

## REPORT SUMMARY

<b>REFERENCE NO - 21/500698/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Proposed loft conversion with hip to gable, rear dormer and front rooflight windows (resubmission to 20/505849/FULL).		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 23 Forge Lane Headcorn Ashford Kent TN27 9QN		
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Approval subject to conditions		
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b> The proposal has been amended sufficiently for the works to not detrimentally impact the visual and residential amenity of the surrounding properties. The works would accord with relevant policies and residential extensions guidelines.		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> Headcorn Parish Council recommended refusal due to the extension appearing large and disproportionate to the existing dwelling and the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and that this be referred to Planning Committee if officers are minded to recommend approval.		
<b>WARD</b> Headcorn	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Headcorn	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr & Mrs Goates <b>AGENT</b> Richardson Architectural Designs
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 07/04/21	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 26/03/21	<b>OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE</b> 05/03/21

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

14/500793/FULL Demolition of existing single garage to provide detached cottage with provision of parking for existing and proposed dwellings. REFUSED

14/505640/FULL Demolition of the existing single garage to provide 2 bedroom end of terrace cottage with provision of parking for the existing and proposed dwelling, including a new vehicle access. PERMITTED

16/500412/SUB Submission of details pursuant to planning permission 14/505640/FULL - to discharge Condition 2 - Materials, Condition 4 - Boundary Treatments and Condition 5 - Landscaping. PERMITTED

16/501445/FULL Removal of Condition 7 of planning permission 14/505640/FULL (Demolition of the existing single garage to provide 2 bedroom end of terrace cottage with provision of parking for the existing and proposed dwelling, including a new vehicle access) - Code 4 for Sustainable homes PERMITTED

20/505849/FULL Proposed loft conversion with hip to gable, rear dormer and front velux windows. REFUSED

## MAIN REPORT

### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.01 The application site comprises of a 2-storey dwelling located on the north-western side of Forge Lane. The site is located within the urban area of Headcorn with a Local Wildlife Site located 500m to the south-east of the site. The site benefits from

a shared driveway with No.23a suitable for several vehicles with no boundary definitions at the front of the property.

- 1.02 Planning permission was granted in 2015 for an end of terrace property which was erected and now forms 23a Forge Lane. The permission involved changes to the roof form of No.23 to join up with the new property creating additional roof space.

## **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.01 The proposal is a resubmission of a previously refused application for a loft conversion with hip to gable, a rear dormer and front rooflight windows. This was refused on the following ground;

The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and roof form, would not appear subservient to the original dwelling and would dominate the appearance of the rear of the property creating an obtrusive feature that would harm the visual character of the host dwelling, contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2017) and the guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (2009).

- 2.02 The current proposals have reduced the size of the rear dormer which now measures 6m in width, 2.3m in height and depth of 2.4m. The ridge line of the roof has been extended from 6.2m to 8.6m.
- 2.03 The application form confirms the proposed materials and finishes will match those used on the existing building.
- 2.04 The proposed dormer and velux windows would serve a study, bedroom and en-suite. The proposal seeks to increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to create an additional bedroom and study room.

## **3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017:

DM1 Principles of Good Design

DM9 – Residential Extensions, Conversions and Redevelopment within built up area.

Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2009), KCC SPG4

## **4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

8 neighbour representations received objecting on the following grounds;

- Overlooking
- Loss of privacy
- Visual appearance of existing property

- Overshadowing

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.01 Headcorn Parish Council recommended refusal due to the extension appearing large and disproportionate to the existing dwelling and the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

## 6.0 APPRAISAL

The key issues are:

- Design and visual impact and whether the previous grounds of refusal have been addressed
- Impact upon neighbouring amenities

### Visual Impact

- 6.01 Policy DM9 states *Within the defined boundaries of the urban area, rural service centres and larger villages, proposals for the extension, conversion or redevelopment of a residential property which meet the following criteria will be permitted if:*
- The scale, height, form, appearance and siting of the proposal would fit unobtrusively with the existing building where retained and the character of the street scene and/or its context;*
  - The traditional boundary treatment of an area would be retained and, where feasible, reinforced;*
  - The privacy, daylight, sunlight and maintenance of a pleasant outlook of adjoining residents would be safeguarded; and*
  - Sufficient parking would be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling without diminishing the character of the street scene.*
- 6.02 Paragraph 4.32 of the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document states: *New dormers will not normally be allowed to front elevations in streets where there are none already. Roof lights, particularly on the front elevation, are a preferable alternative to the use of dormers or roof extensions. The number and size of roof windows should not visually dominate the roof plane. Roof windows need not be large, as more sunlight and daylight reaches a sloping roof than a wall. Roof windows should be designed and installed to have a minimum projection from the roof plane.*
- 6.03 The proposals seek the installation of three rooflights to the front elevation which are not considered to visually dominate or appear as overly large on the roof plane. As the application site is not within a conservation area, it is not considered reasonable to impose a condition requiring conservation style roof light (which have an almost flush appearance to the roof slope).
- 6.04 Paragraph 4.33 of the Residential Extensions supplementary planning document states: *Loft extensions are preferred on the back elevation in order to preserve the character of the street with paragraph 4.34 confirming 'where acceptable, dormer windows should be proportionate in scale to the roof plane and where there is a logical or symmetrical layout of doors and windows, should follow the vertical lines of these openings. They should never project above the original ridgeline and should be set back a minimum of 20 centimetres from the eaves to maintain the visual appearance of the roof line.*

- 6.05 The host property has a sizeable roof, and the proposed dormer extension has been proposed to the rear of the property, is set down off the main ridge line, has been set back a minimum of 20 centimetres from the eaves and has been set in from the sides of the main roof slope so as not to dominate the roof form. The proposed dormer now sits more comfortably within the roof slope as opposed to the previously refused scheme which dominated the roof slope and gave the appearance of a full second storey to the rear elevation. The window arrangement, whilst not following the vertical lines of the existing windows below, is considered acceptable being on the rear elevation with very limited visibility from any public vantage point. Materials are proposed which match the existing materials and these can be controlled by condition. I now consider the overall design of the proposal to be in keeping with the original roof form which does not overwhelm or destroy the character of the main dwelling. The proposed rooflights to the front of the dwelling are also considered to be visually acceptable.
- 6.06 I consider the proposal has now addressed the previous ground of refusal in design terms and complies with policies and guidelines within the residential extension SPD and would be acceptable in terms of design and materials.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 6.07 Policy DM1 amongst other matters states *...respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses and provide adequate residential amenities for future occupiers of the development by ensuring that development does not result in, or is exposed to, excessive noise, vibration, odour, air pollution, activity or vehicular movements, overlooking or visual intrusion, and that the built form would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy or light enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby properties.*
- 6.08 Paragraph 4.72 of the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document states: *In order to safeguard the privacy of neighbours, the introduction of windows in extensions which would overlook windows of habitable rooms in any adjoining property at a close distance and would result in an unreasonable loss of privacy will not be permitted. For similar reasons, a window overlooking the private area immediately adjacent to the rear of an adjoining dwelling is also inappropriate. The Borough Council will normally calculate the private amenity area as a depth of 5 metres from the back of the property which, if it has been extended, will be measured from the back edge of the extension.*
- 6.09 In terms of the positioning of the proposed dormer, the rear elevation faces north-west which is more directed towards 3 & 5 Forge Meadows. The dormer would be sited 20-25m away from the properties to the rear (No's 3 & 5 Forge Meadows) who have objected on grounds of overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing issues. Given the distance set out above, it is not considered that an objection on overlooking could be sustained. It is also not considered that overlooking to any other of the nearby residential properties would warrant a refusal of the application for the same reasons as cited above. The proposal is too far from the properties to cause any overshadowing or loss of sunlight/daylight issues to any properties at the rear.
- 6.10 I am also mindful that the previous ground of refusal did not cite overlooking as a ground of objection and this was found to be acceptable. An objection raised on overlooking grounds now would be considered unreasonable as it was not previously raised.

- 6.11 In terms of the dormer, I do not consider that this would result in any adverse impacts in terms in terms of loss of daylight, outlook or loss of privacy in relation to the neighbouring properties.

#### **Fallback position**

- 6.12 I am also mindful of the fall-back position which exists with the current proposals in terms of permitted development rights which permit the construction of rear dormers (of a certain size), rooflights etc. on dwellinghouses. As I consider the proposals meet the development plan policies, I have not assessed these in detail as a planning application has been submitted for consideration.

#### **Highways**

- 6.13 In regard to the parking at the property, the number of bedrooms is increasing from 3 to 4 bedrooms, KCC Highways states a property of 4 or more bedrooms requires 3 spaces for parking requirements. The existing driveway is sufficient in size to accommodate 3 cars. The proposal would not create any additional harm to highway safety.

### **7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.01 For the reasons set out in this report, it is considered that the development proposals would meet the requirements as set out in the planning policies and residential guidance SPD without material harm arising to the character of the host property or the amenity of surround residents. As such, I recommend approval subject to conditions.

### **8.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT 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 accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building. For the avoidance of doubt, the rear dormer shall be tile hung with tiles that match the existing roof.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

- (3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Location Plan – Received 10.02.21

Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations – Drawing Number RA1464/REV C/03 – Received 23.02.21

Reason: To clarify which plans have been approved.

Planning Committee Report  
22 April 2021

Case Officer: Joanna Woods

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.