

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28 APRIL 2016

PART 2

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 2

Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 15/510082/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of rear extension and outbuildings. Erection of rear and side extensions and loft conversion to include dormers and rooflights.			
ADDRESS 46 Hartlip Hill Hartlip Kent ME9 7NZ			
RECOMMENDATION Approve			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposal is acceptable in principle and does not impact unacceptably upon residential or visual amenities.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Recommendation contrary to Parish Council view			
WARD Hartlip, Newington & Upchurch	PARISH/TOWN Hartlip	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Mr S Collins AGENT Mr Simon Edgington
DECISION DUE DATE 29/01/16	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 11/01/16		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
None			

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 No.46 Hartlip Hill is a detached bungalow located in a row of similarly sized properties, with a varied mixture of property types located on the opposite side of the highway.
- 1.02 The property is located within a fairly substantially sized plot. The frontage of the property extends to some 13m in depth and includes a landscaped garden and a driveway which extends to the side of the property.
- 1.03 There are outbuildings located to the rear of the property and along the common boundary with No.44 Hartlip Hill.
- 1.04 The rear garden is large, measuring approximately 50m in depth and 15m in width.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing rear extension and outbuildings, an increase to the height and width of the bungalow, a rear extension, and formation of rooms in the roofspace.
- 2.02 The property as existing measures 8.3m in width and would be widened to a width of 9.6m. The rear extension would measure a maximum 10.4m in depth and match the width at the front of the dwelling.
- 2.03 The roof of the bungalow would be raised from its existing height of 5.5m to 6.1m. The pitched roof design of the existing bungalow will be retained. To the rear, the proposed extension will have a hipped roof with the ridgeline turned at 90 degrees to that at the front of the dwelling.
- 2.04 The loft space of the dwelling would also be utilised, and as a result of this two pitched-roof dormer windows and a rooflight are proposed on the rear elevation. On the east facing side elevation four rooflights are proposed and on the west facing rooflight two rooflights are proposed.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Potential Archaeological Importance.

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 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.
- 4.02 The adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 echoes a similar sentiment, and policies E1, E19, E24 in particular encourage the provision of high-quality development and minimising potential amenity impacts for local residents. Policy E6 and RC4 aims to restrict development within the countryside and the adopted SPG (referred to below) recommends that extensions to rural properties do not increase the floor space of the original property by more than 60% in total.
- 4.03 The publication draft of the emerging Local Plan, entitled Bearing Fruits 2031, was agreed by Members at Full Council late last year and was agreed in principle by the Local Plan Inspector last year, and, as such, carries some weight in the determination of planning applications. Policies DM14, DM16, DM19 are relevant in this instance.
- 4.04 The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 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.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 Surrounding properties were sent a consultation letter. Five responses were received to the proposal, raising the following summarised objections:

- The proposal is disproportionate and not in keeping with the surrounding bungalows;
- Would adversely impact upon the streetscene as the existing roof heights are all identical;
- The proposal will significantly reduce natural light received to neighbouring dwellings;
- The proposal will give rise to overlooking of surrounding gardens and properties;
- The existing roof tiles are asbestos;
- Construction noise will take place at unsociable hours over a long period of time;

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 **Hartlip Parish Council** objects to this application with the following observations:

“HPC is very concerned about the size of the proposed conversion which would appear to increase the size of the footprint by 60% giving a much larger footprint than for numbers 44 and 48 Hartlip Hill and is too large for rural constraint policies. It is noted that in the letter from Edgington Architectural Services, reference is made to using members of the family in the building trade to carry out some of the works and the work will be undertaken in two phases. The proposed new roof is one metre higher than the existing and will impact on neighbours and affect their amenity. To buy a house with 2 bedrooms when you require 5 seems odd.

HPC have endeavoured to consult the neighbours. Mr. Crawford at 48 Hartlip Hill has just sold his house and will be moving out shortly and it is not known whether the new purchasers are aware of the proposals. It may well come as a very unpleasant surprise to them. Mr Munn at 44 Hartlip Hill is very concerned about the effect on his amenity. He will almost certainly be lodging a letter of objection. He is also concerned about the fact that as the work is to be carried out by family members, it may be undertaken in anti-social hours.

For the above reasons HPC objects to this application. No doubt you will consider very carefully any comments made by neighbours and efforts should be made to consult the new owners of No.48.

If this, or a revised application is granted a condition should be added limiting the number of hours worked to 8.00am to 5.00pm. on Monday to Friday.”

6.02 **Upchurch Parish Council** (the rear site boundary abuts the boundary of Upchurch Parish) responded stating that they *“can see no reason to object to this application provided that neighbours comments are taken into consideration.”*

6.03 **Network Rail** has no objection or further observations to make.

6.04 **KCC Archaeology** are satisfied that *“no archaeological measures are needed.”*

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 Application papers and correspondence relating to planning reference 15/510082/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 8.01 The site lies within the designated countryside where 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 In this instance, the application proposes an increase on the original floorspace of approximately 267%. However, the Council has for some time now considered the Hartlip Hill area to amount to an exception to the normal policies of restraint for development in the countryside. The area is suburban in character, comprising of a substantial length of ribbon development, giving an entirely developed frontage to the road on both sides of the A2. As such, whilst for the purposes of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 the site is located in the countryside, in reality there is little harm to the character of the countryside resulting from development to these dwellings. The policies of rural restraint have accordingly been applied less rigorously here on a number of separate occasions, as large extensions to these dwellings would not be likely to cause material harm to the countryside.
- 8.03 I am therefore of the opinion that whilst the proposed extension would be well in excess of what I would normally consider acceptable, it is acceptable in principle in this location.

Visual Impact and impact upon the streetscene

- 8.04 Concern has been raised locally regarding the change of design and the impact that this would have upon the character of the streetscene. When viewed from the front elevation the host property is of a similar scale and design to the adjoining properties, moving eastwards a further 4 properties are also of a similar in appearance. However, the application as proposed would limit the increase in the ridge height to 0.6m. In addition the application has been amended so that the roof of the rear extension is symmetrical when viewed from the front, this in my view retains the sense of balance of the property.
- 8.05 I also take into consideration that due to the gap between the properties, an increase in roof height of 0.6m and the retention of the pitched roof with front facing gable would result in a design which was not significantly out of keeping with the adjacent dwellings. Furthermore, I note that properties on the opposite side of the highway are a mixture of heights, types and designs. As such, in my view, the proposal would not be considerably out of keeping with surrounding properties. In my view the scheme would therefore not impact unacceptably on either visual amenities or the streetscene.

Residential Amenity

- 8.06 The existing rear elevations of both adjacent properties (Nos. 44 and 48) project beyond the rear elevation of the host property. As proposed, the rear extension would project beyond the rear elevation of No.44 by 5m at a height of 6.1m. However, the flank wall of the extension closest to No.44 would be separated by a distance of 6.5m. I also note that the application will include the demolition of existing outbuildings, a number of which are located either on, or within 1m of the boundary with No.44. As such, the built form will be moved further away from the common boundary. I also pay regard to the SPG which in the case of well spaced

detached properties allows for degree of flexibility in terms of the acceptability of rear projections. Overall I take the view that due to the separation distance between the two properties, the hip of the roof sloping away from the side boundary and the removal of the existing outbuildings that the proposed extension would not have an unacceptably overbearing impact upon the occupiers of No.44 or cause a significant loss of light.

- 8.07 On the opposite side, No.48 has a rear projection abutting the boundary with the host property which projects approximately 1m past the rear elevation of the proposed extension. As such I also take the view that the proposal would not have an unacceptably overbearing impact upon the occupiers of No.48 or cause a significant loss of light to this property.
- 8.08 Local concern has also been raised regarding overlooking of neighbouring properties and gardens. The application proposes rooflights in the side facing roof slopes and two dormer windows and a rooflight in the rear facing roof slope. The rear facing dormer windows and rooflight would provide rearward views in a conventional manner. As such I consider that this element of the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking.
- 8.09 The rooflights on the side elevation serve the stairway and the loft space / storage area. Although I appreciate that there would be the opportunity in future to convert this space into a habitable room I note that the rooflights would be located towards the middle and the front of the roofspace. As such the main views available would be of the roofs of the neighbouring dwelling. As such, in my view the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking or loss of privacy.

Parking

- 8.10 The application site as existing has a driveway which runs from the frontage of the property and along the side of the dwelling. The proposal will retain this driveway but due to the increase in the width of the dwelling it will be reduced to 2.8m in the area between the flank wall and the side boundary. As contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance 4 – Kent Vehicle Parking Standards, July 2006, a width of 2.9m is required when bounded on both sides. However, the driveway would continue in front of the property. As such, there would still be room to park vehicles and due to the size of the frontage, within which a landscaped garden would be retained, I do not consider that parking would therefore be a significantly dominant feature to the front of the dwelling. I also note the existing planting which runs along the boundary with No.48 which would also have the impact of screening vehicles. As such I consider that the parking arrangements are acceptable and would not significantly harm the street scene.

Other Matters

- 8.11 I also note that comments have been made regarding possible asbestos at the site and that construction may cause harm to neighbouring amenities. I will deal with these issues in turn. Firstly, the issue of asbestos is not covered by the planning process but via separate legislation, and would be considered at the Building Regulations stage. Secondly, although not normally imposed on a domestic extension, in this case, due to the relatively large addition to the dwelling I have recommended an hours of construction condition. I therefore believe that neighbouring amenities will be protected in this regard.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.00 Overall I consider that the principle of development is accepted in this location, the proposal would not be significantly out of keeping with the existing street scene and it would not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities. I recommend that planning permission be granted.

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 used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those as stated on the application form.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenities.

- (3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: EAS/15/07/04A; EAS/15/07/05A; EAS/15/07/06A; EAS/15/07/07A; EAS/15/07/08A, received 10th March 2016.

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

- (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.

Reason: In the interests of residential 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 applicant/agent was advised of minor changes required to the application and these were agreed.

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.