

3.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/502305/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing outbuilding. Erection of two storey side extension, rear infill extension, loft conversion and detached triple garage to rear (Resubmission to 19/500129/FULL)		
ADDRESS Cripps Farm Plough Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 4JH		
RECOMMENDATION Refuse		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The development would have an unsympathetic and incongruous presence that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the intrinsic character and beauty of the surrounding countryside.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Cllr Ingleton		
WARD Sheppey East	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT D Buckley Ltd. AGENT DEVA Design
DECISION DUE DATE 28/06/2019		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 06/06/2019

Planning History

19/500129/FULL - Demolition of existing outbuilding. Erection of two storey side extension, rear infill extension and two detached two storey triple garages.
Refused 02.05.2019.

SW/98/0554 - Outbuildings comprising a wildlife shed a storage shed and a garage/hobby shed.
Approved in 1998.

SW/98/0273 - New vehicle access, conversion of barn to dwelling at Cripps Farm.
(Amendments to approved scheme)
Approved in 1998.

SW/98/0163 Replacement Dwelling
Approved in 1998.

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a modern detached dwelling located on a spacious rural plot on the north side of Plough Road. On the opposite side of the road is the residential development of Kingsborough Manor. The dwelling is of brick construction and set back from the road by approximately 15 metres. The original building at the site was a small cottage which was replaced following the grant of planning permission under application reference number SW/98/0163. This permission included a planning condition restricting further enlargement of the new dwelling in view of the Council's rural restraint policies.
- 1.2 The surrounding area forms part of the open countryside as defined by the Local Plan. A detached dwelling known as Appleyard Barn lies approximately 25 metres to the east of the application property, with open agricultural land to the west and north of the site.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application is a revised proposal following refusal at Planning Committee dated 25th April 2019 (Planning Ref: 19/500129/FULL). The application was refused on the following grounds:

The proposed alterations to the existing dwelling by reason of the resultant imposing bulk would constitute an unsympathetic, incongruous and harmful addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and visual amenities of the surrounding countryside. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies CP4, DM11, and DM14 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan (2017), paragraph 3.3 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for 'Designing an Extension and relevant guidance in the revised NPPF.

The proposed detached triple garage by reason of its siting forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling would be prominent and incongruous in a manner detrimental to the setting of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to policies CP4 and DM14 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan (2017), the relevant guidance in the revised NPPF and para. 5.2 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for 'Designing an Extension'.

- 2.2 This revised scheme retains one garage to the rear of the property but omits the detached triple garage originally positioned to the front of the dwelling, which overcomes the second of the reasons for refusal. However, no changes have been made to the proposals which relate to the main dwelling with the extent of the extensions and alterations remaining in their entirety.
- 2.3 The revised scheme proposes a two-storey side extension to the eastern flank of the building, a rear two-storey infill extension and one detached garage close to the north eastern corner rear of the site. The side extension would be approximately 4.3 metres wide and 11.3 metres deep including the front projection. The rear infill element proposed would be 2 metres in depth and 4.3 metres in width.
- 2.4 The proposal includes extending the building to the east at full ridge height, and transformation of the lower existing western roof slope into a full height barn hip, which would require raising of the flank walls on that elevation. A glazed central façade to the front elevation of the building would replace the existing front porch and the canopy above the existing bay windows is shown to be extended to match the appearance of the canopy above the newly formed front projection.
- 2.5 The rear garage would be designed to replicate the appearance of the host dwelling and would be constructed of facing brick work and finished with a barn hip roof. It would be 10 metres wide, 7.2 metres deep and be 6 metres high to the ridge, with an eaves height of 2.4 metres. The garage building would have a barn hip roof to match the roof of the main dwelling with storage at first floor.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.1 The site lies in an area of Potential Archaeological Importance

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Paragraphs 118, 124, 128, 130,131, are relevant.

Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017; Policies CP4, DM11 and DM14
 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): Designing and Extension: A Guide for Householders' Paragraph 3.3 and 5.2.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 One representation was received from a neighbour raising objection to the proposal on the following summarised grounds:

- Incorrect boundary / existing boundary. The site's boundary is incorrect as it is shown closer to Appleyard Barn.

Officer comment: This is an ongoing civil matter which does not warrant the involvement of Planning Services.

- Application Boundary incorrect red and blue boundary lines

Officer comment: Providing that the applicant declares all land in current ownership that is located within close proximity of the site, the Council can proceed to make a decision

- Size of proposed extension to house not consistent to a small farm residential property where income should be derived from land

Officer comment: Noted, and addressed in further detail with the report appraisal

- Access to Plough Road. Construction of a new wall prejudicial to highway safety.

Officer comments: The presence of a new wall is acknowledged and is currently under the investigation of Planning Enforcement. It does not form part of this application and therefore is a separate planning issue.

- Residential caravan at rear. Acceptable whilst work is undertaken

Officer comments: Noted. Should the caravan remain after the works are completed, a suitable planning application should be submitted to avoid being liable for enforcement action.

- Landscaping

Officer comments: A landscaping scheme does not form part of this application but this could be required as part of any approval for the front boundary wall.

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Minster Parish Council supports the application, saying; "The amendments are more in keeping resulting in a visually enhanced main dwelling and garage built to match."

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.1 The submission is accompanied by the following plans and drawings:

- DC/461 Site Location, Block Plans, Existing Ground and First Floor
- DC/462 Existing Elevations
- DC/463 Proposed Ground and First Floor

- DC/464 Proposed Loft Room and Sections
- DC/465 Proposed Elevations
- DC/466 Proposed Triple Garage
- DC/471 Existing Out Building

8. APPRAISAL

- 8.1 The application follows a recent refusal from Planning Committee dated 25th April 2019. (19/500129/FULL). This revised scheme retains one garage to the rear of the property however omits the detached triple garage originally positioned to the front of the dwelling and as such overcomes one of the original reasons for refusal. Notwithstanding, the extent of the development to the main dwelling remains in its entirety and no changes are proposed. As such, I do not consider that the principle reason for refusal has been suitably addressed in this instance.
- 8.2 The application site lies outside the built-up area boundary of Minster and is therefore regarded as a countryside setting. It is important to note that Kingsborough Manor, the large residential housing estate that lies to the south of subject site sits within the built-up area boundary where larger scale is generally supported. As such, based on different site constraints of both sites I do not consider the sites to be comparable in this instance.
- 8.3 The main issues for consideration which remain relevant are the location of the site outside of the built-up area boundary, the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, together with the impact of the proposed garage on the setting of the dwelling and the surrounding streetscene.
- 8.4 A relevant material consideration is policy DM11 of the adopted Local Plan which states that the Council will permit extensions (taking into account any previous additions undertaken) to existing dwellings in rural areas where they are of an appropriate scale, mass and appearance in relation to the location i.e. modest extensions. Also of relevance is the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders' which sets out the Council's approach to the scale and design of extensions to existing buildings and it's a matter to which I attach significant weight. The SPG requires extensions to respect or reflect the character and appearance of the existing building. It further states that in the countryside extensions should not result in an increase of more than 60 percent of the original floorspace.

Visual Impact:

- 8.5 The application building is in a prominent position and can be seen from various locations within the street. It was built as a replacement for a much smaller dwelling granted permission in 1998 and, as required by the SPG, the resulting 43% increase in floor area needs to be taken into account in determining this application. Increase in floor area is a useful approach in assessing proportionality, which is primarily an objective test based on size. The existing floor area is approximately 230 metres square, and the increase in the floor area that would result from this current application would be 197 metres square, including the second floor accommodation which would be contained within the new enlarged roofspace. This is significant when considering that the floor area of the existing dwelling was already a significant increase over the original dwelling, and the scheme currently proposed would result in a cumulative increase of approximately 140% percent over the former dwelling on this site. This would be contrary to the relevant guidance in the SPG. Further, I note the condition appended to the previous approval removing Permitted Development rights for the property in recognition

of the significant increase in scale then approved, in order to safeguard the amenities of the area and to prevent harmful development in the rural area.

- 8.6 In addition, the proposal includes altering the entire existing roof into a barn hip (carried across the new 2 storey side and rear infill extensions), which would not only substantially increase the size, but also alter the appearance of the existing building. I note the points raised by the then Ward Members at the Planning Committee of 25th April 2019 that the proposal would *'balance it out and make the building more attractive.'* Whilst I agree that it would introduce a degree of symmetry to the building, and that design elements such as the central glazed entrance, canopy above bay windows and materials would resonate with the existing building, the resulting proportions of the house when viewed from public views from the front along Plough Road would still appear overly large and incongruous. The scale of the proposed addition would dominate and subsume the character of the original building.
- 8.7 I note previous comments from Members regarding the Kingsborough Manor residential development southwest of the site, in that substantial development works have been allowed to properties within the residential housing estate, however it is reiterated that that the properties within Kingsborough Manor are located within the built-up area boundary where different policy restrictions apply. In addition, the northern site boundary of Kingsborough that runs along the southern side of Plough Road comprises of tall trees and high vegetation which obscures all views of the Kingsborough from the perimeter of Cripps Farm and adjacent public highway. This is a very pronounced change in character on the northern side of Plough Road, which retains a very rural appearance.
- 8.8 The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (2018) states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area. Considering that the resulting building would be large and bulky, its scale and design would fail to respect the proportions of the existing dwelling, contrary to policy DM11 of the adopted local plan and the guidance in the SPG requiring extensions to respect or reflect the character and appearance of the existing buildings.
- 8.9 With respect to the garages, the front triple garage has now been removed from the scheme and therefore an original reason for refusal omitted. With regard to the remaining garage, the Council expects garages and other outbuildings to be subservient in scale and position to the original dwelling and not impact detrimentally on the space surrounding buildings or the street scene by virtue of their scale, form or location. In this respect, garages or outbuildings that are set in front of the building line are not normally permitted. I acknowledge that the garage proposed is of a simple design and intended to be ancillary to the established residential use of the main dwelling at the site.
- 8.10 The triple garage building is approximately 25 metres from the rear of the building, and at the north eastern corner of the site is designed to replicate the appearance of the host dwelling. Members would note that although large, due to the separation distance from the dwellinghouse it would not have any significant adverse impact on the space surrounding the property, or have any adverse impacts on the amenities of the neighbour at Appleyard Barn. This element of the application is considered acceptable.

Other Matters

- 8.11 The comments received from the neighbour at Appleyard Barn in regard to the size of the extension has been addressed in detail within the appraisal section of this report. The recent introduction of the front boundary wall is under investigation with our

Enforcement Section. This neighbour has also raised concerns regarding the access to Plough Road, residential caravan at rear of the site and paving of the front garden, however, these are not matters that can be taken into account in determining this application.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 I therefore conclude that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with policies CP4, DM11, and DM14 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan (2017) and would be contrary to the relevant guidance in the Council's SPG for residential extensions, in particular paragraph 3.3 and 5.2 and objectives of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (2018) to secure high quality design in all development.

10. RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE for the following reason:

(1) The proposed alterations to the existing dwelling by reason of the resultant imposing bulk would constitute an unsympathetic, incongruous and harmful addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and visual amenities of the surrounding countryside. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies CP4, DM11, and DM14 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan (2017), paragraph 3.3 of the Council's *Supplementary* Planning Guidance (SPG) for 'Designing an Extension and relevant guidance in the revised NPPF.

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.

