

OFFICERS REPORT

Application No: Y18/1122/FH

Location: 12 The Haven Hythe Kent CT21 4PJ

Proposal Erection of single storey rear extensions to the main house and garage, following demolition of rear conservatory, together with increase in the height of the garage roof to provide living accommodation, including the installation of a rear dormer and balcony.

ASSESSMENT

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 21.09.18

Applicable 8 week target date: 16.11.18

Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) or Planning Extension Agreement (PEA)? No

If Yes, revised 8/13/16 week target date: N/A

Is the application being determined after 26 weeks without a PPA or a PEA? No

SITE VISIT

Carried out site visit on 08.10.18.

The site and proposals were assessed from the public highway and the following key features were noted as set out in the report below.

SITE

The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Hythe, Flood Zones 2 and 3 as identified by the Environment Agency, a Special Landscape Area and an area of interest to the Romney Marshes Area Internal Drainage Board in relation to the maintenance and management of watercourses. The main building of the site is a two storey dwellinghouse with pitched and barn-hipped roof forms and an attached side garage and rear conservatory. In terms of materials, the house is finished with facing brickwork, hanging tiles, clay tiled roof forms and uPVC windows and doors.

HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history in relation to this application.

PROPOSAL

Erection of single storey rear extensions to the main house and garage, following demolition of rear conservatory, together with increase in the height of the garage roof to provide living accommodation, including the installation of a rear dormer and balcony - The proposed increase in height of the garage would see the eaves line retained and the ridge height increased from 4.6m to 6.2m, with the new ridge meeting the existing side roof slope of the main house. The proposed extensions would see the number of bedrooms within the house increase from three to four, and an office, living room and open-plan kitchen/dining room added at ground floor. In terms of materials, the proposed extensions would be finished with

matching multi-stock brick, matching clay tiles, timber cladding, grey aluminium windows and timber doors.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file. The main points raised are summarised below.

Hythe Town Council were consulted and raised no objection.

REPRESENTATIONS

Three representations were received and are available in full on the planning file. The main point raised is an objection on the basis of overlooking/interlooking from the proposed balcony and first floor bi-fold doors resulting in loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 23.10.18

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review: SD1, BE1, BE8 and CO4

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

The Submission draft of the PPLP (February 2018) was published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) for public consultation between February and March 2018. The Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in September 2018. Accordingly, it is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications in accordance with the NPPF, which confirms that weight may be given to policies in emerging plans following publication (paragraph 48). Based on the current stage of preparation, and given the relative age of the saved policies within the Shepway Local Plan Review (2006), the policies within the Submission Draft Places and Policies Local Plan (2018) may be afforded weight where there has not been significant objection.

Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft: HB1

NPPG

NPPF

Kent Design Guide: Interim Guidance Note 3

APPRAISAL

The main considerations in the determination of this application are design and visual appearance, amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and parking and highways.

DESIGN AND VISUAL APPEARANCE

With regard to the proposed increase in the height of the garage roof, it is considered that the resultant enlarged roof form would remain subservient to, and would mirror the main roof of the house and as such would not be overly visually dominant in relation to the main house. Turning to the proposed single storey rear extension, it is noted that the proposed extension to the main house would have a mono-pitched roof which similarly is considered would mirror and be subservient to the main roof form. In relation to the proposed extension to the rear of the side garage, this has been designed with a flat roof to accommodate the proposed balcony above. In spite of its flat-roofed design, it is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would not be generally visible from the public realm, by virtue of the existing side and rear boundary walls, and given that this would provide an office and living area, it is considered that the flat-roofed extension would serve as an adjunct to the main house. In light

of this, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with saved policy BE8(c). Turning to the proposed rear dormer extension, it is noted that this has been designed with a flat-roof. Saved policy BE8(d) states that permission will not be granted for loft conversions requiring dormer extensions which are large in proportion to the existing roof, as these can completely alter the proportion of the building, presenting a top-heavy and flat-roofed appearance. Given the subservient roof line of the flat-roofed proposed dormer, which would sit 1.2m below the ridge height of the subservient side garage extension, in conjunction with its minor extent and positive choice of materials (timber cladding to cheeks and face), it is considered that the proposed dormer would not be too large in proportion to the existing roof and would not create the impacts which saved policy BE8(d) seeks to avoid and on balance is acceptable. In terms of materials, the choice of matching multi-stock brick and clay tiles is welcomed, and the contrast materials of timber cladding, grey aluminium windows and timber doors are considered to be high quality materials. In addition, given the proposed extension above ground floor level to the side of the main house, the terracing effect has been considered. Given the retained separation distance of 1.6m at the nearest point to the side boundary of the site, and the vacant land to the south, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with saved policy BE8(b) and is acceptable in this regard.

Given the acceptable design and visual impact of the proposal as outlined above, and the domestic scale of the interventions proposed to an existing house, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with saved policy CO4, which seeks to ensure that proposals protect or enhance the natural beauty of the Special Landscape Area.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not bear any significant or detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the house, the street scene or the wider SLA.

AMENITIES OF NEIGHBOURING OCCUPIERS

With regard to overlooking, it is considered that this would be of principal concern to the occupiers of 13 and 14 The Haven as a result of the proposed rear balcony and bi-fold doors at first floor level. It is noted that all other openings included in the proposal would be at ground floor level and would create additional overlooking which would fall within the application site only. As such, it is considered that these openings would not result in undue loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers. In relation to the balcony and first floor bi-fold doors which would provide access, it is considered that given the orientation of the neighbouring plots that any direct overlooking would fall to the front of nos. 13 and 14, which are not considered to constitute private outdoor amenity space as they are readily visible from the public street scene of The Haven. Concern has been raised through the consultation on this application that the balcony would provide direct interlooking to neighbouring windows. This is particularly relevant in relation to the amenity of no.14, however it is noted that any interlooking to neighbouring windows would be at a distance of 30m, which is considered to be a significant separation distance which would avoid any undue loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers. Turning to the neighbouring property, 11 The Haven, it is noted that the balcony would directly overlook the rear garden of the application site and that indirect overlooking from the balcony to the neighbouring plot would be obscured by the main two storey house of the application which protrudes further within the plot. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to overlooking impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Turning to overshadowing impact, it is noted that the proposed single storey rear extension would not fall within the relevant 45-degree angle taken from the nearest neighbouring ground floor window of a habitable room or kitchen and such is in accordance with saved policy BE8(a) and acceptable with regard to overshadowing. Turning to the proposed increased in

the height of the garage roof and installation of rear dormer and balcony, it is considered that given their relative location, the orientation of neighbouring properties and the track of the sun to the south, that the proposed enlargement would not cast a significant level of additional shadow beyond that which is already cast by the main two storey house of the application site. In light of this, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to overshadowing impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

In relation to overbearing/enclosing presence, it is considered that the domestic single storey rear extension proposed to the main house would not result in any significant or detrimental impact in this regard given its low scale and separation distance of over 2m to the common side boundary with no.11. With regard to the proposed enlargement and alteration of the garage side extension, it is noted that the neighbouring land immediately to the south is a sewage pumping station and is therefore not considered to constitute a sensitive receptor in relation to neighbouring amenity. In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to overbearing/enclosing impact.

PARKING AND HIGHWAYS

As referenced above, the proposal would result in the addition of a fourth bedroom to the main house. As a result, the parking requirement of the house would change. It is considered that the existing off-street parking provision of the front driveway, which would be retained under this proposal, would be sufficient to meet the two independently accessible parking spaces recommended for the resultant 4-bedroom house under the Kent Design Guide: Interim Guidance Note 3. As a result, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to parking and would not give rise to any associated issues of highway safety.

FLOOD RISK

Whilst the site is in a flood zone, a condition can be added in accordance with the EA standing advice to ensure finished floor levels are no lower than existing.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the above, it is considered the proposal is a sustainable development that complies with development plan policy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

HUMAN RIGHTS

I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view, the Assessment section above and the Recommendation represents an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) [and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties)] and the wider public interest.

Case Officer: Alex Kalorkoti

Report and draft decision notice completed and passed to senior officer.

Name: Alex Kalorkoti Position: Graduate Planning Officer Date: 07.11.18

Report and draft decision notice amended (if appropriate)

Name: Position: Date:

Senior Officer

Report not agreed. Details of further work required as follows:

Name: _____ Position: _____ Date: _____

Report and draft decision notice agreed and file passed to admin to issue decision.

Name: C Dethier Position: DM Team Leader Date: 16th November 2018