

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 18 AUGUST 2016**PART 2**

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 2Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

2.1 REFERENCE NO - 16/503388/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a first floor front extension over garage to form bedroom together with internal alterations to form new en-suite bathroom, and new bathroom window to side elevation.			
ADDRESS 11 Leet Close Eastchurch Kent ME12 4EE			
RECOMMENDATION Approve			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The application site is within the built up area boundary where the principle of development is accepted and does not in my view give rise to significant harm to visual or residential amenities			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Cllr Andy Booth			
WARD Sheppey East		PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Eastchurch	APPLICANT Mr Paul Faiers AGENT Britch & Associates Ltd
DECISION DUE DATE 21/06/16		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 07/06/16	
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/506728/FULL	Erection of two storey rear extension and changes to fenestration	Approved	10/3/2016

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 No.11 Leet Close is a large detached property situated on a substantial plot within the built up area boundary. The surrounding properties are also large detached dwellings situated on large plots.
- 1.02 The host property has an attached double garage projecting from the front of the property. The remainder of the frontage is made up of a large area of hardstanding and also a landscaped garden.
- 1.03 The property has private amenity space to the rear which measures approximately 22m in depth and 17m in width. To the rear of the property is undeveloped woodland.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for a first floor extension above the garage and an additional window at first floor level in the flank elevation.
- 2.02 The first floor extension above the garage would have a pitched roof with a front facing, pitched roof dormer window. It would measure 7.5m in depth matching the projection of the garage and would be 6.3m to the ridgeline and 3.2m to the eaves.
- 2.03 The proposed window would be located at first floor level in the flank elevation facing towards No.12 Leet Close. The window serves an en-suite bathroom and would be obscure glazed.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Potential Archaeological Importance

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Development Plan: Saved policies E1, E19 and E24 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008
- 4.02 Adopted SPG entitled “Designing an Extension - A Guide for Householders”, was adopted by the Council in 1993 after a period of consultation with the public, local and national consultees, and is specifically referred to in the supporting text for saved Policy E24 of the Local Plan. It therefore remains a material consideration to be afforded substantial weight in the decision making process.
- 4.03 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 4.04 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.”
- 4.05 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 2008 and the NPPF.
- 4.06 This has been carried out in the form of a report agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel on 12 December 2012. Saved 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 Surrounding properties were sent a consultation letter and a site notice was displayed. No responses were received.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Eastchurch Parish Council raises no objection.

- 6.02 The County Archaeological Officer confirms that no archaeological measures are required in connection with the proposal
- 6.03 Cllr Andy Booth stated *“Please can you ensure this application is presented [at] the next available planning committee”*

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 Application papers and correspondence relating to planning reference 16/503388/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

- 8.01 I firstly draw the attention of Members towards the previous application on the site. Although the application (submitted under 15/506728/FULL) approved the *“Erection of two storey rear extension and changes to fenestration”*, as originally submitted the proposal was for the *“Erection of first floor extension over existing garage with insertion of rooflights, erection of two storey rear extension and changes to fenestration.”* The application was reported to Planning Committee on 14th January 2016 with a recommendation for approval and it was resolved that the proposal be deferred to allow the Planning Working Group to meet on site. A site meeting was held on 1st February 2016 and the application reported back to the Planning Committee Meeting of 11th February 2016. It is clear from the Minute’s of this meeting that Members were of the opinion that the first floor front extension above the garage was not acceptable and on this basis I refer to the resolution which reads:

“That application 15/506728/FULL be delegated to officers to approve subject to the deletion of the front element of the application or to refuse if it was not.”

- 8.02 Further to the above, amended plans were received which omitted the first floor front extension and the application was approved on this basis. This current application now proposes the first floor element which was omitted and an additional side window. The remainder of this appraisal sets out my views on the acceptability of these elements.

Principle of Development

- 8.03 The application site is located within the built up area boundary and as such the principle of development is accepted. The main considerations in this case concern the impact upon residential and visual amenities.

Residential Amenity

- 8.04 It is firstly noted that the host and surrounding properties are large detached dwellings with generous frontages. There is a gap of 5m between the flank wall of the existing garage and No.12 and a gap of 17m to the closest part of No.10.
- 8.05 The existing garage measures 4.2m in height and the proposed first floor extension will increase the height to 6.3m. I note that No.12 has flank windows in the side elevation facing towards the extension. However, the host property is to the north of No.12 and combining this with the separation distance between the properties and that the roof slopes away from No.12 I do not consider that the extension above the garage would cause an unacceptable loss of light. On the opposite side due to the siting of the properties, the first floor extension above the garage would be

approximately 17m away from the closest point of No.10. Even accounting for the rooflight on the roofslope facing towards No.10, as this would face towards the frontage of this property I take the view that due to the distance the first floor extension above the garage would have a negligible impact upon the residential amenities of this property.

- 8.06 The proposal also introduces an additional flank window on the side elevation at first floor level facing towards No.12. The proposed floorplan shows that this window will serve an en-suite bathroom. The drawing is annotated to show that this window will be obscure glazed and as such I do not consider that it would result in loss of privacy. To ensure this, I have included a condition which requires this window to be obscure glazed and to be maintained as such in perpetuity. Therefore I believe the introduction of this flank window is acceptable.

Visual Impact

- 8.07 When viewing the property from public vantage points the first floor extension above the garage will be clearly visible. However, the neighbouring property, No.12 also has a projecting element with a double garage at ground floor level and habitable rooms above this. I also consider that the surrounding properties are all of varying designs and therefore I do not believe that the first floor extension would look at all out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 Overall my view regarding the acceptability of this element of the scheme remains consistent with my recommendation made when the previous application was originally submitted. I believe that due to the spacing of the properties and the design of the extension that it will not give rise to significant harm to either residential or visual amenities. I recommend that planning permission is 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.

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) Before the development hereby permitted is first used, the proposed window in the flank elevation shall be obscure glazed and shall subsequently be maintained as such.

Reasons: To protect the privacy of the occupants of No.10 Leet Close.

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:

- 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.