

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 15/503706/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Single-storey side extension and two-storey rear extension.			
ADDRESS 19 Hartlip Hill, Hartlip, Kent, ME9 7NZ.			
RECOMMENDATION GRANT subject to no further representations being received (closing date 3 August 2015)			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION Proposed extension would be of an acceptable scale and design and would not give rise to any serious amenity issues.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection.			
WARD Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN Hartlip	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr And Mrs Kevin And Claire Fisher AGENT Robert Lewis Thornton
DECISION DUE DATE 06/07/15	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 03/08/15		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
SW/13/0548	Grant of permission for two-storey side and rear extension, flue to wood-burning stove, and erection of detached garden building to provide garage, office and store.	Approved	2013
Proposed extension addressed previous refusals by repositioning the bulk of the extensions away from the neighbouring bungalow. The scale of the extensions (amounting to an increase of 282% over the original floor space) was in excess of the 60% maximum stipulated within the adopted SPG, but held by Members to be acceptable in light of the substantial extensions to properties elsewhere along this stretch of road.			
SW/12/1337	Refusal of permission for a two-storey side extension to the western flank, a single-storey drive-through extension on the eastern flank, and a detached outbuilding to provide office, store and garage.	Refused	2012
Amended scheme further to refusal below. Amendments did not adequately address previous reasons for refusal.			
SW/11/1503	Refusal of permission for a two-storey side extension to the western flank, a single-storey drive-through extension on the eastern flank, and a detached outbuilding to provide office, store and garage.	Refused	2011

Application refused due to the bulk, scale and proximity of the side extension to the common boundary which gave rise to amenity concerns for the neighbouring residents; and due to the bulk, scale and poor design of the proposed outbuilding.

SW/99/0729	Grant of permission for a single-storey rear extension.	Approved	2009
------------	---	----------	------

The approved extension has been constructed, but would be replaced by the current proposal (or the extension approved under SW/13/0548).

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application property is a detached house situated in the countryside near Hartlip, forming part of a ribbon development of dwellings along this section of the A2 London Road. The house is set back from the road within a generous garden, with vehicle parking to the front, side and rear, and a single-storey detached outbuilding / garage at the foot of the garden. To the rear of the property is agricultural land.
- 1.02 The street scene here is very mixed in terms of types and designs of dwellings. No.17 (to the east) is a bungalow while nos. 19 and 21 are houses, and there is a varied mix of houses, bungalows and chalet bungalows within the area.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension (on the western flank, adjacent to no.21).
- 2.02 The proposed two-storey rear extension will project approximately 6.5m from the original rear wall of the dwelling at first floor level, across the full width of the elevation. It will feature a pitched roof joined at 90 degrees to the existing roof slope, with a gable end facing the garden. No side windows are proposed other than a small window to the ensuite.
- 2.03 The proposed side extension will sit on the western flank of the house. It will run the full depth of the house including proposed rear extension, and measure approximately 14.3m deep x 3.1m wide x 4m high. It will feature a flat roof with a lantern light towards the rear, and windows at ground level.
- 2.04 The works will provide a large master bedroom with ensuite and large kitchen / lounge area.
- 2.05 Members should note that the proposed extensions are of a smaller scale than those approved at committee under SW/13/0548.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 None.

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages good design as a part of its general drive towards sustainable development. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) offers similar advice.
- 4.02 Policies E1, E6, E19, E24 and RC4 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 are relevant to householder extensions.
- 4.03 The Council's adopted SPG entitled "Designing an Extension" is also relevant, and remains a material consideration having been through a formal review and adoption process. It states, along with policy RC4 of the Local Plan, that only 'modest' extensions of not more than 60% of the original floor space will be permitted within rural areas.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 None.
- 5.02 A second set of consultation letters were sent out after a correction to the description of development (the application originally referred to only single-storey extensions). No letters have been received at the time of writing, but the closing date is 3rd August and I will update Members at the meeting.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Hartlip Parish Council objects to the application, commenting:

"Members of the Parish Council are not clear whether this area along the A2 is within what is described as "the built up area boundary of Hartlip or outside within the rural area". If outside it is clearly against Policy.

Whether it is inside or outside, the Parish Council has concerns about the size of the proposals. The description of the proposals is misleading in that it should include "first floor extension".

The Parish Council objects to the scale and bulk of the 2 storey extension which appears to increase the size by 100%. It will affect the amenity of the neighbours and no doubt you will consider this carefully together with any comments put forward by them."

- 6.02 Kent Highway Services have no comments, noting that the scale of the development does not fall within their remit.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 The previous application noted above, ref. SW/13/0548, is particularly relevant to this application as planning permission was granted for a considerably larger extension in terms of bulk and visual impact. The approved rear extension was 1m shorter in depth, but the side extension was two-storey and brought the property much closer to no.21.
- 7.02 That development would have increased the size of the property by approximately 282% over the floor space of the original property, contrary to the advice of the SPG. However Members of the planning committee recognised the unusual circumstances

of the location (Hartlip Hill, whilst within the countryside, features a number of properties with significant extensions) and approved the application as an exception to the SPG and policy RC4.

- 7.03 The above should be at the forefront of Member's consideration of this application, which seeks extensions amounting to an increase in floor space of approximately 150% over the original property. Members should also note that the previously approved extensions could be constructed if this application were refused.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 8.01 The application site lies outside of any defined built up area boundary, and as such the principle of development is governed by policies E6, RC4, and the adopted SPG. These advise that "modest" extensions in the countryside will be acceptable subject to them not increasing the size of the dwelling by more than 60% over the floor space of the original property.
- 8.02 This application proposes extensions that amount to a floor space increase of approximately 150% over the original. However, given the previous approval for a significant extension as discussed above, and the better design of the current proposal (as discussed below) I consider this application to be acceptable in principle. In this regard, therefore, I do not agree with the Parish Council in respect of the principle of the scale of the extension.

Visual Impact

- 8.03 The proposed rear extension would not be prominent in views from the highway, and would have very limited impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene in my opinion.
- 8.04 The proposed side extension would be single storey and set back from the road. It too would have very little impact upon the area in my opinion. It would also retain a gap between no.19 and no.21 (adjacent) at first floor level, which will help to keep the sense of openness at the site and allow for views through from the road to the skyline at the rear.

Residential Amenity

- 8.05 Whilst the two-storey rear extension would be substantial in size, it would be set well away from the side boundaries with the neighbouring properties – approximately 4.2m from no.21 and 4.5m from no.17. It will also be set to the south of the host property. In this regard I do not consider that it would give rise to any serious issues of overshadowing or loss of light for the neighbours and I note the lack of local objections.
- 8.06 I have no serious concerns in regards to the single-storey element, and do not believe that it would give rise to any serious amenity issues by virtue of its low height.
- 8.07 Again, I do not agree with the Parish Council's objection and consider the scheme to be acceptable in terms of impact upon neighbour's amenity – particularly with regard to the more intrusive scheme previously approved. I have, however, recommended a condition to prevent the insertion of further flank windows to minimise the potential for overlooking of the neighbouring properties in future.

Highways

8.08 Parking for several vehicles (in excess of 4) is available to the front, side, and rear of the property. I therefore have no serious concerns in this regard.

Landscaping

8.09 There is already hedge planting to the front of the site (adjacent to the highway and along the common boundary with no.21) and the rear garden has been soft landscaped to some extent, albeit not yet settled / bedded-in due to construction of the outbuilding to the rear. I therefore see no particular need for a landscaping condition to be attached to this application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.01 The proposed development would be acceptable in principle and would represent an improvement (in terms of scale and design) over the scheme approved in 2013 under SW/13/0548.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT subject to no further representations being received before 3 August 2015 and 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.

Reasons: 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.

Reasons: In the interests of visual amenity.

(3) No additional windows, doors, voids or other openings shall be inserted, placed or formed at any time in the first floor flank walls hereby permitted unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons: To prevent the overlooking of adjoining properties and to safeguard the privacy of their occupiers.

(4) No construction work in connection with the development shall take place on any Sunday or Bank Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times:

Monday to Friday 0730 – 1900 hours, Saturdays 0730 – 1300 hours unless in association with an emergency or with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons: In the interests of residential amenity.

(5) Adequate precautions shall be taken during the period of demolition and construction to prevent the deposit of mud and/or other debris on the public highway.

Reasons: In the interests of highway safety and convenience.

The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering pre-application advice.

Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.

As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance the application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

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.