

5.2 Private Reps (6/0S/0X/1R + Site Notice) One letter received raising objection to the proposal on the following grounds (in summary):

- Over development of the site.
- There has already been an up-scaling of this development in the non-material amendment from integral garage of plot 3 into living space.
- The applicant suggests the proposal is a visual improvement and a benefit to the community. This is of course his own subjective view.
- A triple storey detached garage with an on-site office with bathroom facilities could be seen as a 'habitable dwelling/granny annexe'. We ask that if plans are approved, a caveat is put into place to protect the development from this.
- The site is already marked out and the soil cut away in readiness for this latest expansion.
- A simple retaining wall would be far more attractive and could be easily camouflaged with attractive flora and fauna and would blend in with the surroundings far more quickly.

6. Determining Issues:

6.1 The site lies within the built confines of Addington where the principle of development of this nature is acceptable in the broadest of policy terms. The proposed detached garage is relatively large with a footprint of 66.5sqm and an overall ridge height of 6.05m. However, the location of the site within the confines of the village means that there is no upper limit to the extent to which a property may be extended or outbuildings erected, *in principle*. Furthermore, it should be recognised that Plot 3, which the garage is intended to serve, has a large residential curtilage with an enclosed rear garden to the east, a large driveway and turning area to the front (west) and two sections of front garden; being the bank which is the subject of this application and the area to the west of the drive and north of Laurelle Lodge (which previously served an in-ground swimming pool). I am therefore of the view that the site is sufficiently large to accommodate the proposed building without amounting to an overdevelopment of the site. Furthermore, the proposed garage would not, in my view, result in a wider overdevelopment of the wider site currently undergoing redevelopment.

6.2 With the principle of the proposed development having been established, it is necessary to ensure that the proposal would not harm the street scene and that the development is appropriate for the site and its surroundings. In these respects, Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP requires residential extensions to not have an adverse impact on "the character of the building or the streetscene in terms of form, scale, design, materials and existing trees; nor the residential amenity of

neighbouring properties in terms of light and privacy, and overlooking of garden areas." Policy P4/12 also has an Annex (PA4/12) which sets out further design guidance and amenity tests.

- 6.3 Policy CP24 of the TMBCS relates to achieving a high quality environment and Paragraphs 57 and 58 of the NPPF set out similar criteria.
- 6.4 As I have explained, the proposed outbuilding would be relatively large. However, it must be recognised that it is proposed to be located on an area of ground which has been reduced in level by 3m at its highest point. Accordingly, in my view, the bulk and mass of the proposal should be considered in context with the extent to which the building has been proposed to be dug in to the surrounding bank.
- 6.5 The eaves height of the building would be lower than the height of the bank in which it would sit and the overall ridge height would be viewed in context of a visual background of the surrounding non-excavated land surmounted by a 2m high close-boarded fence and 8m high conifers to the rear (both of which are on top of the non-excavated 3m high bank). The proposed garage would be set to the far north (rear) of the site and would only be visible from glimpse views along the approved new access point. Accordingly, I am of the view that the scale and bulk of the building would be mitigated by the use of levels on the site and would be viewed as subservient to the main dwellinghouse at Plot 3 due to its position within the plot. The scale, form and proportion of the garage are in keeping with the host building at Plot 3 and, following Officer negotiations with the applicant, the design has been amended to propose flat roof dormers, thus reducing their visual impact, with eaves detail to match the front elevation of the house. Matching materials are proposed which have already been approved through TM/14/00234/FL and are considered acceptable.
- 6.6 In light of the above considerations I am satisfied the proposal would sit comfortably within the site when considering the wider context of the ongoing redevelopment of the site and when having due regard to the specific siting of the proposed building, the particular levels on the site and the boundary treatment and mature landscaping to the north. For these reasons, I am of the view the proposal would accord with Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP, Policy CP24 of the TMBCS and Paragraphs 57 and 58 of the NPPF with respect to visual amenity.
- 6.7 The proposed garage would be close to the northern boundary and a section of western boundary, both of which have a 2m close-boarded fence and 8m conifer hedging on the boundary. For these reasons, and due to the garage being proposed to be constructed on the reduced level, I do not consider the proposal would give rise to harm to neighbouring dwellings through loss of light, outlook or the creation of an overbearing impact. In terms of residential amenity I am of the view the proposal would accord with Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP, Policy CP24 of the TMBCS and Paragraphs 57 and 58 of the NPPF.

6.8 The triple garage would provide additional covered parking to the approved driveway space associated with Plot 3. The proposal therefore accords with IGN3: Residential Parking.

6.9 In light of the above considerations I am satisfied the proposal accords with relevant local and national policy and recommend permission be granted.

7. Recommendation:

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Letter dated 16.06.2014, Material Samples dated 16.06.2014, Location Plan dated 16.06.2014, Site Plan 1126 - GA - 3000 B dated 16.06.2014, Floor Plans And Elevations 1126 - GA - 4500 C dated 26.08.14, subject to the following:

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 accord with the approved plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. The garage shall not be used for any other purpose than the accommodation of private vehicles or for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the related dwellinghouse and no trade or business shall be carried on therefrom.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and interests of the occupants of other property in this residential area.

Contact: Lucy Harvey