

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 18/505113/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Second storey addition over Garage to side elevation with pitched roof to match existing (Resubmission of 18/502317/FULL)			
ADDRESS 30 Ferry Road Iwade Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8RR			
RECOMMENDATION - Refuse			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its projection to the side boundary at first floor level, would give rise to a harmful loss of openness at first floor level, resulting in a terracing effect which would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Ward Councillor Hunt.			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade	APPLICANT Mr Robert Ware-Lane AGENT Deva Design	
DECISION DUE DATE 26/11/18	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 25/10/18		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
18/502317/FULL	Erection of a first floor extension over existing garage with pitched roof to match existing. Conversion of garage to provide utility and storage area.	Refused	19/06/18
SW/85/0676	Single storey side extension.	Approved	21/08/85

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 No. 30 Ferry Road is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located within the built up area boundary of Iwade. It is set well back from the highways behind a deep verge, and has a large section of hardstanding to the front. There is private amenity space to the rear of the dwelling. The property has been extended almost up to the northern side boundary at ground floor level in the form of a flat roofed garage, but at first floor level it, and it neighbours sit well away from their side boundaries, creating a spacious character to the streetscene.
- 1.02 The property sits on the western side of Ferry Road in a short slightly staggered row of similar semi-detached houses. Newer development opposite comprises terraced housing set right on the pavement edge, with a different character from the older housing it faces.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor bedroom and en-suite bathroom positioned over the existing garage. This extension would have a

pitched roof to match the existing dwelling and would also extend almost up to the northern side boundary.

- 2.02 The side extension would measure 3.6m in width to the boundary, and would remain subservient to the main dwelling, sitting 0.35m below the existing roofline and being set back 0.5m from the existing dwelling's building line.
- 2.03 Also proposed is the conversion of the existing garage this would create a utility with toilet and allow for a larger kitchen.
- 2.04 This proposal is identical to previously refused application 18/502317/FULL, but the applicant has included a supporting statement with examples of appeals at other sites he considers similar to this one that have been allowed.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Potential Archaeological Importance
- 3.02 Environment Agency Flood Zone 3

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
- 4.02 Development Plan: ST3, CP4, DM7, DM14 and DM16 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan.
- 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 from residents
- 5.02 Councillor James Hunt has called the application to Committee, stating that

"I can understand the reason for refusal of the previous application but as there were no objections from residents or the parish council, and in my view the reason for refusal last time being a fine balance of what may/may not be acceptable, I feel that it would be fair to the applicant for the committee to make a decision."

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Iwade Parish Council has no comments to make.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 Application papers for application 18/505113/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 8.01 The proposal site lies within the built up area and as such the principle of development is acceptable. The main considerations in this case concern the impact upon residential and visual amenities.

Visual Impact

- 8.02 Ferry Road features mainly semi-detached dwellings, many with significant gaps between them at first floor level. Although I have noted the presence of newer terraced dwellings opposite the site, the predominance of semi-detached dwellings, together with the large strip of open land adjacent to the highway, gives the road a sense of openness which should be protected as outlined in the SPG above. In my view, the application site contributes to this openness.
- 8.03 The adopted SPG states that *'where a two storey side extension to a house is proposed in an area of mainly detached or semi-detached housing, the Council is anxious to see that the area should not become terraced in character, losing the sense of openness.'* It further states that *'houses should not be physically or visually linked, especially at first floor level'*. In order to preserve the areas character and sense of openness, a 2m gap between a first floor extension and the side boundary is normally considered to be necessary, whether or not the extension is set back from the main front building line.
- 8.04 The proposal is contrary to the SPG, as at first floor level the proposal would be built almost up to the common boundary, eroding the space between it and 28 Ferry Road. As a result, I believe the proposal would give rise to a significant loss of openness in the streetscene which would be harmful to its open and spacious character and therefore determine that this would amount to a reason for refusal. Such an impact would be especially harmful if repeated next door or elsewhere in this row of semi-detached houses.
- 8.05 I note that in response to the previous refusal (18/502317/FULL) the applicant refers to two appeal decisions where the Council's refusals on similar grounds have been overturned at 35 Springvale Iwade 17/503674/FULL (APP/V2255/D/17/3187449) and at 6 Sheerstone Iwade 15/508144/FULL (APP/V2255/W/16/3154385). The decision issued at 35 Springvale Iwade was overturned as the Inspector considered that even though the 2m guidance was not adhered to there was a sufficient gap between the side boundary and the extension to maintain the openness of the streetscene in the event that no.37 were to be extended. I do not consider this to be the case for 30 Ferry Road as there would only be a distance of 0.25m from the shared boundary which would not allow for a distinct separation between the two dwellings. 6 Sheerstone Iwade was overturned and allows for an additional dwelling attached to a semi-detached pair. However due to the angle of the plot and the maintained distance from the shared boundary I do not consider that the development approved there sets a precedent for the other dwellings along Ferry Road to be extended at two storey level so close to the common boundary.
- 8.06 Notwithstanding these examples, the current application drawings are identical to the previous submission and therefore should be assessed in the same manner as previously as there has been no significant change in policy and I do not believe that there are any extenuating circumstances.

Residential Amenity

- 8.07 The proposed new windows to the front and rear would project no further forwards or rearwards than the existing house and there are no windows proposed in the side

elevation so I therefore consider that there would be no significant harm in terms of overlooking.

- 8.08 No. 28 has the potential to be impacted as a result of this proposal as it projects right to the shared boundary with this neighbour, however, I do not believe the proposal would significantly increase the harm here in terms of an overbearing or overshadowing impact as the neighbouring dwelling is set behind 30 Ferry Road with the closest point to the extension being a garage. I consider the proposal acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Highways

- 8.09 There is a condition that restricts the conversion of the garage into habitable space as stated below:

“The garage hereby permitted shall be used only for the parking of a private motor car or cars or for uses ordinarily incidental to the enjoyment of occupiers and the dwelling house and no development, whether permitted by the Town & Country Planning General Development Orders 1977 to 1981 or not, shall be carried out on the site, in such a manner or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the garage.

In order to ensure that adequate provision is made for the parking of motor vehicles and in order to safeguard the amenities of the area.”

- 8.10 Paragraph 7.0 of the SPG states that “*Extensions or conversion of garages to extra accommodation, which reduce available parking space and increase parking on roads are not likely to be accepted.*” However, in this instance I give significant weight to existing hardstanding to the front of the property that can easily accommodate the 2 parking spaces required for a 3 bedroom property, I consider that the permanent loss of the garage would be unlikely to result in increased parking on the road or harm to the streetscene I therefore believe the proposal acceptable in terms of the parking arrangements.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 I consider that the application gives rise to a harmful loss of openness at first floor which results in harm to the character of the area and would give rise to significant harm to visual amenity both on its own, and especially if repeated.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its projection to the side boundary at first floor level, would give rise to a harmful loss of openness between dwellings at first floor level, which would give rise to significant harm to the spacious character and appearance of the streetscene, contrary to Policies DM14 and DM16 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan – Bearing Fruits 2031 and to paragraph 5.0 of the Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance, entitled “Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders”

The Council’s approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2018 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a

pre-application advice service, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and 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.

