

**Wrotham**  
Wrotham

**562545 158883 29 July 2010**

**TM/10/02023/FL**

Proposal: Provision of first floor side extension.  
Location: Little Nepicar Cottage London Road Wrotham Sevenoaks  
TN15 7RR  
Applicant: Mr And Mrs R Bonny

---

**1. Description:**

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for a first floor side extension at Little Nepicar Cottage, London Road, Wrotham. The application follows refusal of a previous scheme (TM/09/01623/FL) for various extensions to the property which was refused by Members at Area 2 Planning Committee on 12 May 2010.
- 1.2 This application is for a reduced proposal that now provides no increase in footprint or floor space, but would improve head height to the existing landing and one of the rear bedrooms. The proposal would remove a cat-slide roof on the south elevation which currently contains two small dormers, and replace it with a conventional first floor flank wall and windows to match the northern half of the existing rear extension. The rear elevation would have a slightly raised eaves level on the southern side, again to match the northern portion of the existing extension. A small area of flat "table-top" roof would be required.
- 1.3 All materials are proposed to match the main dwellinghouse and no change to vehicle parking, turning or access is proposed.

**2. Reason for reporting to Committee:**

- 2.1 Application TM/09/01623/FL was determined at Committee and therefore, in the interests of consistency, it should be for Members to determine whether this resubmission has adequately addressed the previous reasons for refusal.

**3. The Site:**

- 3.1 The site is situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and outside of the village confines of Wrotham, within the open countryside.
- 3.2 The site fronts on to the A20, London Road and has vehicular access off a private drive to the south of the site.
- 3.3 The front portion of the house has some historical value but is not listed. The later addition to the rear has a cat-slide to the south roof slope with two small dormer windows.

3.4 There are a couple of small sheds within the rear garden and small flat roof garage on the south elevation. A large timber outbuilding has recently been erected on site, forward of the principal elevation of the building. The house has a conservatory on the north elevation.

**4. Planning History:**

TM/00/01398/FL      Grant With Conditions      8 August 2000

Rear Conservatory.

MK/4/57/408      Refuse      28 November 1957

Outline Application for one dwelling and access.

TM/84/228      Grant with Conditions      16 April 1984

Two storey rear extension.

TM/89/1410,      Refuse      6 December 1989

Vehicular access to A20.

TM/05/2228/TPOC      Grant With Conditions      18 August 2005

Remove dead wood, split branches and thin remaining canopy of two Chestnut trees; remove one Chestnut tree near highway (TPO ref. 12-24-22)

TM/08/02563/FL      Refuse      5 November 2008

Two storey rear extension. Demolition of existing garage and replacement with new detached double garage

TM/09/01623/FL      Refuse      25 May 2010

Provision of first floor side extension through alteration of catslide roof with dormers into a 'butterfly' pitched roof and addition of single storey extension to rear

**5. Consultees:**

5.1 PC: No objections, WPC is of the opinion that the proposed extension enhances the visual appearance of the property.

5.2 Private Reps: (6/0X/0R/0S + Site Notice) No representations received at the time of preparing this report.

**6. Determining Issues:**

- 6.1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt where residential extensions can be considered appropriate development provided the level of cumulative extension is not disproportionate to the original house. PPG2: Green Belts and Policy CP3 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 set out the framework for considering proposals in the Green Belt.
- 6.2 Within the AONB, proposals must preserve or enhance the natural beauty of the landscape and accord with policy CP7 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.
- 6.3 Saved Policy P4/12 and Policy Annex PA4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan (TMBLP) 1998 relate to residential extensions and seek to ensure that proposals are of a form, scale, and design (including the use of appropriate materials) which would not adversely impact on the character of the building or wider streetscene. These policies also consider the impact of residential extensions on residential amenity through loss of light, privacy and overlooking of garden areas. Policies CP1 and CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 also seek high quality design in all new development.
- 6.4 The original volume of Little Nepicar Cottage was approximately 240 cubic metres (243 cubic metres including the existing porch). The cottage was extended in 1984 in the form of a two storey rear extension and has subsequently been added to by way of a conservatory to the north elevation.
- 6.5 The proposed first floor extension would add a small increase in volume but would not increase footprint or floor area. The proposed extension would provide for an improved internal head height to one of the rear bedrooms and the landing. The additional volume, when assessed cumulatively with the existing extensions to the property, would represent a level of extension which is at the upper limits of policy allowances, which could be argued to be “disproportionate” to the original house. However, it is my view that the current proposal would provide much needed internal head height in what is a very small bedroom. In addition, the design of the building overall would be improved through the proposal by balancing its form and scale particularly on the rear elevation. Accordingly, it is my view that, in this instance, the benefit to the occupants of the property as a result of improving the internal head height of a small room, added to the improvement to visual amenity, can outweigh the harm by inappropriateness and the harm to the amenities/openness of the Green Belt through disproportionate extension.
- 6.6 The previous proposal had a further reason for refusal relating to the scale, form and proportion of the extension. This reason does not in my view apply in this current case, as the significant rear projection has been removed from the

proposal. It is my view that the scale, form and proportion of the proposed first floor side extension would be in keeping with the existing dwelling and would improve the visual amenity of the locality. I therefore consider the proposal would accord with Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP and Policy CP24 of the TMBCS.

6.7 The proposal would not result in overlooking or overshadowing of neighbours and accordingly would not result in harm to residential amenity. No changes to parking, access or turning are proposed and accordingly the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety.

6.8 In light of the above considerations, I am satisfied the proposal has a sufficient case of "very special circumstances" in the form of the limited volume increase, improved internal head height and benefits to visual amenity, to outweigh the limitations of PPG2: Green Belt. I therefore consider the proposal can be recommended for approval.

## **7. Recommendation:**

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Design and Access Statement dated 23.07.2010, Validation Checklist dated 23.07.2010, Existing Plans SCA/796/01 dated 26.07.2010, Site Plan SCA/796/10 dated 26.07.2010, Block Plan SCA/796/11 dated 26.07.2010, Elevations SCA/796/13 dated 26.07.2010, Proposed Plans SCA/796/14 REV B dated 10.08.2010, Elevations SCA/796/15 REV A dated 29.07.2010, subject to:

### **Conditions:**

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. All materials used externally shall match those of the existing building.

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

Contact: Lucy Stainton