

OFFICERS REPORT

Application No: Y16/1108/SH
Location: 2 Jubilee Close Hythe Kent CT21 6NQ
Proposal Erection of a single storey rear extension

ASSESSMENT

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 11.10.2016
Applicable 8 week target date: 06.12.2016
Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) or Planning Extension Agreement (PEA)? N
If Yes, revised 8/13/16 week target date:
Is the application being determined after 26 weeks without a PPA or a PEA? N

SITE VISIT

Carried out site visit on 04.11.2016
The site and proposals were assessed from the public highway and on site and the key features noted as set out in the report:

SITE

The application site is within the settlement of Hythe, along Jubilee Close which is a predominantly residential street which is home to a small number of dwellings. The application property itself is a detached dwelling which is one of a pair of dwellings which are of the same design. These two dwellings are set back far from the road with a long driveway to the front entrance of each of the dwellings. Due to this long driveway, the garden belonging to the neighbouring property to the east of the application site (1 Jubilee Close) finishes in line with the application property, with the rest of the application site extending along the rear of gardens to dwellings along Dymchurch Road, perpendicular to the application site. The application property is a red brick dwelling with uPVC cladding on the upper floor of the front elevation.

The application site is within flood zones 2 and 3 as identified by the Environment Agency and is shown to be at extreme risk of flooding in 2115 by Shepway's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which takes into consideration climate change and existing sea defences.

HISTORY

Y10/0107/SH - Variation of condition 2 of planning permission SH/75/840 to allow use of garage as living accommodation. Approved with conditions

SH/75/840 - Erect 3 bed house. Approved with conditions

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would extend past the existing side elevation right up against the boundary with 'Palmarsh Hall'. The proposed extension would have a flat roof and would include one roof light. Proposed materials would be Cedral fibre cement board to the external walls and a single membrane GRP flat roof system. The proposed extension would extend approximately 5 metres from the existing rear elevation and would have a height of approximately 2.9 metres to the top of the flat roof, with a parapet wall along the side (south east) elevation at the boundary which would have a total height of approximately 3.1 metres. Each side elevations would include one high level opening window, with a large set of sliding doors on the rear elevation giving access to the rear garden.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Hythe Town Council - no objection

REPRESENTATIONS

None received

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry 04.11.2016

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review saved policies: SD1 BE1 BE8

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

APPRAISAL

The main issues to be considered are design and visual impact and the impact on amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Design and visual impact

Policy BE8 states that extensions to existing buildings should reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building. The proposed extension would be single storey and due to its size considered a subservient addition to the main dwelling, as such it is not considered to significantly alter the scale or proportions of the existing dwelling. The proposed roof would have a single ply membrane and this is considered an acceptable material for a flat roof extension. The external walls are proposed to be covered in Cedral fibre cement board, although the existing dwelling is mostly red brick, uPVC cladding has been used on the front elevation. Although the proposed use of this cladding would not be wholly in keeping with the appearance of the existing dwelling, due to its position to the rear of the dwelling restricting the extension from public view, and that cladding has already been used on the front elevation of the dwelling, it is considered that this cladding would not have a significant impact on the character or appearance of the dwelling. Policy BE8 also states that permission will not be granted for flat roof extensions unless they are not generally visible from a public place and would only be an adjunct to the existing dwelling. Due to the size and

position of the proposed extension, it is considered that it meets the criteria in this part of policy BE8 and is therefore not refusable on the grounds of its flat roof.

Although I do not consider the proposed extension to be of high quality design, the existing house is not of any particular architectural merit and there would be limited options for viewing the proposed extension from a public place. Therefore while it is acknowledged the proposed extension would cause some harm to the character of the existing building, the fact that the dwelling is not considered to be of high quality design itself, it is considered this harm is limited and on balance the proposed extension is not of poor enough design for the extension to be refused.

Amenities of neighbouring occupants

Due to the neighbouring properties to the south east of the application site being perpendicular to the application site, the proposed extension would extend along the shared boundary with the rear of these neighbouring properties. As such, the proposed extension would be located significantly enough away from these neighbouring buildings so as to not cause any significant impact.

The neighbouring property to the north west (3 Jubilee Close) has an attached garage which separates the two dwellings. It is considered that this garage provides enough separation distance between the proposed extension and habitable space within this neighbouring property so as to not cause any significant impact.

Parking and highways

The proposed development would not alter the existing parking or access, nor would it provide any additional bedrooms. As such, there are considered to be no parking or highways implications to this proposal.

Flooding

The location of the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as identified by the Environment Agency. Since the proposed application is for a household extension, it is not a statutory requirement to consult the Environment Agency in this case. However, as per the Government's standing advice regarding flood risk, confirmation was needed regarding the proposed floor levels and the estimated flood level. Submitted drawing 16.16.04 Rev C states that the proposed floor levels would be the same as existing. This will be secured by condition and therefore complies with the government requirements and no further flood resistance measures need to be completed.

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: B Lennon

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

Name: B Lennon Position: Planning Officer Date: 01.12.2016

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: 2/12/16