

**Stansted
Downs**

562078 161563 17 July 2014

TM/14/02465/FL

Proposal:

Erection of a detached single storey oak framed outbuilding and open log store following recent demolition of two outbuildings and greenhouse to rear

Location:

Fairseat Lodge Vigo Road Fairseat Sevenoaks Kent TN15 7LU

Applicant:

Mr Richards

1. Description:

- 1.1 The application proposes the erection of a detached single storey oak framed outbuilding with open log store. Following concerns received regarding the scale of the proposed outbuilding (which was previously 3 bays plus an overhanging roof log store), the applicant has reduced the size of the building to 2 bays with overhanging roof log store. The new outbuilding has a footprint of approximately 7.2m x 5.9m, with an overall ridge height of 4.2m. The building is intended to be located end on to Vigo Road, situated behind existing boundary screening which exists on the frontage of the site with the highway.
- 1.2 The timber framed outbuilding would be located approximately 1m from the site boundary with Underpine Cottage (to the west). The building has been designed with a cat-slide roof on its western facing roof slope, reducing the overall bulk on the outlook of Underpine Cottage. The building would be finished externally in oak weatherboarding above a facing brick plinth, sitting below a slate roof to match the main dwelling.
- 1.3 Taking into consideration the previously permitted but not yet implemented two storey side and single storey rear extension (TM/13/00734/FL), there would be an area of just larger than 8m wide x 9m deep of gravel driveway/manoeuvring space in front of the new two bay outbuilding.
- 1.4 The application documents demonstrate that the applicant has fairly recently demolished two outbuildings within the rear grounds of the property which previously had a footprint of approximately 19.5 sq. metres and to one of which a small greenhouse was attached.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 At the request of Cllr Balfour and Cllr Kemp due to the concerns received from the Parish Council and the cumulative impact of the proposals in relation to previous extensions.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 Fairseat Lodge is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. It is situated to the north-west of the village of Fairseat, within the north-western extent of the Fairseat Conservation Area.
- 3.2 The property has a large two storey frontage along Vigo Road, comprising a red brick and timber clad elevation sitting below a slate tile roof. A single storey brick building sitting below a gable end forms the physical join between this property and the neighbouring Fairseat Cottage.
- 3.3 Fairseat Lodge has an independent gravel driveway on the western side of the property, providing space for several cars the pull off the main highway and manoeuvre before leaving in a forward gear. The property has a large garden to the rear (north) of the property, mainly laid to lawn, with a mix of mature trees and hedgerow along its boundaries.
- 3.4 Originally an annexe to the west of the main property was permitted in 1991 as additional living accommodation, however, this was certified as being a lawfully self-contained dwelling in 2007.
- 3.5 Most recently, a two storey side and single storey rear extension was permitted in 2013 (TM/13/00734/FL) by Members of the Area 2 Planning Committee following a Member Site Inspection on 24 June 2013. This extension has not yet been implemented.

4. Planning History:

TM/69/530	Refuse	2 October 1969
-----------	--------	----------------

Demolition of existing garage and erection of garage with two loose boxes, store on ground floor with bed sitter on first floor.

TM/70/155	Grant with conditions	14 May 1970
-----------	-----------------------	-------------

Demolition of existing garage and erection of new garage, two loose boxes and store, for J. W. Stacpoole.

TM/83/378	Grant with conditions	20 May 1983
-----------	-----------------------	-------------

Single storey rear extension.

TM/87/1418	Grant with conditions	9 October 1987
------------	-----------------------	----------------

Conservatory.

TM/91/69 Grant with conditions 30 May 1991

Use of garden store/garage as sheltered accommodation for elderly relative

TM/13/00734/FL Approved 11 July 2013

Two storey side and single storey rear extension

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: Stansted Parish Council objects to this application. There is planning consent for an extension to the house. This makes the available space within the entrance to the property much smaller and it will be very difficult or impossible for vehicles to turn round within the site. Vigo Road is very narrow at this point with high hedges and poor sight lines, making either reversing out of the property or reversing into it dangerous. The size of the house and lack of public transport will probably mean that multiple vehicles will be attached to the property, potentially making the problem worse.
- 5.2 KCC (Highways): Having considered the concerns raised, raises no objections to the proposals on highway grounds.
- 5.3 Private Reps (5/0X/0R/0S) plus CA and site notice. No letters of representation have been received to the proposals.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The application site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The application must therefore be assessed in relation to National Green Belt Policy, as set out in the NPPF and TMBCS Policy CP3. The application proposes a detached domestic outbuilding and not an extension to the main dwelling, but a . On this basis, the NPPF indicates (in paragraph 89) that the construction of new buildings, such as the one proposed, is inappropriate development.
- 6.2 Fairseat is defined as a Rural Settlement within TMBCS Policy CP13. However, this designation only extends to a relatively small cluster of properties in the centre of the village, not extending far enough north west to encapsulate the application site. Therefore, by definition, Fairseat Lodge is located within the countryside where TMBCS Policy CP14 applies. This policy does not specifically provide support for new domestic outbuildings, except for where they replace existing buildings or represent an appropriate extension of an existing building.
- 6.3 The site is within the Fairseat Conservation Area and paragraph 137 of the NPPF states that opportunities for new development within the setting of heritage assets should enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those

elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

- 6.4 Policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD states that (inter alia) proposals for development will be required to reflect the character and local distinctiveness of the area including its historical and architectural interest as well as the distinctive setting of, and relationship between, the pattern of settlement, roads and the landscape, urban form and important views. Policies CP1 and CP24 of the TMBCS also require the character and amenities of a locality to be safeguarded.
- 6.5 There are also a number of other relevant issues to consider in this case, including:
- Site history, including previously granted planning consent(s) for development at the property;
 - Potential amenity impacts on Underpine Cottage; and
 - Loss of driveway/manoeuvring space within the site.
- 6.6 As outlined above, Fairseat Lodge is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the open countryside, outside of the defined Rural Settlement of Fairseat. The key issues in terms of the MGB and countryside are the visual impact and the impact on openness of the proposed extension.
- 6.7 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF requires protection of the Green Belt and recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In this case, the proposed extension to the property is considered to be inappropriate development since it does not meet one of the exceptions set out in para. 89 of the NPPF. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to whether there are any 'very special circumstances' (VSCs) which exist in this case sufficient to offset potential harm to the Green Belt by reasons of inappropriateness and any other harm.
- 6.8 In this assessment, I am mindful that the main dwelling has benefited from a number of historic planning consents, including a single storey rear extension in 1983 (TM/83/378), a front conservatory extension in 1987 (TM/87/1418) and most recently a two storey side and single storey rear extension in 2013 (TM/13/00734/FL). None of these would prevent the availability of on-site turning space in accordance with normal standards.
- 6.9 In this instance, I am of the view that the proposed oak framed outbuilding (which comprises a two bay garage and overhanging roof log store) would not result in any significant loss of openness to the wider Green Belt. The garage structure, which is rural in character, has been sited to the side of the main dwelling between the built envelope of Fairseat Lodge and Underpine Cottage, is of a general design and form which is visually in-keeping within this rural area and would be relatively hidden from wider vantage points by existing mature tree/hedgerow screens within

the site. The benefit of using a building of this design for vehicle parking is that it will minimise the potentially intrusive impact of reflections from vehicles that would, in any event, be otherwise parking in this position. Whilst the current siting of the building would not fall within Permitted Development (PD) Rights (outbuildings to the side of a property within a Conservation Area require planning permission), should the building be located further into the rear garden this could fall within PD rights. In my opinion the siting of the building deeper into the rear garden (northwards) would have more impact on the general openness of the Green Belt than the location currently chosen. I am of the view that these factors amount, on balance, to a sufficient case of VSCs to set aside the general presumption against inappropriate development in this location.

- 6.10 The general aims of the NPPF and Local Planning Policy are to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. The oak framed outbuilding is located end on to the highway (Vigo Road) and would be relatively hidden behind existing mature vegetation along the front boundary of the site which would be retained. In any case, the proposed oak-framed building is considered to be of a general design, form and external appearance which is entirely acceptable from a planning perspective in rural areas. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal would not conflict with the general thrust of advice contained in paragraph 137 of the NPPF, or the aims and objectives of TMBCS Policies CP1 and CP24 and MDE DPD Policy SQ1.
- 6.11 The proposed outbuilding would be located between the side flank elevation of Fairseat Lodge and the eastern elevation of Underpine Cottage, a small self-contained bungalow also owned by the applicant. The new outbuilding would be located approximately 1m from the shared boundary between these two properties and has been designed with a cat-slide roof facing towards Underpine Cottage. Whilst I fully accept that the new building would be visible and fairly prominent from the outlook of Underpine Cottage, the design of the cat-slide roof which reduces the eaves height to approximately 1.4m closest to the shared boundary goes some way to reducing the building's impact on the adjoining property dropping the eaves. In this case, I am satisfied that the loss of outlook for any current or future occupiers of Underpine Cottage would not be a sufficient reason for refusal of this building in this instance.
- 6.12 Concerns have been expressed regarding the loss of driveway parking and manoeuvring space within the site once the garage is erected and if the previously permitted (but not yet implemented) extensions are constructed. Having looked into this matter further, I note that there would be an area of approximately 8m in width between the front elevation of the new outbuilding and the side flank elevation of the main dwelling and a depth of approximately 9m (excluding the driveway opening). The minimum turning aisle width is 6m. Currently adopted vehicle parking standards require sufficient space for two independently accessible car parking spaces; these would be adequately provided within the new two bay garage together with overflow space for parking and turning in the area of

gravel driveway to be maintained between the new garage and main dwelling. Having also taken advice on this matter from KCC Highways, I note that it has raised no objections to the proposals. On this basis, I am satisfied that the proposals would not result in unacceptable parking or manoeuvring space within the site and that there would not therefore be any detrimental highway safety issues arising from the proposals.

6.13 Having assessed this application in light of current MGB and countryside policy, I have concluded that the proposed new outbuilding accords with the objectives of the NPPF and TMBCS Policies CP3 and CP14. I have concluded that the proposed building is acceptable from a general design perspective and, moreover, would not have a detrimental impact on the public street-scene or Fairseat Conservation Area. I have considered the proposals in light of the previously permitted extensions which have not yet been implemented and am satisfied that there would be no overriding highway concerns either from a parking or manoeuvring perspective which could lead to highway safety issues. On balance, therefore I therefore recommend approval accordingly.

7. Recommendation:

7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** as detailed by: Design and Access Statement dated 17.07.2014, Email dated 27.10.2014, Location Plan CW108/01 A dated 27.10.2014, Proposed Plans and Elevations CW108/3 dated 27.10.2014, 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 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.

Contact: Julian Moat