

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 17/504807/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of single storey rear extension and external alterations to rear fenestration.			
ADDRESS 3 Oak Cottages Perry Wood Selling Faversham Kent ME13 9SE			
RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposal is in accordance with Local Policy and Supplementary Guidance. The works proposed are unlikely to give rise to unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenities.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Objection from Parish Council			
WARD Boughton And Courtenay	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Selling	APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Niall & Paula Leyden AGENT Spacemaker Architects	
DECISION DUE DATE 21/11/17	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 20/10/17		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
SW/12/0995	Lawful Development Certificate for use of land within the curtilage of the dwelling for the stationing of a mobile home to be occupied ancillary to the main house. (Proposed)	Certificate Granted	28 August 2012

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The proposal site is a traditionally designed two storey end terrace dwelling in Perry Wood. The site lies along a rural lane with a wide set back from the building frontage to the main carriageway. Access is provided from the main road to the property via a private lane. The existing building is bare brick faced on the front elevation and the rear walls have been painted with a creamy white colour.
- 1.02 The existing dwelling has been developed in the past to create a part two / part single side and rear extensions. As originally purchased and shown on plans, part the proposal site (Number 3) is set within the neighbouring terrace at ground floor level. This odd arrangement however has no impact on the external boundary arrangement. The existing boundary treatment is made up of part brick and part wooden fencing panels.
- 1.03 The area is in the countryside and part of the designated Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site is however not in a conservation area and the building is not listed. The immediate surroundings are predominantly rural with groups of residential properties scattered across a wide area.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a modern style single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would have a width measuring 5.8 metres, a maximum depth of 3.3 metres and a mono-pitched roof with a height of 2.5 metres at the lower eaves part and 3.0 metres at the highest point. The extension is to provide a dining area.
- 2.02 Three roof windows are proposed, a standard door is proposed to open rearwards, and to the east overlooking the side garden, aluminium bi-fold doors are proposed. The extension will be set back by 0.5m from the common boundary with no. 2 Oaks Cottage.
- 2.03 The extension would be clad in horizontal chestnut feather edged wood panels with dark grey aluminium under a zinc roof. There will be a canopied area supported by posts along the eastern and southern part of the built form.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Ancient Woodland

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty KENT DOWNS

Potential Archaeological Importance

Tree Preservation Order Polygon MBC_SBC Reference: 8093/TPO

Description: Woodland to the south east and east of Oak Cottages, Perry W

Tree Preservation Order Polygon MBC_SBC Reference: 8095/TPO

Description: Woodland to the south east and east of Oak Cottages, Perry W

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and National Planning Practice Guidance.
- Chapter 7: Requiring good design
 - Chapter 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 4.02 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017
- Policy CP 4 Requiring good design
 - DM11 Extensions to, and replacement of, dwellings in the rural area
 - Policy DM 14 General development criteria
 - Policy DM 16 Alterations and extension
 - Policy DM 24 Conserving and enhancing valued landscapes
- 4.03 Supplementary Planning Guidance: 'Designing an Extension – 'A Guide for Householders'

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 None received

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Selling Parish Council has raised objections to the proposal. Councillor's views are stated below:

'The above application was discussed at our Selling Parish Council meeting last night and the councillors were of the opinion that the materials would be out of keeping with the design of the area and the proposed design looks odd.'

7.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 7.01 The development is to provide extra habitable space to the existing dwelling house. The proposed extension is to remain ancillary to the main dwelling and the use of the host dwelling is not changing. For this reason, although the site lies outside of a built up area boundary the proposal is considered acceptable in land use terms subject to it being of a modest scale.

Visual Impact

- 7.02 Paragraph 3.0 of local supplementary guidance 'Designing an Extension – 'A Guide for Householders' notes that extensions should respect or reflect the character and appearance of the existing building. On this basis, the Parish Council has expressed concerns relating to the choice of materials and the design of the proposed extension. Paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 reinforce the design aspect and advise that in older properties, features worth copying should be included and retained.
- 7.03 Plans for the proposal have been annotated to show timber cladding and a canopied area outside of the extension. Whilst the materials and style proposed may not be directly in keeping with the existing, it cannot be argued they are unsympathetic. As detailed above, the extension would be clad in wood panels with aluminium doors and windows. Wood is considered traditional material whereas aluminium is modern. In the view of Officers, the material choice would contrast and complement the existing building. Moreover the chestnut cladding will reflect the surrounding woodland and anchor the extension to its location.
- 7.04 The site is the end building in a row of three dwellings located in a very secluded area. The proposed extension would be contained on the rear elevation and would be just 0.5 metres higher than the existing boundary wall. Views of the proposed extension would be limited to residents of the three immediate neighbouring dwelling from their rear gardens. There will be no direct views from any public vantage points. For this reason and on the basis that the site is not a listed building; it would be unjustified to refuse the application solely based on material choice and design. The material choice in this location is therefore considered appropriate.
- 7.05 In design terms, I consider that the proposed rear extension is an acceptable way of extending this property on account of its general compliance with policy DM 14 of the adopted local plan and the guidance as outlined in the SPG – 'Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders.'

Residential Amenity

- 7.06 The Guidance document advice that development should not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining residents with regard to overlooking, loss of light and creation of

a sense of enclosure. In terms of privacy and overlooking, the proposed extension does not include any windows along the boundary with no. 2. In this instance the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of the neighbouring property.

- 7.07 It is noted that the proposed extension, with an overall depth of 3.3 metres would exceed the 3 m guidance depth for extensions to terraced houses as set out in the local supplementary guidance 'Designing an Extension – 'A Guide for Householders'. The guidance limit is so stated to prevent undue impact on neighbouring residents. Paragraph 5.7 of the same document however advice that leaving a gap to the boundary with your neighbour may offset the 3 metres requirement. For this reason, given that the flank wall of the extension would be set back from the common boundary by half a metre, some flexibility can be applied in this case.
- 7.08 In terms of light, the extension is low in terms of its height, bulk and scale. This, in combination with the siting and southern orientation of adjoining houses, persuades me that this is not a development that warrants refusal of [planning permission. The potential impact of the proposed extension would to my mind be acceptable.

Scale

- 7.09 Whilst this property has previously been extended the current proposal is of very limited impact and, even taken together with the previous extension, would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character of the countryside.

Highways

- 7.10 Owing to the modest scale of the proposed extension and the siting; there will be no highways implications.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.01 The proposal to extend the property to the rear to create habitable living space is considered to be acceptable. The proposed extension exhibits minimal departure from relevant Local Plan policies and SPG guidance. Detailed analysis of the development however indicates that the development would have an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties and minimal impact on the visual amenities of the AONB.
- 8.02 On balance, it is considered the development should be granted planning permission as there are no valid material reasons to withhold consent.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following condition

CONDITION

- (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.

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.
- As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance, the application was acceptable as submitted and no further information was required. The application was also considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant / agent had the opportunity to speak 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.



2.4 3 Oak Cottages, Perry Wood, Selling ME13 9SE
Scale: 1:700

