

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 17/503787/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Single storey rear extension to provide bedroom and bathroom facilities.			
ADDRESS 37 Homefield Drive Rainham Kent ME8 8RS			
RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Objection received from Upchurch Parish Council			
WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN Upchurch	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Draper AGENT Mr Les Jordan
DECISION DUE DATE 26/09/17	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 25/08/17		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
SW/10/0739	Construction of a retaining wall.	APPROVE	11.08.2010

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 No. 37 Homefield Drive is a detached property on a modern housing estate. The property benefits from a block paved driveway to the front leading to an integral garage, providing off road parking for several vehicles. There is a side access giving pedestrian access to the rear private amenity area.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.01 This application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension to provide bedroom and bathroom facilities as required by the applicant, who is disabled. The existing conservatory will be removed and replaced with the proposed extension.

2.02 The proposed extension will project from the host property by 9.3m; 4.7m wide; 2.6m to eaves with a maximum height of 3.2m. There will be a gap of 5.5m to the boundary with the adjacent property at no. 35 Homefield Drive, and a gap 1m will be maintained on the side boundary which faces Lower Rainham Road.

2.03 Three high level windows are proposed on the flank wall facing the side amenity area, these will be non-opening and obscure glazed.

2.04 One window serving the bedroom area and double doors giving access to the garden are proposed to the elevation facing into the garden.

2.05 The proposed extension will be positioned 2m from the rear boundary fence with no. 26

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.01 None

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) are relevant in terms of encouraging good design standards and minimising the potential impacts of any development upon the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4.02 Bearing Fruits 2031; Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 - Policies DM14, DM16, DM19 in particular encourage the provision of high-quality development and minimising potential amenity impacts for local residents.
- 4.03 The Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled “Designing an Extension” is also relevant, and provides general design guidance. The SPG remains a material consideration, having been through a formal review and adoption process.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 One letter of support has been received from the residents at no. 26, stating:

“I have spoken to the householders about their plans for a single storey extension in their back garden. The new construction needs to be big enough for a wet room and bedroom, large enough to be future-proofed for lifts, hoists and other equipment as Mr Draper’s condition worsens over time.

The garden at Number 37 is quite secluded and the position of the proposed extension neither overlooks or is overlooked by neighbouring properties, no more so than the existing conservatory which it will replace. The new building will be hard to see from the Lower Rainham Road because of the very tall hedge which borders the property.

Around the estate, the developers have built detached garages in separate blocks. This addition to number 37 will be in keeping with those detached garages and should not look out of place with the rest of the estate.”

- 5.02 A site notice giving details of the application was displayed in the vicinity of the application site.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Upchurch Parish Council objects to the application on the stating the following:

“Councillors have considered this application and are unable to support the proposal as it is too large for the size of the property and garden. The materials also seem to be incorrect for this type of building construction. The neighbour’s comments need to be taken into consideration with this in mind.”

- 6.02 The applicant has responded:

“I have just seen the comment from Upchurch Parish Council and note their concerns regarding the size of the proposed extension. I understand that the committee have sent representatives to view the site but would just like to make the following comments:

1. *The extension is unlikely to be visible from the Lower Rainham Road because it is behind a 6 foot wall and a tall countryside hedge.*
2. *The position of the proposed extension is as far removed from any other property as it could possibly be and our plot is lower than the plots either side which means that any height impact is reduced.*
3. *The intention is for the materials used to be as compatible with the existing building as modern materials can make it: I am unsure how this has not come across in the plans submitted.*
4. *Although we have gone for full planning permission, I believe that the dimensions of the proposal would have meant that we could have used one of the current "exemptions" that the government has put in place to make the planning process easier for residents.*
5. *My husband really needs the downstairs space that this extension would provide: he is struggling more and more each night to get up the stairs to bed and showering upstairs is also becoming more and more of an issue.*
6. *The positioning of the extension at right angles to the existing building means that I would continue to be able to enjoy my garden from my kitchen window - I love to watch the birds on the lawn when I am at the sink: it gives me great pleasure. The proposed layout would also mean that my husband, in times yet to come, would be also be able to enjoy the view of the garden from the bedroom window."*

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 Application papers and drawings referring to the application reference 17/503787/FULL

8.0 APPRAISAL

- 8.01 The application site is located within the defined built up area boundary in which the principle of development is acceptable subject to the other relevant policy considerations outlined below. The main consideration is the impact the extension would have on the neighbouring occupiers.

Residential Amenity

- 8.02 The proposed extension would project beyond the rear elevation by approximately 9m. The existing conservatory projects by 4m on the boundary. A gap of 5.5m to the boundary of the adjacent property (no. 35) will be retained. The Council's adopted SPG "Designing and extension: a guide for householders" states at paragraph 5.7 *"For single storey rear extensions close to your neighbour's common boundary, the Borough Council considers that a maximum projection of 3m will be allowed."*
- 8.03 In this case, the proposed extension is not on the common boundary with any adjoining neighbour and is over 5m from that boundary, therefore the guidance given in the SPG can be relaxed. In addition, the site and proposed extension lie to the north of the surrounding dwellings, and the proposal would not therefore give rise to any overshadowing. The size and position of the extension would not cause any detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

- 8.04 Three high level windows are proposed on the side elevation facing Lower Rainham Road; these will be non-opening and obscured glazed. There is a limited view of this elevation from the Lower Rainham Road, given the hedgerow and distance to the road.
- 8.05 I do not consider the proposal to be unacceptable in terms of residential amenity. The adjacent neighbour, at no. 26 Homefield Drive, which borders the rear garden of the application site, supports the application, stating that the site is secluded and the positioning of the proposed extension would not overlook or be overlooked by neighbouring properties.

Visual Amenity

- 8.06 In terms of visual amenity, the proposed development is to the rear of the property and will have limited impact on the street scene. No development is proposed to the front of the property. I therefore consider the proposal to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 I consider that the proposal will be in keeping with the property, and believe that it will not give rise to any harm to neighbouring or visual amenities. Given the particular needs of the applicant, I therefore recommend that planning permission should be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION - GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

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 permission is granted.

Reasons: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1900 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.

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.

