

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 2.3 REFERENCE NO - 20/505884/FULL | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Partial demolition of existing extension. Erection of part single storey, part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and part ground floor, part first floor side extension with balcony. Erection of a detached double garage, as amended by drawings 2011-PP01 Rev B, 2011-PP05 Rev A and 2011-PP09 Rev A. | | |
| ADDRESS 1 Rhode Common Cottages Rhode Common Dunkirk Kent ME13 9PT | | |
| RECOMMENDATION – Grant | | |
| REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection | | |
| WARD Boughton And Courtenay | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Dunkirk | APPLICANT Mr Brian Wicks AGENT Brian Wicks Architects |
| DECISION DUE DATE 10/02/21 | PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 21/01/21 | |

Planning History for 1 and 2 Rhode Common Cottages

SW/12/0902

Replacement of 1 and 2 Rhode Common Cottages with 2 Eco houses

Approved Decision Date: 16.10.2012

Implemented - one house built

SW/07/1464

Replacement of 1 and 2 Rhode Common Cottages with 2 Eco houses

Approved Decision Date: 04.12.2009

Permission lapsed

SW/02/0621 (at No.2)

Replacement side extension with hall, W.C, study, living room, kitchen extension, two bedrooms, detached garage

Approved Decision Date: 17.07.2002

Not built

SW/02/0351 (at No.1)

Living room conservatory extension and detached double garage

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 14.05.2002

Not built

SW/89/0766 (at No.1)

Proposed extension to replace existing extension and outhouse

Approved pre 1990 Decision Date: 30.06.1989

This extension has been constructed

SW/89/0278 (at No.1)

Proposed extension

Refused Decision Date: 20.04.1989

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 This property is a detached two storey dwelling that was formally a pair of symmetrical semi-detached cottages built in 1865; and previously known as Nos. 1 and 2 Rhode Common Cottages. The property lies in an isolated location outside any Local Plan defined built up area boundary, within a small cluster of houses set along a remote, narrow lane that is designated as a rural lane in the Council's adopted Local Plan. A public footpath runs through the property boundaries just to the north of the actual cottages. There is predominately farmland surrounding the site to the west, and woodland to the east which lies within an Area of High Landscape Value (Kent Level); although the property itself is not within the AHLV. A Grade II listed dwelling known as Jull Cottage lies on the opposite side of the lane, but about 50m to the south.
- 1.2 The original building here consisted of two small semi-detached cottages that had (long before 1989) each been extended to the side with small and similar (but poorly designed) two storey flat roofed bathroom and bedroom extensions. By 1989 these previous extensions had resulted in the cottages having a combined 'original' floorspace of approximately 176m². In 1989, planning permission (SW/89/0766) was granted at No.1 (the left hand cottage) to demolish the flat roofed side extension and erect a new two storey side extension. This approval also included replacing a small outhouse with a kitchen extension at the rear. This permission resulted in an increase in floorspace of this cottage from approximately 88m² (including the historic extension) to approximately 151m². This was a smaller extension than proposed in the earlier 1989 scheme that had been refused, and was accepted as it secured removal of the unattractive flat roofed side extension, and was a welcome change. This extension was built.
- 1.3 In 2002, planning permission (SW02/0351) was granted at No.1 for the erection of a slight enlargement of the living room in the new extension, and for a small timber framed conservatory to the side of the extended house. The additional floorspace permitted in 2002 was around 22m², bringing the overall permitted total floorspace of No.1 to almost 175m². A detached double garage on the site was also approved. These 2002 approved extension works were never built.
- 1.4 However, also in 2002, a planning application (SW/02/0621) sought to replicate both the built and unbuilt extensions approved at No.1 on No.2 (the right hand cottage) to essentially balance the pair again. This application also proposed a detached garage to replace an existing garage, but this was shown on land divided from the cottages by the public footpath. It was considered that the proposals would re-create a symmetrical pair of cottages and the application was approved.
- 1.5 The approvals of these three 1989 and 2002 applications meant that the total amount of permitted floorspace at the site for both cottages was in the region of 350m². This is roughly double the original floorspace of the cottages, but the approvals provided for removal of the historic two storey extensions, and parts were in a lightweight conservatory style.
- 1.6 Neither of the 2002 approved extensions were ever built. Instead, in 2007, the applicant sought planning permission to demolish both cottages and to erect two detached houses on the wider plot, one being on the land to the north of the public footpath. In 2009, Members resolved to grant planning permission for these new detached houses which were intended

to be built to very high sustainability ratings in terms of the then extant Code for Sustainable Homes. That application (SW/07/1464) proposed the replacement of the cottages with a total floorspace (of both new houses) significantly larger than the permitted extensions would have created, but it was approved on the basis of the eco-credentials of the buildings. This scheme was not built and the permission lapsed.

- 1.7 However, a later revised scheme to completely demolish and replace the two semi-detached cottages with two detached eco houses was approved by Members in October 2012. Again, one house would stand on the site of the cottages, and one would be to the north of the footpath. The 2012 approval was very similar to the 2007 approved scheme and comprised one new house at 332m² on the site of the original cottages, and a second slightly smaller house at 238m² on the garden land north of the footpath. That application (SW/12/0902) envisaged an overall floorspace of 570m², very slightly more than as approved in 2007. Again, these new houses were to feature a far higher standard of sustainable construction than might have been achieved from replacement by a pair of conventional semi-detached dwellings.
- 1.8 The 2012 planning permission was implemented, but only the smaller of the two eco houses has yet been built – the house the north of the footpath – this is now known as ‘Skyfall’. Thus the original pair of cottages still stands (with the 1989 approved side extension already built) but, via negotiation with the applicant, they have now been combined to form one dwelling to avoid the creation of a third property in this remote location. The implementation of the 2012 planning permission means that the larger replacement house can still be carried out, providing for up to 332m² of floorspace in the same position as the original pair of cottages, and in a slightly taller and more modern form.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The original cottages still stand (as one house, as extended in 1989), and the current application seeks planning permission to retain them as one house, but with different extensions to those already approved. This would be an alternative to replacing them with the larger eco house approved in 2012, for which the planning permission has been implemented and can be completed. Importantly, the total floorspace to be created by the extensions now proposed is substantially less (at 296m²) than would be created if the approved eco house were to be built as a replacement (332m²) including loft accommodation), or what has previously been approved as extensions (almost 350m²) - see table below.
- 2.2 Permission is now being sought to construct a staggered single storey extension to the rear, a part single and part two storey side extension at the northern end, and a small part ground floor and part first floor side extension with balcony to the south. Also proposed is a detached double garage to the northern side of the house close to the footpath.
- 2.3 The single storey rear extension would extend off the back of former cottage No.1 to a maximum of 3.75m beyond the rear wall of the 1989 side extension, and the smaller part would project 3.2m beyond the original rear wall what was formerly cottage No.2. The extensions would have pitched roofs with glazing in the gable ends, providing a new open plan kitchen/dining room.

- 2.4 The part single, part two storey side extension on the northern (footpath) side of the house would be set back from the original front elevation, and would project 3.9m sideways to provide a utility room, cloak room and larder. It would have a pitched roof with small dormers at the front and rear, creating ensuite bathrooms to bedroom 2 and 3.
- 2.5 The ground floor extension on the south western side (garden side) of the house would square off the 1989 side extension to provide a larger living room (as previously approved in 2002) and would have a flat roof to be used as a balcony to bedroom 1. The first floor part of this southern extension would have a sloping roof and would provide a cupboard to bedroom 1.
- 2.6 The ground floor extension walls will be built in red brick to match the existing house, and the first floor walls of the 1989 extension will be clad in boarding. The original front and side elevations will be re-pointed to both ground and first floor, and solar panels are proposed for to the south east facing (front) and south facing (side) roofslopes.
- 2.7 The proposed double garage would be close to the footpath and measure 6m wide by 7.2m long. The garage walls will be clad in weatherboarding above a red brickwork plinth, under an artificial slate roof. As originally submitted, the eaves of the garage would have overhung the footpath. However, following comments from the Public Rights Way of Officer, the garage has been re-positioned further into the site to avoid any overhang. There would be a large parking area that would comfortably park three cars in front of the house and garage.
- 2.8 The application is supported by a covering letter and a heritage statement. The following points are drawn from these documents:
- 1 Rhode Common Cottages is now one property. It was formally a pair of semi-detached cottages, Nos.1 & 2. Over the years they were both subject to a variety of planning permissions comprising large side and rear extensions including two large garages and storage buildings
 - 1 Rhode Common Cottages has an existing planning permission to be demolished and replaced with a larger new dwelling. This was subject to the same joint approved planning application (SW/12/0902) as no 2 Rhode Common Cottages, which has now been replaced with the new replacement property (Skyfall, Rhode Common, Selling, Faversham ME13 9PU). The joint planning permission remains in existence to date
 - Since constructing the replacement property (Skyfall) it was decided to investigate the possible alternative of retaining the existing building of No.1 to preserve its heritage value to the locality
 - This proposed new application aims to bring new life into existing 1 Rhode Common Cottages but provides for a different approach utilising the existing fabric but giving an opportunity to reuse the current structure: albeit altered, extended and improved
 - From a design point of view, it was sought to make the best of the building qualities, enhance and strengthen the original front elevation but to improve the overall internal layout and bring it completely up to date with improvements

- The proposal will incorporate technologies such as air source heat pump, solar panels, higher levels of insulation than required by current Building Regulations, improved windows and doors
- The proposals include for a double garage but smaller than the current consent
- The property is dated original 1865 and is located some 52.5 metres away from Jull Cottage Grade II Listed C17 timber frame cottage. The property is screened from 1 Rhode Common Cottages by a larger brick built garden shed with tiled roof adjacent to the road within its' grounds
- These proposals have no impact on the listed building of Jull Cottage. As described below an existing planning permission already is in place for the demolition of 1 Rhode Common Cottages for a new larger more modern property
- In conclusion, these proposals will bring back to life the original building by carrying out the proposals in a sympathetic way to provide a newly revitalised dwelling without the need to demolish and replace with a larger new property which is already approved

2.9 Since submission of the application, additional drawings have been submitted illustrating the silhouettes of the 2002 approved extensions, and of the approved replacement dwelling, in relation to the currently proposed alterations.

3. SUMMARY INFORMATION

| | Total amount of permitted built form (<i>Existing building + unbuilt approved permissions</i>) | SW/12/0902 (<i>Replacement House at No.1 – extant</i>) | 20/505884/FULL (<i>Current application</i>) |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Total Floorspace (m ²) | 350 | 332 (285 + 47) | 296 |
| Approximate Ridge Height (m) | 7.6 | 8 | 7.6 |

4. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

4.1 None

5. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017:

Policy CP4 Requiring good design

Policy ST3 The Swale settlement strategy

Policy DM7 Vehicle parking

Policy DM11 Extensions to, and replacement of, dwellings in the rural area

Policy DM14 General development criteria

Policy DM16 Alterations and extensions

Policy DM26 Rural lanes

5.2 Policy ST3 of Bearing Fruits 2031: Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 states:

“At locations in the countryside, outside the built-up area boundaries shown on the Proposals Map, development will not be permitted, unless supported by national planning policy and able to demonstrate that it would contribute to protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing the intrinsic value, landscape setting, tranquillity and beauty of the countryside, its buildings, and the vitality of rural communities.”

5.3 Policy DM11 deals with extensions to dwellings in the rural area. This states that:

“The Council will permit extensions (taking into account any previous additions undertaken) to existing dwellings in the rural areas where they are of an appropriate scale, mass, and appearance in relation to the location.”

5.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled “Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders”. Paragraph 3.3 of the SPG states that:

“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.”

With regards to design, paragraph 3.2 states that:

“It is often advisable to set the extension back from the front wall of the existing house... The set back should be at least one or two brick lengths but often more and the roof above should be set back by the same amount to create the right impression.”

It further states at paragraph 3.4:

“On houses with pitched roofs it is always best to have a matching pitched roof on the extension with the same type of tiles. All such two-storey extensions should have a pitched roof and front and other prominent single storey extensions are normally better for having pitched roofs.”

5.5 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled “Parking Standards” was adopted by the Council in June 2020 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The recommendation for a 4+ bedroom house in a rural location is 3+ parking spaces. The recommended dimensions for a two car garage are 6 metres wide and 7 metres deep.

6. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 Two letters have been received from local residents and their comments can be summarised as follows:

- Given that the original planning permission was granted and Skyfall built, we believe that any planning permission granted by Swale Borough Council (SBC) can only be damage limitation
- The planning application for the dwelling now known as "Skyfall" was drawing to an end when we moved into the area; had we arrived in time we would, while strongly supporting the proposed eco-friendly approach, have objected to its massive and inappropriate appearance. We think that building a second dwelling in the same style will worsen the visual impact of the first. We would support the building of a smaller dwelling in the style of the present number 1 (with such high insulation standards etc. as might be achievable), which would be more in keeping with existing dwellings in the vicinity
- The present narrow and enclosed nature of the path at the site of the application is very regrettable, and should be addressed. It would be worsened if the present proposals were to go ahead. This footpath is a significant and important one; not only does it provide Rhode Common residents with walking access to Selling Station (including use until recently for commuting to work) and the facilities at the Sondes, Neames Forstal, but it is also provides access from the station to the extensive network of footpaths S. and E. of Rhode Common
- SBC can still ensure that the footpath between the properties is protected in the way set out in the KCC comment. Please insist the current width of the path is protected since, in an ideal world it should be widened by at least 0.5 m.

NOTE: The garage has been re-positioned clear of the footpath since these comments were made.

- We are a little surprised by the paucity of neighbour comments; perhaps the means of communication is a major contributor to this

6.2 The applicant has responded to these points saying

“The footpath width and its’ position was confirmed by KCC footpaths as correct. No alterations to it’s’ position or width is necessitated by this current application it remains unaffected. As confirmed by the KCC PROW Officer.”

7. CONSULTATIONS

7.1 Dunkirk Parish Council requests that the application is refused, responding as follows:

“At the planning meeting on 4th January 2021 Dunkirk Parish Council (DPC) discussed this application.

The councils planning committee also heard, by way of informed comment, from other members of DPC.

History.

Concerns were raised regarding this change to a planning permission that officers recommended (SW/12/0902) against all comments from local people and an adjoining Parish Council. It was stated that the new dwellings would not reach a very high eco standard and that each property would be some 200% larger than the existing Victorian houses.

One of these has been built (we believe in a different place to consented) and the applicant uses this as his address. Skyfall, Rhode Common Dunkirk Kent ME13 9PT

Note: This does not appear on SBC Council Tax list.

No 1 Rhode Common Cottages was a semi-detached cottage with a ground floor of approx. 35sq.m, first floor of again 35sq.m. (70sq.m.) with a two-storey side extension of (over both floors) approx. 64sq.m. along with rear and additional side extension of approx. 17sq.m. This was an additional 115% of the original. Once No.2 Rhode Common Cottage was included by knocking through, this added a further 70sq.m. extension to No.1 to be 215% of the original (No.1). This new proposed 2-storey side extension (to the original No.2 cottage) is a further 27sq.m. and would mean an increase to 254% of the original cottage, with insufficient eco benefits.

This application takes one of the original cottages and adds, by joining them together, effectively a large two storey extension not based on SBC guidance to householders, and then adds a further extension.

Whilst we are aware that the consented 2012 application could still be built and would be a similar size to the two knocked through cottages, both with 2-storey extensions would be similar in size. We also accept that the consented 2012 proposal is much higher and is on 3 levels. SBC were content with the dubious eco credentials although no-one else was, they were at least in place.

From the officers previous report, he appears to confirm this:

The proposed dwellings would incorporate a far higher standard of sustainable construction than the current cottages, which could not be expected from previously approved extensions or from straight replacement dwellings.

DPC members were unanimous that even the low eco levels of the consented could not be met with this conversion of an old (1865) cottage.

A neighbour who originally objected feels that whilst there could be some slight merit in keeping the façade it would still have been better as two smaller affordable homes. Please do not take this statement as one of approval. Please also note they were not notified last time and have not been consulted this time either.

You have been notified by the clerk that we request extra time and ask that you consult all those who commented previously.

Some policies relevant to this application are:

Policy CP4 Requiring good design

Policy ST3 The Swale settlement strategy

Policy DM7 Vehicle Parking

Policy DM11 Extensions to, and replacement of, dwellings in the rural area

Policy DM14 General development criteria

Policy DM16 Alterations and extensions

Policy DM24 Conserving and enhancing valued landscapes

Policy DM26 Rural lanes

We consider that one of the key issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the designated countryside.

The property sits in a prominent position along a designated rural lane. Having looked carefully at the planning history, it is evident that the two storey side extension, along with both single storey extensions, resulted in an increase in floorspace of 126%:- much more than the 60% floorspace guidance of the extensions SPG (we appreciate this is only guidance, but SBC seem to think sometimes it is, and sometimes its a ceiling). This is further increased with the inclusion of another dwelling i.e. 254%

The policy guidance was published by the Council, partly to address the issue of rural cottages were being extended to large dwellings reducing the supply of smaller, more affordable dwellings in the rural area, and harming the character of the countryside.

In short this is even larger than that consented with, we believe, a even lower eco standard.

WE ask that SBC refuses the application as the previous consent has not been complied with (No.2 will be demolished), the eco values are not in line with SBC policies of green development and SBC policies as noted above.”

- 7.2 Following the submission of additional illustrative drawings, Dunkirk Parish has added the following points:

“Dunkirk Parish Council have seen new drawing for this application; we thought SBC might have notified us.

We discussed this again on Monday 18th January at a full council meeting.

All of our previous objections stand.

We appreciate there is an extant permission for what was described as an eco home.

We appreciate the applicant is trying to suggest that, as this is smaller, it should be consented.

However, we still object on the grounds that it wouldn't be economically viable to obtain high eco values, especially as we move to higher specifications.

This application would provide a Victorian cottage, essentially extended by adding the second part of the semi detached original as an extension, plus a plethora of other extensions that would be vastly in excess of the SPG 'Guide to Householders'.

It would therefore be in conflict with Bearing Fruits, NPPF and the draft Local Plan.

This application should be refused.”

7.3 The applicant responded to the Parish Council's objection as follows:

- 1) *History: Planning Permission for replacement 2no Eco houses were granted into 2012, this permission is still current.*
- 2) *The approved new larger replacement dwelling still has permission to be built and can go ahead tomorrow. All conditions have been approved. Building Regulations are approved. This application is to consider improvements and extensions to the existing 1 Rhode Common Cottages in lieu of a replacement new dwelling as indicated on the extensive drawings submitted.*
- 3) *One property now named as Skyfall, Rhode Common, Selling, Faversham Kent ME13 9PU. Has been built in the correct approved position, not as suggested erroneously by Dunkirk Parish Council*
- 4) *Skyfall the new replacement Eco House does indeed pay considerable council Tax and not as suggested erroneously by Dunkirk Parish Council.*
- 5) *Skyfall does not receive any Council Tax reduction relief, even though it has been built at considerable cost with Eco credentials.*
- 6) *The areas of the original pair of cottages were submitted with the original Planning Application for the replacement Eco Houses which were correctly analysed by the Planning Offices. The approved extensions were considered at that time.*
- 7) *The old No 2 Rhode Common Cottages no longer exists having as explained having been knocked into one property namely No 1 Rhode Common Cottages. Accordingly, this property now pays a higher Council Tax accordingly as agreed by the Authorities.*
- 8) *No Planning Permission was required to knock No 1 and old No 2 into one larger property.*
- 9) *Dunkirk Parish Council accepts that the replacement new property would indeed be higher (3 storeys) and substantially larger.*
- 11) *Dunkirk Parish Council again erroneously suggest that the Skyfall does not have any Eco credentials.*
- 12) *What evidence can Dunkirk Parish Council Members present to substantiate their view that the proposed alterations, extensions and substantial upgrading of the existing dwelling cannot be achieved.*
- 13) *Dunkirk Parish Council have suggested from a neighbour that the existing 1 Rhode Common Cottages should revert back to 2 separate cottages and that there is some slight merit in retaining the original front façade, a positive note which is welcomed by the applicant.*
- 14) *The policies listed by Dunkirk Parish Council have been considered.*

15) The character and appearance of the existing property and the alterations have been extensively considered.

16) The road is not designate but is just a rural lane and is now unfortunately being used as a rat run. It would be good if Dunkirk Parish Council instigated imposing 20mph speed limits to enhance the character of Rhode Common.

7.4 Selling Parish Council has raised no objection to the application.

7.5 The KCC Public Rights of Way (PROW) Officer originally raised concerns about the proposed siting of the garage as it appeared the eaves would overhang the adjacent footpath. The applicant has responded to this comment as follows:

Amended drawings were submitted moving the garage further into the site thus avoiding any overhang as requested by the PWOW officer Mr Michael Ellis.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

8.1 Application papers and drawings referring to application reference 20/505884/FULL.

9. APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

9.1 The application site lies within the open countryside, where policy DM11 seeks to restrain extensions to dwellings in rural locations to those that are modest. Previous extensions have been approved but not all have been built. These would have created a larger floorspace than is now proposed, albeit in the form of two cottages - although these could have been combined to create one large house at any time.

9.2 The planning policies and local guidance relevant today are much as they were in 2002 when the Council considered the merits of enlarging these cottages and approved the proposals. The degree of enlargement was larger than might normally have been permitted due to design gains. Since then matters have taken an unusual turn, with an approval for two replacement houses being granted, and the approval started. As such, there is now an extant permission to build a modern, taller house of substantially greater size, and of a less traditional appearance. Such considerations need to be carefully balanced against the benefits of the proposal and whether it would have a significantly greater impact on the surrounding countryside.

Impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and countryside

9.3 This rural cottage, previously two semi-detached cottages, has already been extended, with further extensions approved but not built. In its place a large new house has also been approved, and a new house has been built nearby as a replacement for one of the original cottages. Notwithstanding the fact that half of the pair has already been rebuilt as a new house, the additional drawings submitted by the applicant (at my request) illustrate that the replacement house would have been undoubtedly larger than the current proposal, as would the previously approved extensions had they been built. It is clear that a different approach is now being sought that has substantially reduced the bulk and mass of the building when compared to these previous permissions. The supporting statement argues in favour of

restoring the original building that preserves its rural character and that it is the applicant's intention to incorporate renewable technologies such as air source heat pump, solar panels, and higher levels of insulation.

- 9.4 Although the property has already been altered the alterations now proposed are relatively minor and perhaps less intrusive, and more modest, than those that the Council has previously accepted. The proposed scheme is well-considered and appropriately designed, and it will not add significant bulk to the current appearance of the cottage. The northern extension is set back from the main façade and the extension on the other side will infill a space behind the existing side extension and, at first floor, provide a small cupboard space to serve the master bedroom. At the rear, the ground floor extensions partly replace an existing rear extension to provide an open plan living space.
- 9.5 In terms of floorspace, with the additions now being proposed the property would have a total floorspace of 296m². In comparison, the floorspace of the approved replacement house would have been in the region 332m², and the previously approved extensions would have created a floorspace of around 350m².
- 9.6 In my opinion the extensions now proposed would not significantly alter the size, appearance or character of the existing building. The northern side extension has a pitched roof set lower than the main ridge line which helps to keep the bulk of the extension down, and it would replace the flat roofed extension, which has already been demolished. There would be a small gap between the house and the garage, which has been substantially reduced in scale when compared to that previously approved. As such the additional floorspace now being proposed would not be any more prominent on the site than the approved house. Members should bear in mind that the replacement house can still be built, and to resist a limited further enlargement of the existing building to a similar scale might be difficult.
- 9.7 I note the concern of the Parish Council that the joining of the two cottages has inevitably resulted in an increase in floorspace in its floorspace beyond the 60% guidance of the SPG. I appreciate their wish to see local policy applied consistently, but the additional floorspace now proposed is less than previously accepted and the current proposals will, in my view, have a limited impact on the character of the cottage. I consider that what is now proposed is arguably more acceptable in appearance and local character than which has already been approved, and of the replacement house which could still be built. I note that there is evidence of local support for extending rather than seeing the approved modern house built.

Residential Amenity

- 9.8 The closest neighbouring property is Skyfall, the new house that has been built on the other side of the public footpath. There is no identifiable harm regarding the impact of the proposals upon the amenity of the occupiers of this neighbouring property, who is in fact the applicant. The properties are sufficiently spaced apart that the proposal would not give rise to any serious overshadowing or loss of light to this adjoining property. With regards to overlooking, there are no first floor side windows facing this property. The balcony above the ground floor side extension would face down garden on the other side of the property and as such there would be no harmful overlooking into the garden of Skyfall.

Highways

- 9.9 I am satisfied that sufficient space has been located to the front of the dwelling in which to comfortably park three cars. This parking provision would meet the needs of the occupiers of a four bedroom property, in accordance with the recently adopted SPG. The size of the double garage also meets the required minimum dimensions. There is some concern that the siting of the garage so close to the public footpath will impinge upon the accessibility of this footpath. The applicant has re-sited the proposed garage and I am satisfied that these concerns have been addressed.

Other Matters

- 9.10 There is concern from local residents and the Parish Council that not all interested parties might have been consulted. However, both nearest properties have been consulted and a site notice was posted directly in front of the property, so meeting the necessary publicity requirements. The last planning application here was almost ten years ago and I do not consider that it was necessary to notify those some way from the site, especially for what are more limited proposals.

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 This scheme seeks permission to extend the property to a lesser size than that previously approved, and to less than that of the approved replacement house, one that could still be built. Whilst it is accepted that a separate new house has already been built, that was a positive decision of the Council and it has been partly successful. The Council cannot, and might not even wish to, force the applicant to complete the new replacement house on the site of the original cottages. On that basis, I do not consider that the extensions would be of a form and presence that will be any more detrimental to the character of the area. The proposed extensions might be considered more in-keeping with the rural character, and I therefore recommend that planning permission is granted.

11. **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) The development hereby approved, including the specification of materials to be used in the development, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings

Proposed Ground Floor Plan 2011-PP-02; Proposed First Floor Plan 2011-PP-03; Proposed Roof Plan 2011-PP-04; Proposed Elevations SE & NW; 2011-PP-05 Rev A; Proposed Elevations SW & NE 2011-PP-06; Proposed Garage Layout 2011-PP07 and Proposed Block Plan 2011-PP09 Rev A.

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

- (3) The garage hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for purposes ancillary

to the residential use of the dwelling known as 1 Rhode Common Cottages.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area.

The Council's approach to the application

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019 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.

