

<b>2.5 REFERENCE NO - 22/504622/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Conversion of garage into habitable space and erection of ground rear extension and first floor side extension.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 42 Station Road Teynham Sittingbourne Kent ME9 9SA		
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> APPROVE subject to conditions		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> Parish Council Objection		
<b>WARD</b> Teynham And Lynsted	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Teynham	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Gareth Hopkins <b>AGENT</b> Richard Baker Partnership
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 17/01/23	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 25/10/22	<b>CASE OFFICER</b> Mandi Pilcher

**Planning History**

SW/11/0823

Two storey front extension.

Grand of Unconditional (stat 3yrs)      Decision Date: 15.08.2011

SW/98/0744

Two storey rear extension.

Grant of Conditional PP      Decision Date: 26.10.1998

**1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

1.1 42 Station Road is a two-storey detached dwelling located within the built-up area boundary of Teynham. There is hardstanding to the front and leading to the attached side garage. There is a private amenity space to the rear with a single storey shed that stretches the width of the garden. Although the application site is a detached dwelling, the streetscene in this particular part of Station Road, where this property is located is characterised by terraced properties.

**2. PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 This application seeks planning permission for conversion of the existing garage into habitable space and erection of a ground rear extension and first-floor side extension.
- 2.2 The conversion of the garage and ground floor extension would create an extra bedroom and a kitchen at ground floor level. There is an existing rear/side projection which projects approximately 6.8m past the existing rear elevation. The proposal seeks to extend this to 8.4m in depth, an increase of 1.6m at ground floor level. The first-floor side extension would have a depth of 6.1m and a width of 2.7m and create another

bedroom. The rear wall of the first-floor element of the scheme would be in line with the rear wall of the existing dwelling.

### 3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.1 None

### 4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 policies

CP4 Requiring good design  
DM7 Vehicle parking  
DM14 General development criteria  
DM16 Alterations and extensions

4.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): 'Designing an extension – A Guide for Householders' is also relevant and remains a material planning consideration having been through a formal consultation and adoption process. The SPG states:

*3.4 On houses with pitched roofs it is always best to have a matching pitched roof on the extension with the same type of tiles. All such two-storey extensions should have a pitched roof and other prominent single storey extensions are normally better for having pitched roofs.*

*4.0 On any house, an extension should be well designed to reflect its character. Use of matching bricks, other facing materials and roof tiles together with appropriate doors and windows is essential if an extension is not to upset the appearance of the house or the area as a whole.*

*5.0 Where a two-storey side extension to a house is proposed in an area of mainly detached or semi-detached housing, the Council is anxious to see that area should not become 'terraced' in character, losing the sense of openness. Residents of such a street have a right to expect that the character should be retained. Houses should not be physically or visually linked, especially at first floor level as the space between buildings is important in preserving the areas character and sense of openness. A gap of 2m between a first-floor extension and the side boundary is normally required.*

4.3 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – Parking Standards (May 2020)

### 5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 No neighbour representations received.

5.2 Teynham Parish Council object as follows (summarised):

- The scale of the extension is excessive
- The development would exacerbate street parking
- Concern that the garage and workshop do not have adequate footings for liveable space.

## 6. APPRAISAL

- 6.1 The site is situated within the defined built-up area boundary of Teynham in which the principle of development is acceptable subject to relevant policy and other material considerations. The main relevant policies for house extensions are DM14 and DM16 of the Local Plan. Policy DM7 (parking) is also relevant.
- 6.2 The development proposes the conversion of the garage to a habitable space. The SBC Parking Standards SPD sets out a garage should have a 3.6m width. The existing garage measures approximately 2.6m, so the garage is undersized in width when compared to the SPD and is unlikely to be used for parking. As a result of this, the loss of the garage is unlikely to impact on parking provision in my view.
- 6.3 It is noted that the proposals as a whole provide an additional two bedrooms, turning a 3-bedroom property into a 5-bedroom property. Having considered the site, I am of the view that it would fall to be considered under a 'Suburban' location as set out in the SPD. This states that for the existing 3-bedroom dwelling, 2-3 spaces should be provided, whereas for a 5-bed unit as proposed, 3+ parking spaces should be provided.
- 6.4 The hardstanding to the front and side of the property can comfortably accommodate two vehicles. This would, on the basis of the SPD fall short of the requirement by 1 space. However, it is also important for Members to note that the SPD also states that car parking standards are for guidance and a lower provision should be considered where effective mitigation measures are in place or proposed. These include controlled parking zones and the availability of sustainable transport modes. In this case, I am aware that related to the development to the rear of Station Road for 130 dwellings (approved under ref. 18/503697/FULL), Station Road will, in due course, be subject to parking restrictions in the form of double yellow lines. To compensate for this, and also as a result of the adjacent development, a car park for local residents is being provided directly to the rear of the site subject to this current application. This will provide approximately double the number of car parking spaces that are being lost in Station Road. I also consider that the site sits within walking distance of a number of services and facilities in Teynham including bus routes along the A2 and Teynham Railway Station. Taking all these matters into account I am of the view that in this case, there are clear reasons as to why the level of on-site parking provision should be considered acceptable in this case.
- 6.5 The proposed rear extension will be sited on the north corner of the dwelling and project 1.6m beyond the existing rear extension creating an overall length of approximately 8.4m past the existing rear wall of the property and incorporate a pitched roof. There is only one side window proposed to serve the kitchen.
- 6.6 The boundary with the adjacent dwelling to the south, No.40, is located 5.7m from the ground floor extension, with the property located a further 3.5m from the boundary. Having taken into account the separation distance and the limited additional projection proposed at ground floor level, I am of the opinion that the proposed extension would not give rise to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No.40.
- 6.7 On the opposite side, No. 44 is separated by a distance of 7m, this includes an adjacent pedestrian and vehicular access of approximately 3m in width. The extension projects

9.2m past the rear elevation of this property, but taking into account the separation distance which includes a vehicular access separating the properties, I do not believe that this would lead to unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of the occupants of this property.

- 6.8 The two-storey side element of this proposal would be created over the existing garage and would not extend past the rear elevation and have a pitched roof. There are no proposed side windows at first floor level. The SPG advises that in areas characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings, two storey side extensions should be set a minimum of 2m from the side boundary, to ensure the open character of the streetscene is retained. In this case, the eastern side of Station Road, despite the application site being comprised of a detached dwelling, is characterised by terraced properties. In addition, taking into account the access road which lies adjacent to the property which would retain a gap in any case, I do not consider that this element of the proposal would have an enclosing effect or harm the character of the streetscene.
- 6.9 Due to the distance to the neighbouring property, I do not consider there will be any harmful impacts to neighbouring amenity caused by the two-storey element.
- 6.10 I note that the application form sets out that the materials to be used are fibre cement board cladding and roof tiles to match the existing dwelling. In my view, and to assist in the development sitting sympathetically in the streetscene, I believe that the external finishing materials should match the existing dwelling in their entirety and as such have included a relevant condition.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 I recognise that the Parish Council have raised concern regarding the application as set out in full within this report, however, taking the above into account, I do not consider that the works would give rise to any serious highway safety or amenity concerns and would in my view cause no significant concerns in respect of the impact upon residential or visual amenity. Furthermore, the Parish Council's comments in respect of footings are not a material planning consideration. I consider that the proposed development would accord with policies DM7, DM14 and DM16 of the Local Plan and I recommend that planning permission should be granted.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT Subject to the following conditions

### **CONDITIONS**

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2989/2A.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

### **The Council's approach to the application**

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2021 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a pre-application advice service, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

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

The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.

