



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2019

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday, 25 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/D/19/3234372

15 Maple Avenue, Maidstone, Kent ME16 0DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stuart Clarke against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/501432/FULL, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension, single storey rear extension and replacement detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension, single storey rear extension and replacement detached garage at 15 Maple Avenue, Maidstone, Kent ME16 0DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/501432/FULL, dated 19 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 13-Maple-Avenue-01 Rev A, 13-Maple-Avenue-02 Rev A, 13-Maple-Avenue-03 Rev A and 13-Maple-Avenue-04 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. One of the Council's main objections in the delegated officer report is the apparent lack of *'at least 0.5m of the original sloping roofline on the frontage of the chalet dwelling'* being retained and that this would reduce the dominance of the proposals. However, I observed that the proposal has been designed to reflect what is a common form, design and size of extension on surrounding properties within Maple Avenue and the officer report does not address this

point any further. On my reading, the plans also show a small section of the original gable roof slope being retained due to the extension being set back from the front elevation. This would reflect the appearance of numerous other properties within the street that have been extended in a similar manner.

4. I accept that they would be large additions but they would not be overly dominant and they would reinstate the symmetry with No. 13, which benefits from a similar extension. The fact the eaves of the rear first floor extension would be marginally higher than existing appears to have been done so in order to match the eaves of the 2 small gable features on the side elevation which is visible from the street. Again, this reflects other extensions and this particular element would not be conspicuous and does not indicate to me an extension that would be out of proportion as suggested by the Council.
5. Overall, in the context of a residential street with an overwhelming number of properties benefiting from similar alterations, the proposal would be appropriate in terms of its form, design and appearance and would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the host property or area.
6. For these reasons, the proposal would accord with Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan and the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009 insofar as they require a high quality of design and that residential extensions, amongst other things should be acceptable with regard to scale, form and appearance and the character of the streetscene and/or its context.

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and a condition is required to ensure compliance with the approved plans as this provides clarity. A condition requiring details of the external materials to match existing is also necessary, in order to protect the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR