

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 13 AUGUST 2015**

**PART 3**

Report of the Head of Planning

**PART 3**

Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

<b>3.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/503258/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b>		
Partial demolition of existing dwelling house and demolition of outbuilding to facilitate two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, and construction of a double garage		
<b>ADDRESS</b> Brickfield House Seasalter Road Graveney Kent ME13 9DY		
<b>RECOMMENDATION - Refuse</b>		
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b>		
This proposed extension is not considered to be modest in scale and impact on the character of the dwelling and on the character of the countryside.		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b>		
Recommendation contrary to Parish Council view		
<b>WARD</b> Boughton & Courtenay	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Graveney & Goodnestone	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Matthew French <b>AGENT</b> Diocesan Architects
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 02/07/15	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 13/05/15	

**1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

1.01 Brickfield House is a detached property immediately abutting Seasalter Road which makes it very prominent in the streetscene. There is a separate very dilapidated outbuilding set back from main property which now has a replacement flat roof, and which sits on the boundary of the adjoining property, Marsh View. The property is located within the countryside, in Seasalter Road near the junction with Monksill Road. There is open land to the side and opposite the property.

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

2.01 The proposal seeks permission for partial demolition of the existing dwelling house and demolition of the outbuilding to facilitate a two-storey and single-storey rear extensions, and construction of a double garage.

- 2.02 The overall proposed extensions to the main dwelling, would measure approximately 7.5m wide and approximately 8.2m deep. The original dwelling is approximately 9.2m wide and 8.2m deep with a single storey porch beyond. The proposal would reconfigure the ground floor to provide a utility room, reposition the bathroom and an enlarged kitchen. The first floor would be extended or provide an additional bedroom with en-suite and bathroom. In extended for the property would then have overall dimensions of 14.3m by 9.8m. The extensions would have a ridge height only slightly less than that of the main ridge, but would extend the length of the main ridgeline from 6.8m to 14.3m. The extension would be largely clad in black weatherboarding over red brick whereas the existing property is faced in white render over red brick. New roof ties would match the existing but the new roof would feature a very wide flat roofed dormer window on the prominent roadside elevation.
- 2.03 The proposed garage building, with roof space, would replace the existing flat roofed single storey outbuilding. This would measure approximately 10m wide x 6m deep. The roof space would be accessed by an external staircase situated at the rear of the building. Five roof lights are proposed in the roof – three to the front and two on the rear slope, along with a pitched roof porch providing access from the stairway.
- 2.04 The garage building would be positioned in the same location as that of the existing – close to the boundary with Marsh View.
- 2.05 The applicant points out that the overall net floorspace of the extension represents an increase is 54%, but fails to mention that at pre-application stage advice was given that despite this the extension appeared large and would benefit from being reduced in size. UPVC windows are to be replaced with timber units.

### 3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION

EXTENSION TO DWELLING	Existing	Proposed	Change (+/-)
Approximate Ridge Height (m)	7.7	7.3 – 7.7	0
Approximate Eaves Height (m)	1.9 - 5	1.9 - 5	0
Approximate Depth (m)	10.8	9.8	- 1
Approximate Width (m)	9.2	14.3	+ 5.1
No. of Storeys	2	2	0
Net Floor Area (sq m)	149.71	229.98	+ 80.27

REPLACEMENT GARAGE	Existing	Proposed	Change (+/-)
Approximate Height (m)	3.2	5.8	+ 2.6
Approximate Depth (m)	5	6	+ 1
Approximate Width (m)	10	10	0

#### **4.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

4.01 Potential Archaeological Importance

#### **5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

5.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) are relevant in terms of encouraging good design standards and minimising the potential impacts of any development upon the amenity of neighbouring residents.

5.02 The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled "Designing an Extension" is also relevant, and provides general design guidance. The SPG remains a material consideration, having been through a formal review and adoption process. This gives advice on scale and on the design of dormer windows.

5.03 The adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 echoes a similar sentiment, and policies E1 (General Development Criteria); E6 (Countryside); E19 (Design); E24 (Alterations and Extensions) in particular encourage the provision of high-quality development and minimising potential amenity impacts for local residents. Policy RC4 (Extensions to dwellings in rural areas), aims to restrict development within the countryside and recommends that extensions to rural properties are modest. It refers to the SPG (see above) which states at paragraph 3.3 that in the countryside scale is of particular importance, that the Council do not normally approve extensions which increase the floor space of the original property by more than 60% in total, and that "In many cases even extensions of this size are not acceptable".

5.04 The publication draft of the emerging Local Plan, entitled Bearing Fruits 2031, was agreed by Members at Full Council late last year and, as such, carries some weight in the determination of planning applications. Policies DM11 (extensions to, and replacement of, dwellings in the rural area) and DM14 (general development criteria) are relevant in this instance.

#### **6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

6.01 One letter of support has been received, from the neighbouring property, commenting the changes would improve the general appearance of the property especially the outbuilding which at present is an eyesore. The application would enhance the rural region generally.

#### **7.0 CONSULTATIONS**

7.01 Graveney Parish Council objects to the proposed garage, in particular its height and it being a 3 bay garage; the proximity of the garage to the neighbouring property at Marsh View, and it possibly extending beyond the boundary of Brickfield House. They also expressed concern over the potential future use of the garage, given the large scale and possibility of its

conversion to residential use. They conclude by supporting the extensions to the main dwelling, but object to the garage development.

7.02 The County Archaeological Officer raises no objection to the application, saying that no archaeological measures are required

7.03 Kent Highways raise no objection

## **8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS**

8.1 Application papers and drawings referring to the application reference 15/503258/FULL

## **9.0 APPRAISAL**

9.01 The main issue for concern in this case is the modesty and scale of the proposed development due to the location in the countryside. Also of consideration is the design, impact on neighbouring amenity and highway safety/convenience.

9.02 Council policy resists large extensions on small cottages in the countryside, and seeks modest additions to enhance the character and appearance of the property and visual amenity. The proposed development is of such a scale and mass that it would create a large property at odds with its current simple appearance and causing harm to visual and residential amenity.

9.03 Adopted Council guidance, as stated in the SPG “Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders” states: *“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. In many cases even extensions of this size are not acceptable.”*

9.04 This proposed extension is an increase of approximately 54% floorspace from the original dwelling. However, SPG makes clear the increase in floorspace is only one consideration when assessing modesty. In this case, the rural dwelling would visually be doubled in width (appearing much more than a 60% increase) significantly altering the simple modest nature of this property. Therefore, the bulk, scale and design of the proposal is not modest and will result in significant harm to the character of the property and the streetscene.

9.05 Whilst the proposed garage/outbuilding would be located very close to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property, it would result in a much improved design to the existing outbuilding. I note it would be higher and slightly bigger than existing, however, I do not consider this would result in any significant harm to neighbouring amenity. The current building is currently extremely unattractive and the garage block proposed is not of an unusual

nature for a rural property. I believe that will enhance the appearance of the area.

- 9.06 With regards to highway safety/convenience, the proposal provides ample space for parking utilizing the existing access.

## **10.0 CONCLUSION**

- 10.01 I do not consider that the proposed extension to Brickfield House is of a modest nature in terms of design, due to the size, bulk and scale. The impact of the proposed extension fronting the highway would dominate this part of Seasalter Road, creating an elevation measuring 14.3m, out of scale with a modest extension to the existing cottage. The length of the ridgeline would also cause an adverse effect on the visual amenities of this countryside location, creating a roofline measuring over 14m, over double that which exists now. I consider this increase to be unacceptable and I recommend that that planning permission be refused.

- 10.02 The proposed garage building would be a welcome development. The current building is in a very poor state of repair and the planned replacement building proposed would be of a design to match that of the original building with a pitched roof. The size and location of this building would not have a detrimental impact of the residential amenities of the area.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATION – Refuse for the following reasons:**

### **REASONS**

1. The proposed extension would be of a poor design, resulting in a considerable visual increase in bulk and scale, doubling the width of this rural dwelling resulting in an immodest extension. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene, contrary to policies E1, E6, E19, E24 and RC4 of the Swale Borough Local Plan, and to paragraph 3.3 of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "Designing an Extension – A guide for householders".

### **Council's Approach to 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 applicant applied for pre-application advice, this was given advising to reduce the scale and impact of the proposal, not all issues were addressed with this 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.