

2.7 REFERENCE NO - 15/510564/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of garage/workshop; Construction of two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, front porch and alterations to front fenestration			
ADDRESS 6 Meadow Rise Iwade Kent ME9 8SB			
RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE RECEIPT OF AMENDED DRAWINGS			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION Subject to the receipt of amended drawings, the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenities or highway safety or convenience.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Objection received from Parish Council			
WARD Bobbing, Iwade & Lower Halstow	PARISH/TOWN Iwade	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr P Seitz AGENT John Childs And Associates
DECISION DUE DATE 17/02/16	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 04/02/16		

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 6 Meadow Rise is a modern semi-detached property with the off road parking for at least two vehicles to the front of the property. The property benefits from an open lawn to the front and an enclosed garden to the rear. To the side of the property stands a substantial single storey garage/workshop building.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.01 This application seeks permission to demolish the existing garage/workshop and construct a two-storey side and single-storey rear extension, front porch with alterations to front fenestration.

2.02 The two storey side extension would extend from the side elevation of the host property by 3.30m and would be approximately 6.8m deep. A covered area and office to the rear of the dwelling would be removed and the single storey element of the proposed development erected in its place, projecting no further to the rear (2.5m rear of the main body of the dwelling). A porch to the front elevation is also proposed, measuring 1.2m deep and 2.7m wide, with a pitched roof.

2.03 This proposal will create an additional sitting room to the side and a breakfast room leading from the existing kitchen to the rear (incorporating the office area). The first floor will have an additional bedroom with en suite facilities.

2.04 The boundary of the site is at an angle to the dwelling, and therefore whilst at the front of the elevation of the extension there would be a gap of 2m between the proposed extension and the side boundary, to the rear this gap would narrow to less than a metre.

3.0 PLANNING POLICY

- 3.01 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.
- 3.02 The adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 echoes a similar sentiment, and saved policies E1, E19, E24 in particular encourage the provision of high-quality development and minimising potential amenity impacts for local residents.
- 3.03 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 DM14, DM16, DM19 are relevant in this instance.
- 3.04 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.

4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.01 No local representations have been received.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.01 Iwade Parish Council raises objection and comment as follows:

The Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

- a) Loss of parking spaces.*
- b) Visual impact on the existing street scene; although this is not necessarily a negative comment.*

6.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

Application papers and drawings referring to the application reference 15/510564/FULL.

7.0 APPRAISAL

- 7.01 The key considerations in this case are whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of design and impact on visual amenity, and impact on residential amenity.

Design and visual amenity

- 7.02 The design of the proposed extension is, in my view, not acceptable as submitted. The SPG requires first floor side extensions to be set down from the ridge of the roof of the dwelling, and to be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, in order that they are viewed as a subordinate structure to the original dwelling and that their bulk and scale is minimised. Neither of these design features have been utilised here, and the proposed extension would in my view appear as a bulky addition to the dwelling.

7.03 I would not consider this to amount to a reason for refusal, if the two storey extension was set in by two metres from the boundary, as also required by the SPG. The purpose of this, in areas of well spaced detached or semi-detached dwellings, is to retain a sense of openness and to prevent a “terracing effect”, harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. In this case, whilst the extension would be 2m from the side boundary at the front, due to the angled nature of the boundary, this space narrows to less than a metre at the rear. This would lead, in my opinion, to a harmful loss of openness between the dwelling the subject of the application and the neighbouring property which, if repeated elsewhere in the streetscene, would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7.04 I have previously requested that the application be amended to address this issue. The plans have not though been amended, and the agent has provided the following response:

“..from the principle elevation we will have approximately 2.26m from the boundary to the front corner of the extension. I have also added a dotted blue line to demonstrate that if number 8 were to construct a two storey extension and adhere to your 2m policy, there would still be approximately 4.26m separation to the principle elevations. Because of this separation and the unique plot position we strongly feel that the openness will still be retained along with the character of the street and because there will be no physical or visual link then there will be no terracing affect either. At its narrowest point and in the scenario that number 8 does extend in future, the gap between the two dwellings will still be a good 3.2m. I trust this satisfies to the council that, although there is a set policy in place, the application should be taken on its own merits also.”

7.05 In short, the agent considers that as there would be a 2m space to the boundary at the front of the site, the proposal should be considered acceptable. I do not agree, and am firmly of the view that this proposal would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

7.06 I have requested that the plans be amended in accordance with the SPG and my recommendation for approval is wholly on the basis that these amendments are received. I will update Members at the Meeting as to whether appropriately amended drawings have been received.

Impact on residential amenity

7.07 The proposed porch is acceptable and would not harm the amenities of occupiers of adjacent dwellings. Equally the single storey element of the proposals would not project further than the existing, and would in any case comply with the limit of 3m rear projection as set out in the SPG. I do not consider that it would harm residential amenity.

7.08 The proposed two storey element of the scheme would be separated from the adjacent dwelling by a minimum of 4m, and would not project beyond the rear of that dwelling. Due to the angle of the properties relative to each other, it would be set forward of the adjacent dwelling by approximately 1m, but at this point would be in excess of 6m from the adjacent dwelling. As such, I do not consider that it would cause demonstrable harm to residential amenity.

Highways impact

7.09 The existing garage falls well short of the minimum internal dimensions set by KCC Highways and Transportation, and in my view is not capable of being used for parking of a vehicle. As such, its demolition would not represent the loss of a parking space, and the parking arrangements at the site are unlikely to change. There is already off street parking for two vehicles at the site, which is the requirement for a property of this size. I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to an increase in on street parking, nor do I consider that the provision of all of the parking to the front of the dwelling is objectionable in this instance.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.01 Subject to the receipt of appropriately amended drawings relating to the two storey side extension, I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable. I will update Members at the Meeting regarding this, but on this basis I recommend that planning permission is granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION - GRANT Subject to the receipt of amended drawings and the following conditions:

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 permission is granted.

Reasons: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1900 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.

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 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.