
Hadlow (Golden Green) **563405 148328** **13 March 2013** **TM/13/00613/FL**
East Peckham And
Golden Green

Proposal: Proposed two storey side extensions to the existing dwelling
Location: Tithe Ward House Three Elm Lane Golden Green Tonbridge
 Kent TN11 0BN
Applicant: Mrs Gilly Easter

1. Description:

- 1.1 There are two distinct additions proposed with this scheme. One would infill an area located between the historical dwelling located towards the front of the site and the former cart shed/existing garage building located behind it. This addition would measure 4m in width, 6.8m in length and would stand 8.6m high at ridge level. This addition would have a pitched, tiled roof linking into the roofs of the buildings in front and to the rear of it.
- 1.2 The second addition would be a sideways extension to the existing 'garage' block (extending in an easterly direction towards 1 and 2 Tithe Ward Cottages). This part of the extension would measure 9.2m in length, 6.8m in width and 6.9m high at ridge level. Attached to this would be a single storey rear extension to the existing building that would contain a lobby and W.C. The roof of these additions would be gabled, but would also contain a catslide and a projecting gable on the rear elevation.
- 1.3 The extensions would be constructed externally from brickwork, concrete roof tiles and painted timber windows, all to match those materials used on the existing dwelling.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 Called in by local councillor in light of concerns raised by local residents regarding impact upon the Green Belt and residential amenity.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The site is located outside the settlement confines of Golden Green, within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The site is located on the south side of Three Elm Lane and contains a large, detached, dwelling house located within a substantial plot. Residential properties are located on either side of the application site and agricultural land adjoins the site to the rear.

4. Planning History:

TM/78/01593/FL grant with conditions 5 March 1979

Erection of two storey pitched roof extension.

TM/10/01793/FL Approved 10 August 2010

Widening of entrance to drive, partially remove the existing hedge and replace with a 4ft 6 inch post and rail fence, with automated gates to increase the security of the property

TM/11/02441/FL Refuse 25 October 2011

Alterations and extension to private house

TM/12/02884/FL Refuse 26 November 2012

Proposed extension to the existing dwelling and driveway

5. Consultees:

5.1 PC: 23.04.13: Agree.

5.2 Private Reps: (including responses to site notices): 4/0X/0S/5R: Five letters of objection have been received, four of which have been submitted by or on behalf of the same household. The reasons for the objections are as follows:

- The extension is substantially disproportionate to the size of the original dwelling.
- The gap between Titheward House and 1 Titheward Cottages would be reduced by more than half. This would be a significant reduction in the openness of the Green Belt.
- No 'very special circumstances' have been given in support of this or the previous applications.
- The extensions will appear dominant and overbearing from the small rear garden of the neighbouring property.
- The extensions would harm the views and outlook from the neighbouring property.
- The extension would impact upon the views from the public footpath located to the rear of the site.

- The intensification of the use of this site is contrary to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.

6. Determining Issues:

6.1 Section 9 of the NPPF relates to development within the Green Belt. It states at paragraph 87:

“As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”

6.2 Paragraph 89 of the NPPF lists the types of buildings that the Government does not consider to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. One type is the erection of an extension to a building provided that;

“it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.”

6.3 As with previous Green Belt policy, the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence, according to paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

6.4 Paragraph 80 of the NPPF lists the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt. These are:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

6.5 Policy CP 3 of the TMBCS requires developments within the Green Belt to comply with national Green Belt policy.

6.6 Policy CP 24 of the TMBCS requires all developments to be well designed and of a high quality in terms of detailing and use of materials. It also requires proposals to respect the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of scale, siting, character and appearance.

- 6.7 Saved policy P4/12 of the TMBLP relates specifically to extensions to residential properties. It requires schemes to not have an adverse impact on the character of the building or the street scene in terms of form, scale, design and use of materials. Schemes must also not detract from the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or privacy.
- 6.8 With regard to Green Belt impacts, the issue of what is the original building has to be considered. In this particular case, the original building consists of two distinct elements. The square, hipped roof, red-brick 'Georgian' style dwelling located towards the front of the site forms part of the original building within this site. The brick built former cart shed (now garage and study) located to the rear of the main part of the dwelling house is also an 'original' part of the building for the purpose of applying Green Belt policy as it existed within this site prior to 1st July 1948. During the 1970's this was linked by a small addition to the back of the house to provide additional habitable accommodation. Therefore, the 'original' building within this site, for the purposes of applying Green belt policy is the majority of the existing building.
- 6.9 Having identified what is considered to be the original building, I now turn to the impact of the proposed extensions. The 'central' extension would infill a small space currently surrounded on three sides by the existing building. Whilst this addition would raise the height of the existing link between the forward most part of the house and the former cart barn, it would still be lower than the highest part of the existing dwelling house. Despite this increase in height, this addition is still considered to be subservient and in proportion to the size of the original dwelling house within this site. Due to its limited size and discreet position within the site, this addition would also not harm the openness of the Green Belt.
- 6.10 The second extension would be to the side of the existing garage building/former cart shed. This addition would measure 6.8m in width, a maximum of 9.2m in length and would stand 6.9m high at ridge level. The roof of this extension would be pitched, but contains a catslide and a gabled wall to the rear. Whilst this building could be considered to be large in its own right, the issue is whether it would be in proportion to the size of the original building. The original building within this site is extensive in size, measuring a maximum of 19.5 metres in length and a maximum of 13.4m in width. (The original building is 'L' shaped and these dimensions relate to the outside lengths of the building). Given the size of the original building within this site, the proposed side extension to the garage/former cart shed is also considered to be a limited addition, subservient to the scale of the original building within this site.
- 6.11 The cumulative impact of both of the proposed extensions upon the Green Belt also has to be considered; not just in terms of whether they are inappropriate development, but also whether they would erode the openness of the Green Belt. One of the objectors states that the proposed extensions would increase the floor space of the building by approximately 50%. The relevant test is whether the

proposed extensions would be disproportionate when compared to the size of the original building. In this case, the original parts of the building within this site are large in size and the proposed additions, even when taken together and added to the link extension approved in 1978, would not be disproportionate additions, over and above the size of the original building.

- 6.12 Concern has been expressed that the proposed extension to the garage/cart/barn would harm the openness of the Green Belt by eroding the gap between the existing dwelling house and the neighbouring dwelling at 1 Tithe Ward Cottages. As the addition to the existing garage would extend sideways, the gap between the existing dwellings would be reduced by this proposal. However, the distance from the edge of the proposed extension to the boundary with no.1 Tithe Ward Cottages would be between 4.5 and 7m. In the context of this site and how it relates to the wider locality, I consider that an acceptable visual gap would be maintained by this proposal between these two dwellings. In light of this, and that the extensions are considered to be in proportion to the size of the original building within this site, the proposed additions are not considered to cause such harm to the openness of the Green Belt that would warrant a recommendation to refuse permission.
- 6.13 A previous application for two storey side extensions to this dwelling was refused under ref. TM/12/02884/FL and local residents consider that the Council should be consistent in applying planning policies and, therefore, refuse this application. However, as Members will be aware, each application has to be considered on its individual merits. The previously refused scheme extended to within 1 metre of the boundary with 1 Tithe Ward Cottages. This larger extension was considered to be unacceptable in terms of its impact upon the openness of the Green Belt as well as upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. In the current proposal, the extension would be located between 4.5m and 7m away from the boundary with the neighbouring property and would, therefore, be significantly smaller in size than the previously refused scheme. It would also impact much less upon the openness of the Green Belt.
- 6.14 One of the objections to this proposal is that it would conflict with the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt. However, as the proposed extensions would be in proportion to the size of the original building with this site and would be located within the existing curtilage of a residential property, they would not undermine the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, which are listed within paragraph 6.4 of this report.
- 6.15 In concluding upon the Green Belt issues, it is considered that the proposed extensions would be a proportionate addition to the original building within this site and would not erode the openness of the Green Belt by an unacceptable degree. Consequently, the proposal is considered to comply with current Government guidance contained within the NPPF as well as policy CP 3 of the TMBCS.

- 6.16 The extensions, in terms of their form and detailed design, would be in keeping with the character of the existing building and matching materials would be used externally. Due to the appropriate form, design and external appearance of the proposed extensions, they would also not have an adverse impact upon the character of the street scene.
- 6.17 Concerning residential amenity issues, the proposed extensions would be positioned far enough away so as not to cause a loss of light to the habitable rooms within the neighbouring dwelling house. The principal windows within the living room of 1 Tithe Ward Cottages face north west and look towards the front garden of the application site. I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not appear unduly overbearing from this room within the neighbouring property due to the orientation of the windows and the position of the proposed extensions.
- 6.18 The kitchen/dining room within this neighbouring dwelling contains windows within its north west and south west elevations. The proposed extensions would be visible from these windows. However, I am satisfied that, due to the position of the proposed extensions at least 4.5m away from the boundary of this neighbouring property, they would not appear overly dominant when seen from this room within the neighbouring property.
- 6.19 It must also be noted that a mature tree and shrubs are located within the neighbouring property at 1 Tithe Ward Cottages along its north-west boundary. These currently obscure some views into the application site from the kitchen and living rooms as well as from the rear garden of 1 Tithe Ward Cottages. Whilst these could be felled or cut back at any time, their very existence reduces views towards the position of the proposed extensions and would, therefore, help to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed additions upon the outlook from this neighbouring dwelling.
- 6.20 The private rear garden of 1 Tithe Ward Cottages is very small in size (essentially a small courtyard) and is currently enclosed by the rear wall of the dwelling house within this site and a tall brick wall that forms part of the adjoining dwelling house at 2 Tithe Ward Cottages. The boundary of this courtyard facing the application site contains mature shrubs. This space is, therefore, already significantly enclosed by existing natural and man-made structures located around its perimeter. In this context, and given that the extensions would be located at least 4.5m away from the boundary with this property, they are not considered to result in an unacceptably overbearing impact upon the outlook from the neighbouring courtyard.
- 6.21 A small patio area is also located between the flank wall of the dwelling house within 1 Titheward Cottages and its boundary with the application site. The proposed extensions would be visible from this particular area but, due to their position within the application site, would not be unacceptably overbearing when viewed from this patio area.

- 6.22 In summary, the proposed extensions are not considered to cause such harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring property that would warrant a recommendation to refuse planning permission.
- 6.23 Policy SQ 8 of the MDEDPD requires all proposals to comply with adopted parking standards. In this case, the relevant car parking standards contained within the adopted parking standards require two car parking spaces to be provided for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms plus one visitor space. The submitted drawings show that adequate parking and turning provision would be provided within the front garden of the application site.
- 6.24 In light of the above, the proposed extensions are considered to be acceptable in planning terms and I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** as detailed in the following submitted details: Letter dated 01.03.2013, Design and Access Statement dated 01.03.2013, Proposed Floor Plans AL(00)31 dated 01.03.2013, Proposed Floor Plans AL(00)32 dated 01.03.2013, Proposed Roof Plan AL(00)33 dated 01.03.2013, Proposed Elevations AL(00)34 dated 01.03.2013, Proposed Elevations AL(00)35 dated 01.03.2013, Site Plan AL(00)37 dated 01.03.2013, Elevations AL(00)38 dated 01.03.2013, Location Plan AL(00)36 dated 01.03.2013, subject to:

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. 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 in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007, Policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010 and paragraphs 17, 57, 58 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. The windows on the east elevation of the extension at first floor level serving the family bathrooms and laundry rooms shall be fitted with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung light shall be non-opening. This work shall be effected before the room is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To minimise the effect of overlooking onto adjoining property in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy and paragraphs 17, 57, 58 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

4. The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space 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 and 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 or garaging of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking contrary to Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007, Policy SQ8 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010 and paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Informatives

1. The applicant is advised that any further proposal to insert clear glazed and openable windows in the flank elevation of the extended dwelling above ground floor level will need to be the subject of a planning application. This is because such works do not benefit from being permitted development as defined within Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended).
2. The applicant is advised that, given the location of the site within the Green Belt, the local planning authority is unlikely to support further applications to extend this dwelling house in the future.
3. The applicant is advised to minimise noise and general disturbance to the neighbouring residential properties by undertaking the construction works between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and not to carry out construction works on Sundays, Bank or public holidays.

Contact: Matthew Broome