

3.2 14/504051/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Alteration and extension to existing dwelling			
ADDRESS Cherry Tree Cottage Dunkirk Road South Dunkirk Kent ME13 9PB			
RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL Poor design and immodest extension in the countryside.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council support			
WARD Boughton & Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Dunkirk	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs N Williams AGENT Mr Ian Barber	
DECISION DUE DATE 13/11/14	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 13/11/14		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	
SW/12/1239	Alteration and extension to existing dwelling	Approved	

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.1 The site is a traditionally designed three bedroom cottage surrounded by a large garden. It is located in a country lane and in within the designated countryside.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks permission for alterations and extensions to the property which is detached and lies within the designated countryside.

2.2 The proposal would create a family/breakfast area at ground floor and an additional bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. This part of the proposal is identical to a scheme granted planning permission here in 2012 (SW/12/1239). However, this amended scheme also includes the addition of a wrap around conservatory in the location of the patio which would cover almost the whole of the northern elevation and wrap around the eastern elevation.

2.3 The existing floorspace of the cottage is approximately 101.11 square metres. The previous approval increased the floorspace by 71.14 square metres; which amounts to approximately a 70.35% percentage increase from the original floorspace. The additional floorspace provided by the additional conservatory proposed under the current application would be 23.24 sq m, this added to the approved increase amounts to 94.98 sq m, approximately a 94% increase over the original.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.1 None

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Development Plan:

4.2 Swale Borough Local Plan 2008

E1 (General Development Criteria)

E6 (the Countryside)

E19 (Design Criteria)

E24 (Extensions & Alterations)

RC4 (Extensions to, and replacement of dwellings in the countryside)

4.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 1993 entitled '*Designing an Extension*'. This is adopted guidance and is referred to in paragraph 3.71 of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008.

4.4 In particular para 3.3 states "*in the countryside, scale is of particular importance. In rural areas, policies are designed to maintain their attractive character and the extension of a small cottage to create a large house will normally be resisted. The Council will not normally approve an extension to a dwelling in a rural area if it results in an increase of more than 60% of the property's original floorspace. In many cases, even extensions of this size are not acceptable.*"

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 None received.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Dunkirk Parish Council support the application. They do not give a reason for supporting the application.

7.0 APPRAISAL

7.1 I consider the key issues in this case are whether the design of the proposal is appropriate to the property and the rural area, whether the proposal amounts to a modest extension to a property in the countryside and whether the proposal would cause harm to neighbouring amenity or highway safety.

7.2 With regards to the first issue, the proposed design of the conservatory is, in my view, inappropriate and out-of-scale on this modest cottage, introducing a totally alien form and design to the house. The materials fail to compliment the existing building, and the form fails to respect the character of the existing dwelling. This combined with the significant increase in overall development and floorspace has a detrimental impact upon the simplicity of the original character of the dwelling resulting in an immodest addition, failing to comply with the criteria as set out within policies E6 & RC4 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008. It is neither modest in terms of increase in floorspace, amounting to an increase of approximately 94%, nor in terms of massing. I

therefore do not consider the proposal could be considered modest in any sense and as a result would cause harm to the character and appearance of the rural area in which it is situated.

7.3 With regards to neighbouring amenity, the dwelling is not sited in close proximity to any neighbouring properties. I therefore do not consider it would result in any significant harm to neighbouring amenity. With regards to highway safety, there would be no impact above and beyond the situation already considered to be acceptable under the earlier approval.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, form, materials and poorly detailed design, would detract from the character of this dwelling and that of the countryside itself, and would not represent a modest or appropriate extension to a dwelling in the countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies E1, E6, E9, E19, E24 & RC4 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders'.

COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO THE APPLICATION

The Council recognises the advice in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and seeks to work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service; having a duty planner service; and seeking to find solutions to any obstacles to approval of applications having due regard to the responses to consultation, where it can reasonably be expected that amendments to an application will result in an approval without resulting in a significant change to the nature of the application and the application can then be amended and determined in accordance with statutory timescales.

In this instance the application was determined by the Council's Planning Committee where the applicant was able to speak to the Committee and support 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.