

OFFICERS REPORT

Application No: Y17/0541/SH

Location: Greatworth Canterbury Road Etchinghill Folkestone Kent CT18 8BS

Proposal Erection of a rear extension to form annexe accommodation together with the erection of an entrance porch.

ASSESSMENT

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 28.04.2017

Applicable 8/13/16 week target date: 23.06.2017

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

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

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

SITE VISIT

Carried out site visit on 03.10.2016 as part of a previous planning application.

The site and proposals were assessed from the public highway and from within the application site. Key features are noted in the assessment.

SITE

The application site is located outside of any settlement boundary, within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Special Landscape Area and Area of Archaeological Potential.

The site is close to the main road which runs through the village. A side access/driveway leads to a gate at the rear of the property where a large hard standing area offers ample parking provision.

The dwelling itself is a detached, single storey family home finished in a painted rough cast render with tiled roof and white UPVC fenestration.

HISTORY

SH/79/960 - Erection of porch. Approved

89/1040/SH - Extension to form additional bedroom and alteration to kitchen and lounge. Approved with conditions

Y09/0215/SH - Certificate of lawfulness for existing use of part of the site for the parking and operation of five mini coaches. Refused

Y12/0406/SH - Retrospective application for extension of existing hardstanding to the rear. Approved with conditions

Y15/0452/SH - Proposed rear extension and new roof to accommodate first floor accommodation to create annex. Approved with conditions

Y16/0146/SH - Proposed rear and first floor extensions to form annexe accommodation (revision to Y15/0452/SH). Refused

Y16/0809/SH - Erection of rear and first floor extensions to form annexe accommodation. Approved with conditions

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a rear extension to form annex accommodation together with the erection of a front entrance porch.

At present the internal layout at ground floor provides a living room, kitchen, study, three bedrooms and a bathroom and separate WC. The proposed extension would provide a living room, study and WC at ground floor together with other internal alterations to the current layout.

The rear extension is approximately 11m in length, 5.1m in width and 4.6m in height with an eaves height level of 2.5m.

The front porch measures approximately 1m in length, 1.7m in width, 3.5m in height with an eaves height level of 2.5m.

A similar sized extension and porch has previously been approved under Y16/0809/SH but this application also included a first floor extension and new roof structure, which has been omitted from the most recent submission.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Lyminge Parish Council offered no objection

No reply received from KCC Archaeology.

REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 29.05.2017

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review: SD1, BE1, BE8, TR11, TR12, CO1, CO4, CO21, HO13

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD, SS3, CSD3, CSD4

NPPF: Paragraph 12

NPPG

APPRAISAL

Design and visual appearance

In terms of visual appearance it is accepted that the rear extension and porch will not be highly visible from the public highway. It is noted that a public right of way runs approximately 90m to the south east of the site. It is expected that views of the proposal will be visible from this location.

The additions sit comfortably upon the host building and sufficiently reflect the existing character and appearance of the site. On balance I am satisfied that the proposals will not cause adverse harm upon the character or appearance of the streetscene or wider AONB and SLA.

In terms of design, saved local plan policy BE8 says that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should reflect the scale, appearance, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building.

The ridge height of the proposed extensions are below the ridge height of the main dwelling and therefore it is considered that they would read as subservient additions that would not

adversely impact upon the dwelling to such a degree as to warrant concerns with regards to the aims of this policy.

The application site is situated with the open countryside, outside of any known settlement. Regard needs to be given to Policy CO21 of the Shepway District Local Plan.

Policy CO21 states that the District Planning Authority will grant planning permission for an extension or alteration to an existing dwelling in the countryside subject to the following:

a) The application site must be in lawful residential use.

Having visited the site I believe this to be the case and saw no evidence to the contrary.

b) The proposal is acceptable in terms of Policy BE8.

Having assessed the proposals I deem the application to be compliant with policy BE8.

c) The proposal must not visually dominate or substantially alter the character of the existing dwelling.

Having assessed the application I consider that the proposals are compliant for reasons as detailed above.

d) The development must not adversely impact on the quality and character of the landscape or be detrimental to the rural setting.

The application site is privileged a good sized amenity area and in terms of the impact upon the countryside, the extension is considered to be subservient, is contained within the current residential curtilage and does not encroach into the wider countryside. Overall it is considered that impact upon the rural setting would be minimal in this instance.

In conclusion it is considered that the extension is acceptable in terms of policy CO21 and it has no adverse impact upon the countryside visually amenity.

Saved policy HO13 states that the Council will permit proposals for extensions to existing dwellings to accommodate those people with special housing requirements due to a need for supervision and care including elderly relatives or disabled people. In order to be considered acceptable the following criteria should be met. The extension should be attached to the main dwelling and have access from it, it should be capable of reverting back to part of the main dwelling when the need for the annex has ceased, it must only be used for purposes ancillary to the occupation of the existing dwelling and not as a separate dwelling, it should not be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties and in areas at risk of flooding, that are not protected to an adequate standard should not include sleeping accommodation on the ground floor. The proposal is considered to meet these criteria.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

Having visited the site it is noted that there is substantial space separation between the application site and the nearest neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered that this proposal will not significantly detrimentally impact upon existing neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, overshadowing or overbearing.

Parking and highways

Whilst some of the existing off-street parking provision will be lost as a result of the rear extension it is considered that sufficient parking will be retained to ensure that the proposal will not cause highway issues.

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.

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.

Case Officer:

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

Name: Katy Claw Position: Planning Officer Date: 19.06.2017

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: N/A delegated decision Position: Date: