

Ightham **559367 157980** **14 April 2008** **TM/07/04461/FL**
Ightham

Proposal: Two storey side extension, two storey rear extension, first floor front extension, conservatory, basement and alterations being a revision to planning permission ref. TM/07/01769/FL (revised internal layouts, revised position for vehicle access, revised position for conservatory, basement)

Location: South View Fen Pond Road Ightham Sevenoaks Kent TN15 9JD

Applicant: Mr + Mrs Paul Deakin

1. Description:

- 1.1 The application is retrospective as works of alteration to the dwelling have already commenced. The roof structure of the existing dwelling has been removed, as have some walls. Construction of some of the external walls of the proposed extensions has also commenced.
- 1.2 The proposal entails erecting a two storey extension and a conservatory on the west (flank) elevation of the property. A basement would be located underneath this extension.
- 1.3 The proposed works also include extending the east flank wall of the kitchen out to be flush with the flank wall of the sitting room behind it and extending above the kitchen to provide an additional bathroom.
- 1.4 A modest two storey extension is also proposed to the rear of the existing dining room/bedroom 2 (2.4 m depth). A recess located between the existing dining and sitting rooms would also be in-filled under this development.
- 1.5 It is also proposed to change the external appearance of the building which is/was of redbrick construction with plain tile hanging at first floor level. Plain clay tiles were used to clad the roof. It is now proposed to construct a dwarf Ragstone wall around the entirety of the building as proposed to be extended and finish the walls with a render (colour to be agreed). It is proposed to clad the finished roof with natural slates, although precise details have not been submitted as part of this application. The rationale behind this change is that the existing building is constructed from solid brickwork with no insulation in the walls. Under this scheme, insulation can be introduced into the walls of the existing building, as well as within the new external walls.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 The application is contentious and has attracted numerous letters of objection.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The site is located outside the settlement confines of Ightham, within the Metropolitan Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- 3.2 The site is located on the west side of Fen Pond Road, to the south of the Fen Meadow residential development. A detached residential property adjoins the site to the south and a paddock adjoins the site to the west.

4. Planning History (most relevant):

TM/96/00980/FL Grant With Conditions 16 August 1996

Triple garage and boundary treatment between South View and former Brymitre site

TM/07/00169/FL Refuse 7 March 2007

Two storey side extension, resiting of conservatory, remodelling of driveway and widening of access

TM/07/01716/FL Application Not Proceeded With 15 May 2007

Two storey rear extension to domestic dwelling

TM/07/01769/FL Grant with conditions 29 June 2007

Two storey rear extension to domestic dwelling

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: We object on the grounds that the new proposals increase the bulk and would adversely affect the visual appearance of the house with regard to the conservatory and removal of tiles. We also object to the use of render for the walls instead of brickwork. All materials used externally should match those on the existing building so as not to harm the character and appearance of the locality. The road is characterised by the use of traditional Kentish building materials.
- 5.2 KCC (Highways): The plan shows that the existing entrance will be permanently closed and anew access created 15m southwards. Following a site inspection forward visibility would be very similar to that from the original entrance, subject to the trimming of hedges bounding the site.

However, the new access would allow a longer more private driveway, with improved parking and turning facilities. The first part of the access to be constructed of suitable hard materials and of a suitable width to allow two cars to

pass each other. New gates to the access to be set back 5 metres from the highway boundary.

I raise no objections to the application.

5.3 Private Reps (including responses to Art 8 Site and Press Notices): 7/0X/0S/11R. 6 of the letters of objection have been received from one local resident. The reasons for objection are as follows:

- The use of render would radically alter the appearance of the existing building.
- The roof line would be raised across the breadth of the house, not just a short section as was previously agreed.
- The conservatory is an incongruous addition to the existing building.
- The proposed conservatory is significantly larger than the approved conservatory.
- The revised position of the vehicle access closer to a bend would significantly increase the probability of further accidents along this dangerous stretch of road.
- The plan does not make it clear whether an existing tree near the proposed access will remain and seek confirmation as to whether a Beech hedge will be planted.
- The proposal abandons the previously approved sympathetic design approach for the extension.
- No details are included as to the proposed tiling and roof colour.
- The rendered finish would reduce the amenity of the view from the neighbouring property.
- The balcony shown on the south elevation would detract from the amenity of the adjacent residential property.
- The floor plans do not fit with the elevations of the proposed works.
- The plans should contain dimensions in order to fully appreciate what is being proposed.
- The plans show a building labelled as a garage located within the paddock adjacent to the residential curtilage of this property. This has not been used as a garage.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The main determining issues that relate to this proposal are the principle of the development and its impact upon the natural beauty of the AONB.
- 6.2 Concern has been expressed with regard to the accuracy of the submitted drawings. It is true that elevation and plan drawings that have now been superseded did not tally with regard to the dimensions of the proposed extensions to this building. However, the latest set of drawings, which are being considered for determination have been checked and the dimensions on the plans now tally with those shown the proposed elevation drawings.
- 6.3 Policy CP 3 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy (TMBCS) states that national Green Belt policy will be applied in areas that include the application site. Policy SS2 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan states that new buildings in the Green Belt should accord with the provisions of PPG 2.
- 6.4 National Green Belt policy is contained within PPG 2 (Green Belts) and states at paragraph 3.1 that there is a presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt and such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- 6.5 Paragraph 3.4 defines types of new buildings that are not considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt; one of which is the limited extension of an existing dwelling. PPG2 goes on to state at paragraph 3.6 that provided it does not result in a disproportionate addition, over and above the size of the original building, the extension of a dwelling is not inappropriate development within the Belt.
- 6.6 The extension currently proposed must be assessed in the context of the previously approved scheme for extensions and alterations to this property (ref. TM/07/01769/FL). It is quite similar in terms of its mass, bulk and size to the previously approved scheme. The most significant differences between that scheme and the current one are the inclusion of the conservatory and basement. Whilst the basement adds volume, being contained completely below ground, it has no impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The addition of the contemporary conservatory does add a modest amount of additional mass and bulk above that of the approved extension to this property. However, this is a single storey element and of predominantly lightweight glazed construction. As such, I consider that this element would have only a very limited impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The scheme as a whole is considered not to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling within this site. The scheme is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in Green Belt terms.

- 6.7 Much concern has been expressed regarding the form and appearance of the building as proposed to be altered under the current scheme. The scale, form and design of the extension are similar to those of the extension approved under ref. TM/07/01769/FL. A significant change is the appearance of the building. As previously permitted, the extension would have been constructed externally from materials to match those of the existing dwelling (red brick, tile hanging, and red clay roof tiles). The proposed development would be finished externally with a Ragstone plinth with rendered walls above. The roof would be clad with natural slate. Policy CP 24 of the TMBCS requires proposals to be well designed and of a high quality in terms of detailing and use of materials. It also states that proposals must be designed to respect the site and its surroundings in terms of scale, siting, character and appearance. The precise details of the colour render and roof slates are not known at this stage. However natural slate does complement pale coloured rendered walls (white or cream for example). Whilst this combination of materials is not prevalent in the locality (where red brick and clay tiles are more widely used) there are residential dwellings within the wider Ightham area that are finished externally from these materials. I consider that a pale coloured render, a Ragstone plinth and natural slate roof would be an acceptable palette of materials for this particular design of house. It must also be remembered that the applicant could have rendered the existing walls in advance without needing planning approval from the Council.
- 6.8 However consideration must be given as to how the proposal as a whole would impact upon its locality including the natural beauty of the AONB, in which the site is located.
- 6.9 The property is a detached dwelling that is set within a generous plot well back from the road. When travelling along Fen Pond Road, the dwelling is not viewed in the same context as the development at Fen Meadow to the north or Puddleduck Cottage to the south due to its position in relation to these properties and the extensive mature boundary treatment that is located along each side of Fen Pond Road in this locality. Therefore, the change in appearance of this property would not, in my opinion, harm the rural character of the locality or the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Planning conditions can be used to ensure appropriate materials are used in the construction of the proposed extensions and alterations to this dwelling, and indeed that appropriate landscaping is introduced and maintained, should permission be granted.
- 6.10 Specific objections have been submitted concerning the proposed conservatory in terms of its inappropriate form and design. However, conservatories generally take a different form to the building they would be attached to. In this case, the glazing design for the conservatory would be of a similar design to that used for the windows within this dwelling and would in my view give a sense of continuity and completeness. The conservatory would not be readily visible from public vantage

points. In light of these factors, I am satisfied that this particular aspect of the development would not harm the character of the locality or the natural beauty of the AONB.

- 6.11 I note the concerns of the local residents regarding the highway safety implications of the proposed new vehicular access. However, Kent Highway Services (the local highway authority) has not objected to this proposal – no doubt because there could be no demonstrable change in traffic movements as a result of the proposal.
- 6.12 With regard to the issue of residential amenity several issues have been raised by local residents. There is no right to a view from an individual property and I am satisfied that in light of the distances between the dwelling the subject of this application and the neighbouring properties, the proposed extensions would not cause an unacceptable loss of outlook to them.
- 6.13 Concerning the issue of privacy, the extension/alterations have been designed so as not to overlook the properties to the north. A pair of glazed doors is proposed to be located within a bedroom at first floor level on the rear elevation of the extension. A neighbour has expressed concern that this window is shown on elevation with a balcony which would allow overlooking into Puddleduck Corner to the south of the application site. However the applicant's agent has confirmed that this is not a balcony, but a piece of toughened glass that would be fixed across the external face of this opening into the walls. It would not be possible to step onto this feature. I am satisfied that this feature of the building would not cause unacceptable overlooking to the neighbouring property.
- 6.14 The location of the extensions is such that they would not cause an unacceptable loss of light to the adjacent residential properties.
- 6.15 A building located within the paddock adjacent to, but outside the application site has been labelled as garage. However, the applicant's agent has now confirmed that this is not used as a garage, but for the storage of equine equipment and machinery used to maintain both the paddock and the adjacent domestic residential curtilage.
- 6.16 In light of the above, I recommend that planning permission be granted.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Design and Access Statement dated 27.12.2007, Letter dated 27.12.2007, Location Plan 1 dated 27.12.2007, Site Plan 2 dated 27.12.2007, Section DETAIL A dated 27.12.2008, Letter dated 10.04.2008, Floor Plan 2 A dated 10.06.2008, Floor Plan 1 B dated 10.06.2008, Existing Plans 5 dated 10.06.2008, Existing Plans 6 dated 10.06.2008, Letter dated 18.07.2008, Elevations 4 D dated 25.07.2008, Elevations EXISTING dated 19.08.2008, subject to the following:

Conditions / Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the north elevation of the building other than as hereby approved, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control any such further development in the interests of amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

3. Within 2 calendar months of the date of this permission details of the colour finishes of the render and windows, details of the proposed roof slates and details of the proposed surface finish for the vehicular access & driveway shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the visual amenity of the locality.

4. Within 2 calendar months of the date of this permission, a scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. All planting, seeding and turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be implemented during the first planting season following occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the earlier. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying, being seriously damaged or diseased within 10 years of planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees or shrubs of similar size and species, unless the Authority gives written consent to any variation. Any boundary fences or walls or similar structures as may be approved shall be erected before first occupation of the building to which they relate.

Reason: Pursuant to Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

5. Any gateway to the access shall be set back 5.0 metres from the edge of the highway.

Reason: To enable vehicles to stand off the highway whilst any gates are being operated.

6. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as the new vehicular access has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

Informative

1. With regard to the construction of the pavement crossing, the applicant is asked to consult The Community Delivery Manager, Kent County Council, Kent Highway Services, Double Day House, St Michaels Close, Aylesford Tel: 08458 247 800.

Contact: Matthew Broome