

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 15/506728/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of first floor extension over existing garage with insertion of rooflights, erection of two storey rear extension and changes to fenestration.		
ADDRESS 11 Leet Close Eastchurch Kent ME12 4EE		
RECOMMENDATION - Approve		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The application site is within the built up area boundary where the principle of development is accepted and does not in my view give rise to significant harm to visual or residential amenities.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Recommendation contrary to Parish Council view.		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr Paul Faies AGENT Britch & Associates Ltd.
DECISION DUE DATE 18/12/15	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 23/11/15	

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 No.11 Leet Close is a large detached property situated on a substantial plot within the built up area boundary. The surrounding properties are also large detached dwellings situated on large plots.
- 1.02 The host property has an attached double garage projecting from the front of the property. The remainder of the frontage is made up of a large area of hardstanding and also a landscaped garden.
- 1.03 The property has private amenity space to the rear which measures approximately 22m in depth and 17m in width. To the rear of the property is undeveloped woodland.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for a first floor extension above the garage, a full width two storey rear extension and an additional first floor window in both flank elevations, each serving an en-suite bathroom.
- 2.02 The first floor extension above the garage would have a pitched roof with a front facing, pitched roof dormer window. It would measure 7.5m in depth matching the projection of the garage and would be 6.3m to the ridgeline and 3.2m to the eaves.
- 2.03 The two storey rear extension would measure 3m in depth with a width of 12m, slightly below the width of existing dwelling. The extension would have an M shaped pitched roof, with twin hipped roofs each with the ridgeline turned 90 degrees from the ridgeline of the main dwelling. The rear extension would measure 5m to the eaves and 7.8m in overall height.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.01 Potential Archaeological Importance

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Development Plan: Saved policies E1, E19 and E24 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008

4.02 Adopted SPG entitled “Designing an Extension - A Guide for Householders”, was adopted by the Council in 1993 after a period of consultation with the public, local and national consultees, and is specifically referred to in the supporting text for saved Policy E24 of the Local Plan. It therefore remains a material consideration to be afforded substantial weight in the decision making process.

4.03 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.04 The NPPF was released on 27th March 2012 with immediate effect, however, para 214 states “that for 12 months from this publication date, decision-makers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework.”

4.05 The 12 month period noted above has now expired, as such, it is necessary for a review of the consistency between the policies contained within the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 and the NPPF.

4.06 This has been carried out in the form of a report agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel on 12 December 2012. Saved policies E1, E19 and E24 are considered to accord with the NPPF for the purposes of determining this application and as such, these policies can still be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.01 Surrounding properties were sent a consultation letter and a site notice was displayed. Two responses have been received from the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, objecting to the application on the following summarised grounds:

- The proposed design will look out of character with the existing properties in Leet Close and is the same design as the properties being built phase 2 and 3 of Kingborough Manor;
- The extension and flank windows will lead to a loss of privacy for residents of neighbouring properties;
- The extension will cause overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring properties;
- The design of the property will put the neighbouring properties at a security risk as the proposal site is more identifiable;
- Lights from the first floor side window will shine into the neighbouring living room;
- Outbuildings have been erected constituting a loss of garden space and no more than half the area of land around the original dwelling should be built upon;
- The properties, when sold, were advertised as ‘Executive homes’ and the proposal will significantly alter the appearance of an ‘Executive Close’.
- The proposal would place an additional strain upon utilities such as water / sewerage.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Eastchurch Parish Council Planning Committee objects to this application with the following observations:

“There is concern with the size of the extension and the overshadowing of other properties. Side windows would overlook other properties.

The Estate has been well designed and the proposed, planned development is out of keeping with this phase of the property building on the estate, as had originally been agreed by the Planning Authority.”

- 6.02 The County Archaeological Officer confirms that no archaeological measures are required in connection with the proposal

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 Application papers and correspondence relating to planning reference 15/506728/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

The application site is located within the built up area boundary and as such the principle of development is accepted. The main considerations in this case concern the impact upon residential and visual amenities.

Residential Amenity

- 8.01 It is firstly noted that the host and surrounding properties are large detached dwellings with a generous frontage and plentiful private amenity space to the rear. There is a gap of 5m between the flank wall of the host property and No.12 and a gap of 7m to No.10.
- 8.02 The proposed rear extension projects by 3m at two storey level. The result of this would be that the extension would project at two storey level 5m past the existing rear wall of No.12, however, due to the gap of 5m between the properties I do not consider that this would lead to an unacceptably overbearing proposal. Furthermore, I note that the host property is located to the north of No.12 and as such do not believe that this element of the proposal would lead to a loss of sunlight received by this dwelling.
- 8.03 On the opposite side, even taking into consideration the rear extension, the rear wall of No.10 would still project 1m beyond the host property. When this is combined with the gap between the properties I take the view that the rear extension would have an extremely limited impact upon the residential amenities of this adjacent property. I note comments that have been made regarding loss of privacy but am of the opinion that the extension would afford little additional views than the first floor windows that are already in existence on the rear of the property.
- 8.04 The application also proposes a first floor extension above the existing garage with a front facing pitched roof dormer. The existing garage measures 4.2m in height and the extension will increase the height to 6.3m. I note that No.12 has flank windows in the side elevation facing towards the extension. However, as stated above, the host property is to the north of No.12 and combining this with the separation distance

between the properties and that the roof slopes away from No.12 I do not consider that the extension above the garage would cause an unacceptable loss of light. On the opposite side due to the siting of the properties, the first floor extension above the garage would be approximately 17m away from the closest point of No.10. As such I take the view that this element of the proposal would have a negligible impact upon the residential amenities of this property.

- 8.05 The proposal also introduces an additional flank window on each side elevation at first floor level. The proposed floorplan shows that these windows will serve en-suite bathrooms. As such, although concern has been raised regarding these windows resulting in a loss of privacy, they would be expected to be obscure glazed. To ensure this, and to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers I have included a condition which requires these windows to be obscure glazed and to be maintain as such in perpetuity. As such I believe the introduction of these flank windows is acceptable.

Visual Amenity

- 8.06 There has been some concern raised regarding the design of the proposal and that it would look out of keeping within this part of the Kingsborough Manor estate. When viewing the property from public vantage points the main alteration that will be seen is the first floor extension above the garage. However, the neighbouring property, No.12 also has a projecting element with a double garage at ground floor level and habitable rooms above this. I also consider that the surrounding properties are all of varying designs and therefore I do not believe that the first floor extension would look at all out of keeping with the surrounding properties.
- 8.07 The rear extension has an M shaped pitched roof which I believe to be an appropriate design for an extension of this type on a property of this size. Furthermore it is entirely contained on the rear of the property and as such I take the view that the impact of this element of the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to visual amenities.

Other Matters

- 8.08 In relation to the other points raised in the objection letters I respond as follows. In this case I fail to see how an extension to a property could increase the security risk for surrounding properties and as such do not consider that this amounts to a reason for refusal. Furthermore, with regards to lights shining from windows into the neighbouring property, I do not believe that with the separation distances that these properties enjoy that a domestic light would have an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenities.
- 8.09 A point has also been raised in regards to other additions in the rear garden of the host property, namely a swimming pool and outbuilding. Both of these can be installed and erected under permitted development rights (the property retains its permitted development rights under Class E). With regards to the area of land around the dwelling, due to the generous frontage and rear private amenity space, and having carried out a site visit I am of the firm view that over half of the area around the property has not been built upon. Notwithstanding this, the proposal has been submitted as a planning application and assessed as such whereas the comments received relate to permitted development thresholds.

8.10 Further comments relate to the host and surrounding properties being sold as Executive homes. I consider this to simply represent the way in which the properties were marketed and therefore would not have a bearing on the way that this planning application is judged. Finally, in regards to the impact on utilities, in the context of the wider estate the extension will add a relatively small amount of additional floorspace and as such in my view will have a limited impact on utilities/services. Therefore, I do not consider that this would substantiate a reason for refusal.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.01 I am of the view that due to the distances between the host and neighbouring properties the proposal would not have a significant impact upon residential amenities, as set out in the assessment above. Furthermore, I believe that the scheme has been appropriately designed with pitched roofs and therefore would not have an unacceptable impact upon visual amenities and would sit comfortably in the streetscene. I recommend that planning permission be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

(1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reasons: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

(2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reasons: In the interests of visual amenity.

(3) Before the development hereby permitted is first used, the two proposed windows in the flank elevations shall be obscure glazed and shall subsequently be maintained as such.

Reasons: To protect the privacy of the occupants of No.10 and No.12 Leet Close.

The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Offering pre-application advice.
- Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
- As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.
The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.