its current location out to the footpath		

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: Strongly object as they consider the proposal will conflict with the openness of the estate on this corner site. They consider that the amended plans do not overcome the previous grounds for refusal.
- 5.2 KCC (Highways) Satisfied that a suitable level of off street parking is to be provided and no objections are raised.
- 5.3 DHH: No objections.
- 5.4 Private Reps: 9/0X/5R/0S. Five letters of representation have been received, including one signed by residents from 9 households. Comments have been made about harm to the open aspect and views of the area and possible future extension or formation of an annex. References have been made to the previous applications and an appeal at the site.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The application is considered mainly 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 As highlighted in previous reports, the site is within the urban confines of Larkfield and as such there is a presumption in favour of new residential development and extensions subject to compliance with all relevant policies and subject to matters of detail.
- 6.3 It is necessary to consider the recent planning history of the site. Number 6 has been the subject of previous refusals firstly for a detached two storey, three bedroom house; secondly for a three bedroom detached chalet bungalow; and thirdly for a detached bungalow. The application for the bungalow was the subject of an appeal which was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. In each of these cases the main consideration was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. With the scheme for the bungalow it was noted that the development 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 the proposals, in different ways, would fail to integrate with or complement the neighbouring dwellings and would detract from the overall appearance of the area.
- 6.4 Earlier this year a fourth application was made to construct a two storey side extension to form a two bedroom annex and a new single garage (TM/09/01812/FL). The annex extension and the garage had a combined width of 7.4m. At the time it was noted that the proposed annex had no internal link to number 6 and as a result could easily be used as a separate self-contained dwelling. The level of accommodation shown, with no shared facilities, appeared to go beyond that normally associated with an annexe. In principle however there was no policy objection to this aspect of the proposal as the site falls within the urban area where the creation of a separate dwelling can be acceptable.
- 6.5 Application TM/09/01812/FL was considered at the planning committee meeting of 20th August and was refused on the basis that it would be out of keeping with the character of the street scene and general open area, by virtue of its position on a prominent corner.
- 6.6 The current scheme differs from the earlier refusals in that it relates to an extension rather than a self-contained unit. The extension would be located on the site of the existing garage. The garage has a width of 4.1m whilst the proposed extension would be 3.8m in width. It is clear therefore that the extension would not project as far into the garden area and therefore would not lead to a loss of openness of this corner plot.

- 6.7 No indication has been given that the current proposal would provide annexe accommodation and in fact it does not appear that this could be achieved as there is no separate staircase shown on the drawings. It is not possible to withhold consent for something that may happen in the future and, moreover, any future changes to the detail of the internal layout would not be subject to control under the Planning Acts.
- 6.8 The continuing concerns of neighbours about the impact upon the character of the area have been noted. The proposed addition would not extend so far into the garden area to the side of number 6 as previous schemes (nor, indeed as much as the existing garage) and as a result would not occupy such a prominent position. The reduced size of the extension would mean that it 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.
- 6.9 I have also considered the comments made by the neighbours about the open nature of the site. The relationship with neighbouring properties and the degree of separation are similar to those found elsewhere in the vicinity on other neighbouring sites. As a result and as with the previous scheme there would be no undue loss of amenity for the occupants of surrounding properties such as to justify withholding consent.
- 6.10 The reduced width and depth of the extension when compared to previous schemes means that there will be no undue harm to the character of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is acceptable in terms of policy CP24 and it is therefore recommended that permission is granted.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Floor Plan 6-JEROME-ROAD-01 A dated 13.10.2009, Elevations 6-JEROME-ROAD-02 A dated 13.10.2009, Floor Plan 6-JEROME-ROAD-03 A dated 13.10.2009, Elevations 6-JEROME-ROAD-04 A dated 13.10.2009, 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 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 or 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.

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

Contact: Hilary Johnson