

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 16/501964/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Partial demolition of existing rear utility extension, erection of two single storey rear extensions as amended by drawings LW92/16/05 rev A and LW92/16/06 rev A received 19th May 2016		
ADDRESS 13 Cambridge Road Faversham Kent ME13 8RW		
RECOMMENDATION APPROVE		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposal would not give rise to unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenity		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Town Council objection		
WARD St Ann's	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Faversham Town	APPLICANT Miss Lucy Wiggins AGENT Jason Davies Architectural Services
DECISION DUE DATE 28/07/16	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 03/06/16	

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 No. 13 Cambridge Road is a terraced dwelling located on a highway of similar properties. There is an amenity space to the rear and there is a small paved area to the front. To the south of the property is a railway line. This property lies within the Faversham conservation area.
- 1.02 This property is one of a large number of dwellings within the Faversham conservation area that are affected by a 2007 Article 4(2) Direction affecting Permitted Development rights for alterations to the front elevations.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for a demolition of existing rear utility extension and a proposed single storey rear shower room extension measuring a maximum 2.6m in depth (it was originally proposed as 3.0m) from the rear elevation. The other part of the works is on western elevation and along the neighbouring boundary of no.12. This second side/rear extension runs for 3.0m along the common boundary.
- 2.02 Since submission the rear extension has had the roof form changed from a gable end to a simpler lean-to style much along the lines of the current extension in that position. The shower room extension has also been reduced in length from 3.0m to 2.6m in overall length. Each proposed extension now has a pitched lean-to style roof.
- 2.03 The side extension will entail removal of an existing rear window serving the middle ground floor room but this is currently a uPVC window which is not a valuable part of the conservation area.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Article 4 Faversham Conservation Area

Article 4 Swale Article 4 directive

Conservation Area Faversham

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG):
Development Plan: Saved policies E1, E15, E19 and E24 of Swale Borough Local Plan 2008
Supplementary Planning Documents: Conservation Areas
Supplementary Planning Documents: Designing an Extension
- 4.02 The NPPF was released on 27th March 2012 with immediate effect, however, para 214 states “that for 12 months from this publication date, decision-makers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework.
- 4.03 The 12 month period noted above has now expired, as such, it is necessary for a review of the consistency between the policies contained within the Swale Borough Local Plan 2015 and the NPPF.
- 4.04 This has been carried out in the form of a report agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel on 12 December 2012. Policies E1, E19 and E24 are considered to accord with the NPPF for the purposes of determining this application and as such, these policies can still be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 One objection has been received from the occupier at No.12, objecting to the application on the following summarised grounds:
- Overshadowing – extensions will overshadow my back yard and block light into my ground floor windows as it is higher than the boundary wall
 - Overlooking another property and loss of privacy – the existing boundary wall between two properties is lower once it passes the original footprint of the properties and the French windows in the proposed rear elevation will overlook the existing garden boundary leading to loss of privacy
 - Visual appearance/design – the proposed extension will use new materials and excessive glazing out of keeping with the weathered wall and style of glazing in the existing property
 - Noise, smells and disturbance – the proposed extension has a gutter that runs half way over the existing garden boundary wall. If this gutter were to be blocked or broken, my neighbour would have no access to it and water might run onto my property
 - Effect on listed buildings and the conservation area – the extensions will have a substantial effect upon the relationships between properties, especially if repeated on other properties

The neighbour has been re-consulted on the amended drawings but no further comment has been received

5.02 The applicant has responded to the comments above saying;

- Overshadowing – I disagree that the extension will have as much an impact as described in the letter. When you look at the overall scale of the properties and the two existing projections to the rear (one to no.13 and one to no.12) both of which are two storey, it is quite clear that these existing projections already form a very shadowed court yard area to each dwelling which is typical of such properties. The kitchen extension is just 3m in length and the shower room is set 1.8m off the common boundary
- Overlooking – The loss of privacy will be no worse than the existing arrangement. It should be noted that the private garden area directly adjacent to no.12 will not be overlooked
- Design/Appearance/Materials – yellow face brickwork will be used to match the existing as best as possible together with slate roof. Both of these materials were traditionally used on Victorian housing. Part of the existing work to be removed is clad in alien white cladding
- Access – The right to access for maintenance is not a planning issue and will need to be agreed between neighbours
- Effect on conservation area – this is considered in the Design and Access Statement

5.03 The other neighbour at No.14 supports the amended version of the application, although he queries the position of rainwater pipes serving the gutters

6.01 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 Faversham Town Council's original comment on the application was to raise no objection to this application subject to the shower room extension being under one roof and the depth of this extension causing no significant loss of amenity to the neighbouring property.

6.02 Amended drawings were received on the 19th May 2016 simplifying the roof of the shower room extension and reducing its overall length, yet the Faversham Town Council have now objects on these grounds:

- The proposed shower room extension is unnecessarily long
- The proposed side extension would have an adverse effect on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

7.0 APPRAISAL

7.01 The main considerations in the determination of this application concern the impact of the proposal upon the character of the conservation area, and on the visual and neighbouring amenities.

7.02 Paragraph 6.5 of the SPG relating to conservation areas states that *'any new development should preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of a conservation area, whilst allowing the area to remain alive and prosperous. It will be important to see that every new building is designed not as a separate entity, but as part of a larger whole which has a well established character of its own. A high standard of development therefore will be required for all buildings in conservation areas and for extensions to existing buildings.'*

- 7.03 I consider the key issue in this respect is whether the proposal meets the aims and objectives of policy E15 of the SBLP 2008 in preventing development that fails to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.04 In my view the traditional lean-to design of the extensions is acceptable and suitable for this sensitive location meeting the aims and objectives by preserving or enhancing the special character of the conservation area. The materials for the proposed extension will be all in keeping with the original building and the surrounding area.
- 7.05 The proposed development is of a small scale and would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of the host property or be out of keeping with the nature and appearance of the immediate street scene.
- 7.06 I have also considered whether the proposal would result in harm to neighbouring amenity. Here, I consider that there will be no overlooking issues as the new extension only has roof lights and windows facing straight down the garden of No.13. No.12 has side windows but they should not adversely affected by the extension.
- 7.07 I have considered whether, due to their height, scale and massing, the extensions would unacceptably affect the residential amenity of any of the adjacent neighbour properties.
- 7.08 Paragraph 5.7 of the Council's SPG regarding extensions stats that *'for single storey rear extensions close to your neighbours common boundary, the Borough Council considers that a maximum projection of 3m will be allowed. A first floor extension should not exceed 1.8m (with two storey rear extensions the potential impact can be even greater). Leaving a gap to the boundary with your neighbour may offset this requirement slightly depending on the distance allowed.*
- 7.09 In this light both extensions are within the Council's normal guidelines of not extending more than 3.0m along a common boundary and accord with the Council's tried and tested standards which are generally considered acceptable in these circumstances.
- 7.10 I take into account the neighbour's comments regarding over shadowing and loss of light (as above) The proposed ground floor extension projects 3m off the rear elevation (in accordance with the SPG) and with the new the roof overall heights of 3.2m and 2.2m at the eaves and with the kitchen extension sloping up away at its closest point to the neighbouring boundary of no. 12 I see no unusually significant impact here.
- 7.11 Overall I consider that the proposal would not impact unacceptably upon neighbouring amenities and the design is acceptable in the circumstances. Therefore I recommend planning permission be granted.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.01 This application for the partial demolition of existing rear utility, erection of two single storey rear extensions is considered acceptable and I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to 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 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 conserving the character of the conservation area.

Council's approach to the 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 after receipt of amended drawings received 19 May 2016.

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.