

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 21/501945/FULL	
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Proposed conversion of existing garage to a habitable room, changes to garage roof to provide internal stairs, part single storey part two storey rear extension together with widening of existing drive to provide parking for two cars (Resubmission of 20/505333/FULL).	
ADDRESS 14 Woodpecker Drive Iwade Sittingbourne Kent ME9 8ST	
RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to conditions	
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION Following the submission of amended plans reducing the scale of the development, the scheme would not have an unacceptable impact on residential and visual amenities, and would provide adequate parking provision.	
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection	
WARD Bobbing, Iwade And Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Iwade
APPLICANT Miss Wendy Hughes AGENT Nigel Sands & Associates	
DECISION DUE DATE 03/06/21	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 02/08/21

Planning History

20/505333/FULL

Proposed conversion of existing garage to habitable room, two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and widening existing drive to provide parking for 2 cars

Refused Decision Date: 08.01.2021

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 14 Woodpecker Drive is a detached two storey property located within the built up area boundary of Iwade. There is an attached single garage to the side of the dwelling, with a driveway to the front of this. The rest of the front garden is laid with grass. To the rear is private amenity space.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is characterised by residential development of a similar scale. Notably the building line of the application site and immediate surrounding properties is staggered, meaning No. 12 to the north is set forward of No. 14, whilst No. 16 to the south is set further back.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks planning permission for the conversion of existing garage to a habitable room, changes to the garage roof to facilitate a new internal staircase to the first floor, part single storey part two storey rear extension together with widening of existing drive to provide parking for two cars.

- 2.2 The garage would be converted into part of an open lounge/family room. The roof slope above the garage would be altered and increased in ridge height by roughly 0.7m, in order to create a staircase/landing providing access to the first floor. On the front elevation, this would simply appear as a continuation of the existing garage roof slope. At the rear, the garage roof alterations would take the form of a first floor extension under a short pitched roof, with a further flat roofed section at single storey level. The single storey flat roof would have a height of 3m, whilst the pitched element would have an eaves height that matches the height of the eaves on the main roof of the dwelling, and an overall ridge height of approx. 5.9m. Grey weatherboarding is proposed on the front elevation and first floor rear elevation of the garage.
- 2.3 A part single storey, part two storey rear extension is also proposed. On the ground floor, it would project 3m from the rear wall of the main dwelling and a width of 5.3m. At first floor, the extension would project 3m also, with a width of 3.2m. The two storey element would have a pitched roof with a ridge height of 6.1m and an eaves height that matches the main roof. The single storey element would have a flat roof with a height of 3m and one roof lantern will be situated in it. The extension would provide a kitchen on the ground floor and a larger bedroom with en-suite on the first floor.
- 2.4 The existing driveway would be widened to 5m in width in order to provide two parking spaces side by side.
- 2.5 This application is a resubmission of application 20/505333/FULL. That application was refused due to the harmful impact the proposed two storey side extension would have upon the openness between dwellings, and the unacceptable impact to residential amenity at No. 12 Woodpecker Drive. This application seeks to overcome this by reducing the height and scale of the extension and impact on No. 12.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.1 Potential Archaeological Importance

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- 4.2 Development Plan: Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017
- 4.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders'

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 Five objections have been received from two neighbouring properties. Their contents are summarised below:
- Loss of outlook, sunlight and overshadowing at No. 12 from the single storey side extension, which will be unacceptably dominating and overbearing.
 - Overlooking of rear garden at No. 12 from proposed large first floor window– the

development does not give adequate privacy and the window should be reduced in scale and obscure glazed.

- The rear extension will cause overshadowing and loss of outlook to windows in the side elevation of No. 16, which includes kitchen, stairs, hallway, landing, bathroom and main bedroom on the second floor.
- Rear extension causes privacy issues to No. 16 due to its proximity and size, which will impact family's health and wellbeing.
- Amended plans do not address impact from rear extension to No. 16.
- The development would detract from the character and appearance of the houses on the estate and represent overdevelopment.
- The visual appearance and loss of outside green space is not in-keeping.
- Parking is already an issue in the area, and construction vehicles and site workers would exacerbate this issue during construction.
- Many residents have more than 1 vehicle and if No. 14 is allowed a further increase to the dropped kerb already at the property, this will set a precedent for other properties.
- No consideration of environmental issues or any suggestions to offset the carbon footprint due to the increase in the size of the property.
- Two trees will be removed during the development due to extension to driveway.
- Concerned about damage to beech hedge and boundary fencing from heavy excavation. Any damage should be rectified and replaced like for like if necessary.
- A licensed dog care company is run from No. 12 and debris netting must be used to prevent risk of debris falling into the rear garden.
- The increased noise and activity levels will give rise to the dogs being anxious and unsettled resulting in barking. Any complaints in this respect will be considered very unfair and unjust.
- The owners of No 12 do not give permission at any time for their property to be accessed or utilised during building works.
- If approved, construction hours should be restricted and consideration should be given to how construction traffic is managed given the small, contained scale of the site.

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 KCC Archaeology – No archaeological measures required.

6.2 HM Explosives Directorate – No comments provided the development is not a vulnerable building. The property does not meet the criteria to be classed as a vulnerable building.

6.3 Iwade Parish Council – *“Iwade Parish Council's previous objections still stand, as follows: The proposed extensions greatly increase the footprint of the existing building, making it quite imposing. Will cut out a massive amount of light to the adjacent buildings (nos 12 and 16); resulting in loss of light to numerous rooms and overshadowing. Parish Councillors would ask for a site meeting to properly see the impact of this proposal on the adjacent buildings. Iwade Parish Council would ask Members of Swale's Planning Committee to take into account neighbours' comments when considering this application.”*

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.1 Plans and documents submitted as part of application 21/501945/FULL.

8. APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 8.1 The application site lies within the built up area boundary of Iwade where the principle of development and ability to extend a domestic property is accepted, subject to the policy considerations set out below.

Visual Impact

- 8.2 The rear extension will not be visible in the streetscene and is well designed in my view, with a pitched roof over the two storey element and a small and discreet flat roof over the single storey area. The garage conversion will result in the replacement of the garage door with a window, which is of a similar scale to the existing windows on the front elevation and will sit comfortably on the dwelling in my opinion.
- 8.3 I note previous application 20/505333/FULL was refused due to the scale of the side / garage roof extension and the harmful impact it would have upon the streetscene. The current application has reduced the ridge height of the proposed roof by 1 metre compared to the refused scheme, and the scale of the extension has been substantially reduced towards the rear. When viewed from Woodpecker Drive, the proposal would represent a small increase in height to the existing garage roof slope. I consider that this would retain a very similar visual appearance to the existing building when viewed from the road, and is acceptable.
- 8.4 Grey weatherboarding and matching brick work and roof tiles are proposed on the development. I consider the use of grey weatherboarding to be acceptable here, as whilst it isn't currently present on the property, other properties to the south of the site are clad with weatherboarding of various colours, and as such this material is already present in the streetscene. As such, I have no concerns regarding the impact of the proposal upon the wider visual amenities of the area.

Residential Amenity

- 8.5 The main properties that could be impacted by the proposal are the properties either side of the site. The Council's SPG entitled "*Designing an Extension*" states that for single storey rear extensions close to the common boundary, a maximum projection of 3m is allowed, and a maximum projection of 1.8m is allowed for two storey extensions. In this case, both the single storey and two storey elements of the rear extension project 3m. The alterations to the garage no longer project any further to the rear of the property - albeit that the bulk of the building would increase at first floor level.
- 8.6 Firstly considering the impact of the part single, part two storey rear extensions upon No. 12, I take into account the host property is already set rearwards of this neighbouring dwelling, and therefore a degree of overshadowing and massing is already experienced at No 12. The proposed rear extension would be set 2.8m from the common boundary between the properties at ground floor level, and the two storey element would be 5m

away from this boundary. Due to the staggered position of the dwellings, the rear extension would project roughly 8.4m past the rear elevation of No. 12. However given the distance from the boundary and the existing staggered building line, I do not consider that any overshadowing or overbearing impact would be significantly harmful to the amenities of No 12.

- 8.7 Regarding the impact from the rear extension upon No. 16, I note this neighbouring property is already set further back than the host site. The rear extensions will project roughly in line with the front elevation of the garage at No. 16. I note the neighbours objection regarding a loss of outlook and overshadowing of the windows which are located in the side elevation of No. 16. These windows serve a kitchen, landing and bathroom.
- 8.8 The proposed extension would add build form and massing close to the boundary with No 16. However this is confined to the side of the property and would not affect main habitable windows in the front and rear elevations of No 16 (noting that the kitchen also appears to be served by a window on the rear elevation). Taking into account that the side windows do not serve habitable rooms, I do not consider any impact here would be substantial enough to amount to a reason for refusal.
- 8.9 Following amendments to the scale of the development to the garage roof, the proposed extension would incorporate a first floor partially within the roof space and partially appearing as a full first floor extension to the rear of the property. This would extend approx. 2m beyond the rear elevation of No 12 and would be marginally in excess of the 1.8m projection guidance in the Council's SPG. However, I give weight to the bulk and scale of the existing garage roof (part of which would be removed through the proposal) and the limited additional impact that would occur with the proposed enlargement, and I also give weight to the staggered position of the main house in relation to No. 12. Taking these factors into account, I consider the impact to No. 12 to be acceptable. I note the neighbours concerns regarding overlooking from the first floor rear window serving the stairwell, however I do not consider any overlooking from this window will be significantly harmful to residential amenity. It will provide views of the rear garden at No. 12, but this relationship is typical for neighbouring dwellings and these views will not cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity in my opinion.
- 8.10 I note that due to the location of the garage on the northern side of the property, this element of the proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact on No. 16 to the south.

Highways

- 8.11 The loss of the garage as a parking space needs to be considered. In line with the recently adopted SBC Parking Standards SPD, a three bedroom dwelling in this location requires two parking spaces. The existing driveway at the property will be extended in width to provide these spaces side by side. As such, I consider the proposed parking provision acceptable.
- 8.12 The Council usually seeks to avoid development that results in all parking being forced to the front of the dwelling, however in this case I consider it is acceptable as frontage parking is already a feature at many surrounding dwellings.

- 8.13 An objector has raised concern regarding the loss of green space and two trees from the front garden. I do not have significant concerns regarding the loss of some of the grassed area, as a substantial amount is to remain, and I note that the front garden of No. 16 to the south is largely covered with hardstanding so large driveways are a feature of the area in my view. There are two trees on the front garden and one, if not both of the trees may need to be removed to enlarge the driveway. I impose a condition below to ensure one tree is retained, and if it is damaged during the construction of the driveway, another tree is planted in its place.
- 8.14 I note concern has been raised regarding the enlargement to the driveway setting a precedent for larger dropped kerbs to be installed at other dwellings in the area. An extension to the dropped kerb in Woodpecker Drive does not require planning permission, and only requires consent from KCC Highways, and as such does not need to be considered here. As set out above, the extension to the driveway is considered acceptable, and as such I have no concerns in this regard.

Other Matters

- 8.15 Concerns raised by neighbours relating to potential damage to their properties and boundary treatments during construction amounts to a private matter, and cannot be taken into account here. I note it is also requested that construction hours and details relating to construction vehicles are controlled by the Planning Department. Given the fact the scheme only proposes extensions to an existing residential dwelling, I do not consider it is appropriate to restrict construction hours when taking into account the limited scale of the development.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 Following the submission of amended plans during the course of the application to address the impact to No. 12, I am satisfied that the development will not cause significantly harmful impacts to residential amenity at both No. 12 and No. 16 Woodpecker Drive. The design of the extensions are acceptable in my view and will not harm the character and appearance of the property or wider streetscene. The extension to the driveway will ensure the parking provision is acceptable given the loss of the garage. On the basis of the above, I consider the development is acceptable and recommend planning permission is granted.

10. RECOMMENDATION - GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun no 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 enlarged driveway hereby approved shall be kept available for the parking of vehicles and no permanent development, whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as

amended) (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) or not, shall be carried out on the land or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access thereto.

Reason: Development without adequate provision for the parking or garaging of cars is likely to lead to car parking inconvenient to other road users and in a manner detrimental to highway safety and amenity.

- (3) One tree located to the front of the property shall be retained and maintained. If this tree is removed, dies, is severely damaged or becomes seriously diseased within five years of the date of this permission it shall be replaced with a tree of such size and species as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan, including the materials set out on the plan and within the email from the applicant dated 16.07.21: 20/3078/1G.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt.

The Council's approach to the application

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2021 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.

