

TM/07/04461/FL

Approved

30 September 2008

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).

5. Consultees:

5.1 PC: No objection.

5.2 KCC (Highways): This application is similar to the previous one to which no highway objections were raised. Surface water from private areas is not to discharge onto the public highway. It is noted that the existing vehicle access is to be permanently closed off and the hedge line re-instated. I also require that the area fronting the road is reinstated as a verge. The applicant must liaise with Kent Highway Services (KHS) regarding the vehicle crossover and all works affecting the public highway.

5.3 Private Reps (including Art 8 Site Notice): 8\0X\1S\2R. The reasons for objecting are:

- The plans are inaccurate.
- The scheme entails further increasing the scale and height of the building which will impact detrimentally upon the neighbouring properties.

The letter submitted in support of the application states that the sooner the application is approved the better, so it looks like a house, not a building site.

6. Determining Issues:

6.1 The amendments to the approved scheme, particularly the increase in the height of the eaves and ridge levels, noticeably increases the mass and bulk of the building from that previously approved. However, it must also be considered that the overall length and depth of the building have not been altered under this proposal. Despite the increase in the height of the extended building, I do not consider the increase to the mass and bulk of the original building to be significantly more intrusive than that of the previously approved scheme. Consequently, I consider that this scheme would not cause such harm to the openness and function of the Green Belt when compared to the previously approved scheme that would warrant a recommendation to refuse permission. Accordingly, I consider the current scheme to be acceptable in Green Belt terms.

- 6.2 The alterations to the extension produce a building with a more uniform appearance with the rationalisation of the eaves and ridge lines. Whilst the variation in the height of different elements of the dwelling was a feature of the original dwelling, I consider the aesthetics of the current proposal to be no worse than the previously approved scheme in terms of its general appearance. The building appears to be better proportioned in terms of the relationship between the walls and the roof planes, as well as the size and arrangement of windows. Whilst this is a subjective judgement, I do not consider that the current scheme for the extension would detract from the visual amenity of the locality to any greater degree than the scheme the subject of TM/07/04461/FL.
- 6.3 I note the concern of the local residents that the increase in the height of the building would impact upon their amenity. In terms of privacy, the first floor windows that were located on the front (north) elevation of this dwelling before any works commenced, have been shifted upwards so the top of the windows would now stand at 5.4m above ground level compared to 4.8m in the previously approved scheme. I do not consider that this modest change in the height of the first floor windows would detract from the privacy of the neighbouring residential properties situated to the north of the application site. No additional windows are proposed to be located at first floor level in the north elevation of the extended building, in order to safeguard the privacy of the neighbouring residential properties.
- 6.4 Concerning the issue of light, whilst the ridge height of the extended dwelling would be increased by a maximum of 0.5 metres (to 8.5 metres), the dwelling would stand approximately 15 metres away from the nearest residential dwelling. In light of this separation between properties, I am satisfied that this development would not, when completed, cause an unacceptable loss of light to the neighbouring property.
- 6.5 I note the comments of the neighbour concerning the inaccuracy of the submitted drawings. However I have checked the submitted elevation drawing against the submitted floor plans and can confirm that they do correlate.
- 6.6 Kent Highway Services considers the proposal to be acceptable in terms of highway safety. Indeed the alterations to the existing access are the same as those previously approved.
- 6.7 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 21.04.2009, Location Plan NO.1 07/1812 dated 31.03.2009, Elevations NO. 4F 07/0319 as proposed dated 21.04.2009, Elevations NO. 7 07/0319 + floor plan as revised dated 21.04.2009, Floor Plan as existing dated 27.04.2009, Elevations as existing dated 27.04.2009, Floor

Plan NO.3D 07/1812 as proposed dated 27.04.2009, Site Plan NO2A 07/1812 as proposed dated 29.04.2009, subject to the following:

Conditions / Reasons

1. Within 1 month 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 for the approval 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.

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 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.

4. 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.

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.

Informatives

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.
2. You are advised that the Local Planning Authority considers that facing brick is preferable for the external elevations of the property in lieu of the render proposed in the application.
3. You are advised that details of any hardstandings submitted pursuant to condition 6 shall be made of porous material or provision should be made to direct water run-off from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area within the curtilage of the dwelling house.

Contact: Matthew Broome