

2.9 REFERENCE NO - 21/502172/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Proposed first floor rear extension with Juliet balcony, single storey front and side extension and conversion of garage to a workshop and store.		
ADDRESS 20 Harrier Drive Sittingbourne Kent ME10 4UY		
RECOMMENDATION – Grant subject to conditions		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Ward Member.		
WARD Roman	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL N/A	APPLICANT Mr Dean Sargeant AGENT Woodstock Associates
DECISION DUE DATE 27/07/2021		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 25/05/21

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 20 Harrier Drive is a modern two-storey detached property located within the built up area boundary of Sittingbourne. Harrier Drive is situated on a hill and the application site is one of six dwellings, four of which are similarly designed and sized based within a small side road which is situated on a steep slope. Due to the position on the hillside the site levels between each property varies considerably. There is an amenity space to the front of the property with a small element of soft landscaping on the south west side and a paved driveway to allow for off-road parking, this leads down the north east side of the property to an attached garage and amenity space to the rear.
- 1.2 The street scene is mainly residential with properties of similar designs and sizes.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application proposes a single storey front and side extension which would attach to the existing garage. The garage would be converted to create a workshop and store. It also proposes a first-floor rear extension which includes a Juliet balcony at the rear. This would extend partially over an existing single storey projection to the rear of the dwelling.
- 2.2 The front / side extension would wrap around the building and extend close to the side boundary with No 22, with a nominal gap of some 5cm between buildings. An existing porch would be demolished, and the extension would project forward of the main front wall of the dwelling by 1.2m. The extension would have a maximum width of approximately 4.82m where it extends along the front of the existing dwelling, and a width of 2.38m where it extends between the existing side wall of the dwelling and No 22. The extension would have a mono-pitched roof when viewed from the front, with an eaves height of approximately 2.76m and an overall height of approximately 3.36m. Behind this, the side extension would incorporate a flat roof which would then tie into the existing garage roof. The extension would accommodate a new porch, shower room, office and utility room. Three roof lights are proposed within the flat roof area of the side extension. The existing garage would be converted to a workshop and store, externally the only alteration to the garage would be the insertion of a window adjacent to the garage door on the north east side elevation.

- 2.3 The proposed first floor rear extension would be sited above an existing single storey extension to the rear of the property. It would project from the rear of the dwelling at first floor by approximately 1.8m and would have a gable roof with a ridge height of approximately 6.69m which would be lower than the ridge height on the existing dwelling. In terms of the proposed fenestration one window serving an on-suite bathroom and a set of double doors providing a Juliet balcony are proposed facing the rear on the first floor. The extension would be approximately 15 metres from the rear boundary of the site, beyond which is the rear part of the garden to a property at 41 Fallowfield.
- 2.4 In terms of materials the proposed extensions would be constructed of materials which would match those used on the existing dwelling.
- 2.5 The proposal would reduce the existing parking at the dwelling in terms of the loss of the garage and the parking along the north east side of the dwelling and as such amended block plans have been provided altering the existing landscaping to the front of the property to provide two parking spaces.

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.

5.6 *If not sensibly planned, rear extensions can have considerable impact upon your neighbour. Careful regard should be given to the outlook of your neighbours and the effect of the extension on sunlight and daylight to their dwelling. This is particularly important where the extension is along a common boundary and especially on terraces or semi-detached properties. To minimise this impact, the Borough Council limits the amount of outward projection on the extension.*

5.7 *For single storey rear extensions close to your neighbour's common boundary, the Borough Council considers that a maximum projection of 3.0m will be allowed. A first floor extension should not exceed 1.8m (with two storey rear extensions the potential impact can be even greater). Leaving a gap to the boundary with your neighbour may offset this requirement slightly depending on the distance allowed.*

6.1 *Windows to the rear should be at least 21m from the windows of other houses to the rear. Extensions which reduce such a distance will need to be carefully examined. It should be noted that the option of a high level window or high level rooflight as the only light and ventilation to a habitable room to overcome these problems is not normally accepted by the Council.*

7.0 *The effect on available off-road parking space is also a matter of concern to the Council. Where car parking is or could be provided in the grounds of the property the Council will try to ensure that a new extension does not take this away without a suitable alternative area being made available. The Council will seek to ensure that at least one retained space is suitable for the building of a garage if one does not already exist. Extensions or conversions of garages to extra accommodation, which reduce available parking space and increase parking on roads are not likely to be accepted. Nor is the provision of all car parking in the front garden a suitable alternative as the position is unlikely to be suitable for a garage and will create a poor appearance in the streetscene.*

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 One letter of objection has been received from occupants of the neighbouring property which says, in summary:

- *There is no party wall agreement which I understand has to be put in place because of the close proximity (5cm) of the proposed extension to their house.*
- *I am obviously very worried about my foundations being compromised. The houses in Harrier Drive are built on the site of an old pug quarry. My house is at the top of a steep hill and is over 3ft higher than no.20 and I am so afraid that excavating below my foundations would undermine and de-stable them, affecting the structural integrity of my side wall and subsequently the house.*
- Reference to 'The access to neighbouring land act 1992' – enables access to adjoining land for the purpose of basic preservation works. The proposed extension would hinder access to their property. The occupier of no.22 Harrier Drive does not know how she would access the lower part of wall through a 5cm gap to rectify any future problems which may arise. A 5cm gap would not allow much airflow which could cause problems in the future.
- *When looking at the front elevations on the plans my first impression was that it would make the two properties appear link-detached. This part of Harrier Drive has four*

visibly detached houses. This proposed structure would alter the visual appearance from the road. A 5cm gap would not be obviously visible from the road and it would greatly affect the visual appearance of my house.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 None received.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.1 Application papers for application 21/502172/FULL

8.0 APPRAISAL

- 8.1 This site is situated within the built up area boundary of Sittingbourne 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 single storey front / side extension would be visible from public vantage points. It would represent a modest addition to the dwelling with materials to match existing. In visual terms, it would have a pitched roof at the front which would hide much of the flat roof behind. It would essentially appear to link with the neighbouring property at No 22. However this is not unusual or unacceptable in planning terms and many properties extend to the site boundary at single storey level. I also note that due to the land level changes, No 22 is built approx. 0.8m higher than the application site, which further distinguishes between the two properties. A visual gap would remain at first floor level and the staggered line of the dwellings would further limit visual impact. I have no concerns about the visual appearance of the extension, and consider it to be in accordance with Local Plan policy DM16.
- 8.3 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance at extract 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 The proposed side extension, part of the front extension and the proposed conversion of the existing garage will result in the loss of existing parking at the application site. Initially the parking to the front of the property would not have allowed two adequately sized parking spaces in line with SBC parking standards however, the applicant has submitted amended drawings showing the existing landscaping on the south west side altered to enable two parking spaces to be available to the front of the dwelling. This amendment now provides adequate hardstanding space for a property of this size to allow for off road parking and an element of soft landscaping will remain to the front of the property. I consider this to be acceptable
- 8.5 Turning to scale, and referencing extracts 5.6 and 5.7 from the SPG as set out above, the first floor rear extension would project 1.8m from the rear of the dwelling and as such adheres to the maximum recommendation in the SPG guidance. I note further, as well as the site levels of each dwelling being different, the dwellings themselves are staggered where each house is set in a different position. No.18 Harrier Drive sits further to the rear than the host property and I note No.18 has a window positioned on the side elevation at first floor, however this serves a staircase, therefore I do not believe this adjacent dwelling would be adversely affected. To the north east, no.22 is positioned further forwards than

the host property and as such the proposed first floor extension could have more impact on this neighbouring dwelling. However, taking into consideration the distance of the proposed first floor extension to the boundary and the differing site levels where this neighbouring dwelling is positioned significantly higher than no.20, I do not believe the proposed first floor rear extension would cause significant harm in terms of loss of light, overbearing or overshadowing to this neighbouring amenity.

- 8.6 The proposed side extension would run directly along the boundary with No 22. However, due to level differences, the extension would only marginally exceed the height of the boundary fence between the properties and for this reason would not appear overbearing or lead to any material loss of light or privacy. Therefore I consider that the proposed side extension would not give rise to significant harm to the amenity of this neighbouring resident.
- 8.7 The windows to the rear of the property, including the Juliet balcony would not directly face any windows of properties to the rear though the windows would be brought closer to the rear amenity area of no.41 Fallowfield, however they would be over 21m from the centre-line of this neighbouring property's rear garden and therefore in line with the guidance above in extract 6.1 of the SPG. I do not consider that this would cause any unacceptable harm to any neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking.
- 8.8 I sympathise with and acknowledge the concerns received from the adjacent neighbour relating to the impact of the proposed side extension due to its close proximity to their side wall and foundations. However the objections relating to structural/foundation issues, and the Party Wall Act and access to the side wall are not matters that are controlled by planning legislation.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 Overall, whilst I appreciate the concerns of the neighbour, I consider that the proposal is acceptable in planning terms. On the basis of the above assessment, I do not consider that any significant harm would arise 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 it is appropriate to recommend this application for approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following 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 shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings SA/01/104.01 Rev A, SA/01/104.03 and SA/01/104.05.

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

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.

