

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 17/506083/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing garage and conservatory and erection of replacement detached garage, erection of two single storey side extensions and erection of new entrance gates.			
ADDRESS Kimlee Grovehurst Road Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8QZ			
RECOMMENDATION - Approve subject to conditions			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposal is acceptable in principle and would not be significantly harmful to residential or visual amenity, or to highway safety and convenience.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Sutton AGENT Woodstock Associates	
DECISION DUE DATE 08/03/18	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 06/02/18		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
SW/85/0783	Use of part of rear garden as nursery erection of polytunnel and additional parking facilities.	REFUSED, ALLOWED ON APPEAL	13.09.1985
15/501847/FULL	Single storey pitch roof extension to the side of the property, single storey flat roof extension to the opposite side of the property leading to a new pitched roof garage and workshop extension, along with internal alterations.	APPROVED	27.04.2015

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 Kimlee is a detached bungalow located on a large plot. The property has a large garden and driveway to the front and to the rear is private amenity space.
- 1.02 The adjacent property to the west is Crosswinds, a children’s nurse and the remainder of the surrounding dwellings are residential.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing garage and conservatory at the property, and the erection of a new detached double garage, two side extensions and new entrance gates to the front of the property. The replacement garage will measure 6.5m in width and 7.5m in length, and will be located in roughly the same position as the existing garage, 0.5m from the boundary with neighbouring property No. 1 Kingfisher Close. The proposed garage will have a pitched roof with a ridge height of 4.5m.

- 2.02 The side extension on the west side of the property will project from the flank wall by 4m, and will have a length of 10.8m. It will have a flat roof with sloping sides, which will have a maximum height of 3.6m. The extension will provide an additional two bedrooms to the property and an en-suite bathroom. The side extension on the east side of the property will replace the existing conservatory. It will project from the flank wall of the existing dwelling by 2.5m and will have a length of 6m, slightly longer than the existing conservatory. It will have a flat roof with a height of 2.7m. The proposed side extension will facilitate the creation of a larger kitchen and utility room.
- 2.03 Amended drawings were submitted by the applicant who wished to erect entrance gates to the front of the bungalow. The drawings first submitted were deemed unacceptable from a highway safety perspective as the gates were not situated 5m from the rear of the footpath. I also considered the original design of the gates would result in them appearing incongruous when compared to the low fence panels either side of the gates, so recommended the design be revised. Amended drawings were then submitted addressing the issues raised above. The proposed gates will have a maximum height of 1.4m and will be situated 5m from the rear of the footpath to the front of the property. They will be constructed of wrought iron.
- 2.04 I note a similar application for planning permission was approved under 15/501847/FULL. The main difference between the applications is the position of the replacement garage. In the previous application, the garage was to be situated further back and connected to the house through the side extension to the east of the property. The previous application also did not propose entrance gates.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Potential Archaeological Importance

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
- 4.02 Development Plan: Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of “Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017”.
- 4.03 The Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled “Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders”.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 None received

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Iwade Parish Council originally commented on the application stating they had no objections to the proposal, although they queried whether the work had been started. The Parish Council were re-consulted when amended drawings were received with the proposed entrance gates. The Parish Council then provided the following comment:

“The Parish Council raised no objection to the building works, but does object to the erection of new entrance gates. Councillors also object to the existing fencing to the front of the bungalow, as shown on the plan submitted on the

21st December. The height of this fencing obstructs the sight line and any vehicle exiting the property has to enter the road to obtain a clear sight line to the right, this can be hazardous. The Planning Section were (James Wilson is aware, as Cllr. James Hunt had discussed this with him) instructing the owner to take down this existing fencing and gates because of the sight lines.”

6.02 Kent Highways and Transportation state the proposal does not warrant involvement from the Highway Authority.

6.03 The County Archaeological Officer states that no archaeological measures are required in connection with the proposal.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 Application papers for application 17/506083/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

8.01 The application site lies within the built up area boundary where the principle of development is acceptable subject to relevant policy considerations and local amenity impacts.

Visual Impact

8.02 The extension on the western side of the property incorporates a flat roof with sloping edges. Due the proposed roof not being entirely flat, I consider the design is acceptable. On the opposite side, the proposed side extension will have a flat roof. As this extension is of a small scale, I consider the flat roof will be acceptable in this case. The proposed double garage will have a pitched roof that matches the style of the roof on the main dwelling, and is therefore acceptable. I note the application form states the materials used on the proposed extensions and replacement garage will match those on the existing dwelling.

8.03 Regarding the proposed entrance gates, I consider their amended design acceptable and that they will not give rise to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the property or wider street scene.

8.04 Taking all of the above into account, I consider the proposal will not detrimentally harm the visual amenities of the area.

Residential Amenity

8.05 The proposed side extension to the west of the property will be constructed between 3.7m – 4.4m away from the common boundary with the adjacent nursery, Crosswinds. I note the flank wall of Crosswinds is a further 1.4m – 1.7m from the common boundary with the host property. When taking into account these distances, I consider this aspect of the proposal will not cause unacceptable harm to residential amenities.

8.06 On the eastern side of the property, a new side extension and detached double garage will be constructed. The proposed side extension will be built between 7.4m – 7.8m away from the common boundary with No. 1 Kingfisher Close. As such, due to

the distance involved, I consider the side extension will not adversely impact neighbouring amenities.

- 8.07 The proposed garage will be located between 0.4m – 1.4m from the common boundary with No. 1. I note the garage will project no further forward than the front wall at the adjacent property, and there will be no windows in the flank walls of the garage, and as such, the prospect of overlooking will be reduced. I consider the proposal is acceptable with regard to impact to residential amenities.

Highways

- 8.08 Regarding the proposed gates to the front of the property, the amended drawings show they will be located 5m away from the rear of the footpath, allowing space for a vehicle to pull in from the road when entering the property. Due to the location of the gates, set back from Grovehurst Road, vehicles exiting the property will be able to see oncoming vehicles and pedestrians. I consider the gates will not impair highway safety or convenience, and as such are acceptable.
- 8.09 The proposed double garage will measure 6.5m in width x 7.4m in length, which is larger than the KCC recommended minimum dimensions of 6m in width x 5.5m in length. A condition will be placed upon the garage to ensure it is only used for the parking of vehicles.
- 8.10 The comments of the Parish Council are noted. There was previously a fence affixed to the top of the front boundary wall. This was the subject of enforcement action and has now been removed. The fence referred to by the Parish Council, (a couple of panels, affixed to the ground either side of the access and located behind the front walls) does not require planning permission.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 Taking into account all of the above, I consider the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable harm to visual or residential amenities and note following amendment, the proposed entrance gates are acceptable with regard to highway safety. As such, I recommend planning permission be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: 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 development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reasons: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: SU/17/147.03, SU/17/147.04, SU/17/147.05 and SU/17/147.06 rev C.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- (4) The garage hereby approved shall be kept available for the parking of vehicles and no permanent development, whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) or not, shall be carried out on the land or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access thereto.

Reason: Development without adequate provision for the parking or garaging of cars is likely to lead to car parking inconvenient to other road users and in a manner detrimental to highway safety and 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 applicant/agent was advised of minor changes required to the application and these were agreed and submitted.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent has 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.

