

<b>2.2 REFERENCE NO - 21/502802/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Erection of single storey front extension		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 135 Honeyball Walk Teynham Sittingbourne Kent ME9 9TW		
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> – Grant subject to conditions		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b>		
Applicant is a member of staff.		
<b>WARD</b> Teynham And Lynsted	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Teynham	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mrs C Wade
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 26/07/2021	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 28/06/21	

## 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 135 Honeyball Walk is a modern end of terrace 3 bedroom property situated within the Local Plan defined built-up area of Teynham. The property is positioned at the end of a walkway with an amenity area to the front of the dwelling which also extends to the side where there is a driveway for the parking of a number of vehicles, and an enclosed garden to the rear. A high dense hedge is positioned along the walkway and along the front and south west boundary. A garage is situated on the north east side towards the rear of the property which is also set within a block of garages, one of which projects forward of the front wall of the dwelling on the north east side by 2.9m.
- 1.2 The streetscene comprises properties of similar design and size. Many of the dwellings along this terrace have flat roof front porches, however, a number of dwellings within the Honeyball Walk estate have had these removed and replaced with single storey, pitched roofed front additions.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application proposes a single storey, lean to style front extension which would extend across the entire width of the front of the house. It would project 1.2m from the front elevation of the dwelling and would measure approximately 5.2m in width, extending across the entire width of the front of the house. The extension would have a mono pitched roof with an eaves height of approximately 3m and an overall height of approximately 3.69m. The existing porch would be demolished as part of the proposal.
- 2.2 No windows would be positioned in the side elevations of the proposed front extension, but one existing window on the ground floor north east side elevation of the existing dwelling would be removed. Internally, the first floor would be re-arranged to provide a fourth bedroom and a new window would be inserted within the side elevation at first floor level.
- 2.3 In terms of materials the proposed front extension would be constructed of materials which would match those used on the existing dwelling. The drawings also show that a small area of white cladding on the north east side elevation would be replaced with Marley Cedral cladding, and this would also be used on the front elevation replacing a small area of hanging tiles which would remain above the proposed front

extension. The additional window proposed within the north east elevation at first floor will match the existing windows.

### **3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

- 3.1 None.

### **4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
- 4.2 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 policies:
- CP4 (Requiring good design)
  - DM14 (General development criteria)
  - DM16 (Alterations and extensions)
- 4.3 The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) titled "Designing an Extension A Guide for Householders". Relevant extracts state:

*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 other prominent single storey extensions are normally better for having pitched roofs.*

*4.0 On any house, an extension should be well designed to reflect its character. Use of matching bricks, other facing materials, and roof tiles together with appropriate doors and windows is essential if an extension is not to upset the appearance of the house or the area as a whole.*

*5.2 It is the extension to the front of your house that will normally have the greatest impact upon the appearance of the street. Any extension forward of the existing front wall is likely to pose difficulties. In conventional streets two storey front extensions are rarely acceptable. Where there is a strong building line, extensions other than small porches are unlikely to be acceptable.*

*5.3 To make sure the extension to the front of your dwelling is of a good design, the Borough Council normally require that it should have a pitched roof and that its projection should be kept to an absolute minimum. The Borough Council normally requires that front additions are kept to a maximum of 1.2m.*

### **5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1 None received.

### **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

- 6.1 None received.

### **7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS**

- 7.1 Application papers for application 21/502802/FULL

## 8.0 APPRAISAL

- 8.1 This site is situated within the built up area boundary of Teynham and as such the principle of the development is acceptable subject to the other relevant policy considerations outlined below. The main considerations in the determination of this planning application are the design and scale of the extension in relation to the house itself and the impact upon the residential and visual amenities in the area.
- 8.2 The properties along this stretch of Honeyball Walk front a walkway on what was designed as an open-plan estate. The original open plan front garden to 135 Honeyball Walk is bordered to the front with a tall dense hedge and the rear of an 'en-bloc' garage adjacent to the dwelling, which sits further forwards than the front wall of the house. I note therefore a significant amount of the dwelling's lower front elevation is hidden from view within the wider streetscene. However, there is a strong building line present along this terrace of houses on both sides of the walkway, none of which have been extended in a similar manner to what is proposed. Therefore, any front additions would need to be carefully considered.
- 8.3 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance at paragraph 5.3 generally requires that '*front additions are kept to a maximum of 1.2m*'. In this instance the proposed front extension would project to the front of the dwelling by 1.2m and as such conforms with this recommended depth.
- 8.4 I note that there are a number of front extensions in Honeyball Walk and similar front extensions have also been approved in nearby Bradfield Avenue where the SPG has been adhered to with a front projection of 1.2m. I therefore take the view that this form of extension is not out of the norm and relatively common on this type of dwelling within this area.
- 8.5 The proposed single storey front extension would project no further forward than the adjacent 'enbloc' garage on the north east side and as such I consider it would not be entirely visible within the wider streetscene.
- 8.6 In terms of design the proposed single storey front extension would have a pitched roof which satisfies extract 3.4 of the SPG which states that any prominent single storey extensions are normally better for having pitched roofs.
- 8.7 The single storey front extension would be visible from certain public vantage points so Local Plan policy CP4 (Good design), is of the utmost importance. In this case, the brickwork, windows and roof tiles would match those on the existing dwelling which I consider to be acceptable and in accordance with Local Plan policy DM16. As part of the proposal the use of Forest Grey Marley Cedral cladding is proposed to replace the existing white cladding on the north east (side) elevation and to the front elevation above the proposed extension replacing the existing hanging tiles. I consider this to be acceptable as it would replace existing cladding on the side elevation. I note no other dwellings within this terrace of houses have cladding to the front however I consider only a small amount would be visible due to the overall height of the proposed front extension. Additional to this there are similarly styled dwellings to the north east of the application site within Honeyball Walk where the whole of the upper front elevations have been clad.
- 8.8 One window is proposed at first floor on the north east side elevation serving an additional bedroom. There is already a side window present at first floor on this elevation and there are no adjacent dwellings due to the block of garages situated to

this side of the dwelling. I therefore do not have significant concerns here in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

- 8.9 The property enjoys a substantial driveway and I have no concerns over parking provision.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 I do not see any significant harm arising to the amenities of neighbours or to the character of the area; nor do I consider that the Council could successfully defend an appeal here. This proposal essentially follows the guidance as set out in the Council's own Supplementary Planning Guidance, and I feel it appropriate to recommend this application for approval.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION – Grant**

### **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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, other than the Forest Grey Marley Cedral cladding, shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity

### **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.

