

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/501881/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Proposed first floor rear extension. | | |
| ADDRESS Old Moss Mill Lane Hartlip Sittingbourne Kent ME9 7TB | | |
| RECOMMENDATION Approve | | |
| SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The development will not cause unacceptable impacts to either residential or visual amenities and will not impact the parking provision at the property. | | |
| REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection | | |
| WARD Hartlip, Newington And Upchurch | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Hartlip | APPLICANT Mr Ryan Bendelow AGENT Resi |
| DECISION DUE DATE 25/06/19 | PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 28/05/19 | |

Planning History

SW/13/0992

Single storey front extension, single storey rear extension, roof extension to dwelling, dormer windows front and rear and other alterations.

Approved Decision Date: 22.10.2013

SW/13/0333

Proposed single storey front and rear extensions including enlargement of garage, first floor side extension, new roof with increased ridge height for loft accommodation with two front and two rear dormer windows.

Refused Decision Date: 05.06.2013

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.1 Old Moss is a two and a half storey detached property located in a ribbon of development outside the built up area boundary of Hartlip, and is therefore considered to lie in open countryside. The property has a paved driveway to the front and private amenity space to the rear. The property is surrounded by open fields to the east and west, with a mixture of housing styles and types present in the streetscene to the north and south of the site. Immediately to the north is a two storey detached dwelling of a similar scale, and to the south lies a row of four terrace houses (Millfeld Cottages), which are set considerably further forward than Old Moss.

1.2 The property was extended significantly under application SW/13/0992, when the roof of the original house was raised to form a two and a half storey dwelling with dormers lighting rooms in the new roof space, along with the erection of flat roofed single storey front and rear extensions.

2. PROPOSAL

2.1 The current application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor extension at the rear of the property, which will be situated approximately above the central part of the recently built single storey rear extension. It will measure 4.1m x 5.5m. It will have an assymmetric partly pitched and partly flat roof to prevent obscuring

views from rear dormer windows. The extension will provide a larger bedroom on the first floor, with associated rear balcony set between side walls/roofslope of the extension.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.1 None

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

4.2 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 policies CP4, DM11, DM14 and DM16.

4.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): ‘Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders’

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 One objection was received from a neighbouring property. Its content is summarised below:

- Old Moss has been extensively re-modelled and extended over the last few years, however this latest planning proposal crosses the line in terms of acceptability from our point of view as the immediate neighbour to the left of Old Moss
- The proposed first floor extension with bi-fold doors and balcony will overlook our garden impacting our privacy
- The proposed extension itself - on top of the already extended ground floor is to the south of us and will restrict our light, overshadow our garden and patio area and be generally obtrusive to our property
- The attraction of the immediate semi-rural neighbourhood is that we are not overlooked – an important consideration when we purchased the property, but also in terms of future saleability, value and general amenity - this proposal would be detrimental to that attraction

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Hartlip Parish Council originally commented on the application as follows;

“HPC does have concerns about this application as the proposed development could affect the amenity of neighbours such as loss of light and privacy.”

I queried whether the Parish Council objected to the application and received the following response:

“In view of the fact that the neighbour has the same concerns as the Parish Council, the Parish Council objects to this application.”

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.1 Plans and documents relating to 19/501881/FULL.

8. APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

8.1 The site lies outside any built up area boundary and is therefore considered to be located in the countryside. Policy DM11 permits extensions to dwellings in the

countryside (taking into account any previous enlargements) where they are of an appropriate scale, appearance and mass in relation to the location. The Council's SPG entitled 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders' states that extensions to properties in the countryside will not normally be permitted if they result in an increase of more than 60% of the properties original floorspace. This guidance aims to prevent small, rural properties from becoming extended into large dwellings, altering their character and appearance and harming the appearance of the wider countryside. In this case, when taking into account the floorspace of the original property (which was a moderately sized, detached three bedroom house) and the potential floorspace that could of been created in the original property's loft space via permitted development, the additional floorspace added under SW/13/0992 equates to a roughly 60% increase. I consider the extension proposed now will be small in scale and I note it will not extend the footprint of the property, being situated above the existing flat roofed rear extension. Taking all of the above into account, I believe the principle of development is acceptable and the proposal will not have a significantly harmful impact on the surrounding countryside.

Visual Impact

- 8.2 Regarding impact upon visual amenities, I note the proposal will be located entirely at the rear of the dwelling and as such, will not be visible from public vantage points. It is of an unusual design, which reflects an attempt to lessen the impact it will have on neighbouring dwellings. Although it does not mirror the existing character of the building (which was changed significantly following approved application SW/13/0992), I believe its design would not constitute a reason for refusal. The use of modern design on traditionally designed buildings enables a clear distinction between, and appreciation of, the original and newer parts of the structure. I contacted the agent requesting specific details of the materials to be used on the extension. They suggested a condition be included requesting these details be submitted at a later date. Therefore I recommend such a condition below.

Residential Amenity

- 8.3 The Council's SPG states that first floor rear extensions sited on a common boundary should not project more that 1.8m from the rear wall of the dwelling, although if an extension is set away from the boundary a longer extension may be permitted. In this case the proposed extension would be set away from the common boundaries with both neighbouring properties Omega (to the north) and 1 Millfield Cottages (to the south), by roughly 4.2m and 1.5m respectively. Due to the separation distance between the extension and Omega I believe it would not give rise to any unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impacts at this property. The proposed extension lies only 1.5m from the boundary with 1 Millfield Cottages, although the property itself lies a further 1.8m from the common boundary. I note that Old Moss is set considerably rearwards of Millfield Cottages and that there is an existing negative impact on the residential amenity at 1 Millfield Cottages. However, as the extension follows the same roof line as the existing sloped roof at Old Moss, the extension will project no closer than the existing roof line. Taking this into account, and the fact the extension is set away from the common boundary, I believe the impact on this neighbouring property will not be significantly worse than the existing circumstances. As such, I believe the extension will have an acceptable impact on residential amenity.
- 8.4 I take into account the objection received from Omega and the Parish Council, however as set out above, the extension will be set away from the common boundary by 4.2m. Taking into account this distance, any overshadowing impact will be minimal in my opinion. With regards to overlooking from the proposed bi-fold doors, I do not consider any overlooking impact will be considerably worse than the existing views of the neighbouring garden from the rear windows of Old Moss. It is also important to note that

the balcony is contained between solid walls/roofslope and should give rise to any direct view across the private areas of adjoining rear gardens.

Parking

8.5 The extension will not increase the number of bedrooms at the property and therefore the parking requirement will not be altered. I do note however that the driveway to the front of the property is capable of providing off-street parking for three vehicles, which is in excess of the parking provision recommended by Kent Highways for a four bedroom dwelling in this location (parking standards require a minimum of two spaces). As such I have no concerns from this regard.

Other Matters

8.6 The objector has raised concerns about the impact the proposal could have on the value of their property but any potential loss of value is not a planning matter and therefore cannot be taken into consideration here.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed extension, due to the separation distances from the neighbouring properties, will not lead to unacceptable impacts on residential amenity, nor will it cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or wider countryside. As such I recommend this application be approved.

10. 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 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) No development shall take place until details of the external finishing materials to be used on the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

The Council's approach to the 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.

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.

