

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 18/504421/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of single storey extension to front, side and rear.			
ADDRESS 1 Wihtrred Road Bapchild Sittingbourne Kent ME9 9ND			
RECOMMENDATION - Approve			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The application has previously had approval under SW/14/0607 and I consider the reasons for approval remain the same where there would be an acceptable impact on the neighbouring amenity in terms of the scale and siting of the proposed extensions.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Three local objections received and application called in by Ward Member.			
WARD West Downs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bapchild	APPLICANT Mr Sam Feaver AGENT Mr Julian Mann	
DECISION DUE DATE 15/11/18	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 25/09/18		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
SW/14/0607	Single storey extensions to front, side and rear.	Approved	21/07/2014

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application property is a two bedroom semi-detached bungalow situated on a prominent corner plot where Wihtrred Road meets Ashstead Drive, within the built up area boundary of Bapchild. As such it appears to front on to Ashstead Drive although its front door and porch are on the side (end elevation) facing Wihtrred Road. The property has an area for parking large enough for at least two cars, situated to the rear on the south side of the site accessed from the Wihtrred Road, with most of the curtilage being to the front and side of the property, and an enclosed private garden to the rear.
- 1.02 The property is situated within a mature residential village location surrounded by a number of two storey semi-detached properties and attached to a bungalow of similar size and style. The bungalow appears not to have previously been extended but the current Ordnance Survey plans still show the outline of what might have been a conservatory behind the lounge. This addition is not there today.
- 1.03 The attached property (4 Ashstead Drive) is a similar bungalow, but it has a deep front wing across half of its front elevation, making the pair of bungalows appear asymmetric when viewed from Ashstead Drive.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The application is for a single storey front extension (fronting Ashstead Drive) and a separate wrap-around side and rear extension fronting Wihfred Road and extending towards the side elevation of 3 Wihfred Road.
- 2.02 The single storey extension proposed to the west side of the existing property would project by 3.93m (about the same as the front wing at 4 Ashstead Drive) with a width measurement of approximately 4.4m. The height to the eaves would be 2.5m with an overall roof height of 4.2m.
- 2.03 The single storey side and rear extension would be L shaped in form. The existing porch would be removed and the side extension element (south elevation) would extend to the side of the property by approximately 2.6m and would also extend from the rear of the property by 4.5m with a width at the rear of 5.6m. The overall height of the roof on the side extension would match the existing roof height of 5.1m and the rear extension would have a maximum height of 4.2m.
- 2.04 The proposed extensions would convert the property from a two bedroom bungalow to a four bedroom bungalow.
- 2.05 This application is a resubmission of the approved application SW/14/0607 which has now expired and there are no changes to the proposal, other than the fact that a previously existing pre-fabricated garage facing Wihfred Road has since been removed.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 None.

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
- 4.02 Policies CP4 (good design), DM14 (general criteria), and DM16 (extensions and alterations) of the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 are relevant.
- 4.03 Council's adopted SPG "Designing an Extension" is also relevant.
- 4.04 Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 – Residential Parking (November 2008).

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 Three letters of objection were received, raising the following summarised comments:
- The existing bungalow is a one/two bedroom bungalow suitable for the elderly to downsize to. The extension will prevent such downsizing.
 - Retirement bungalows are limited in Bapchild, and 1 Wihfred Road is one of them, two bedroom bungalows are fast disappearing.
 - Four bedroom properties will be available in the Stones Farm development in the village.

- Parking – The bungalow is on a corner plot on a very busy T-junction, when vehicles are parked on the pavement at the corner it causes issues with vehicles turning into the road – adequate off road parking is required for a four bedroom dwelling. Currently there is only provision for 1 parking space.
- The OS plans are wrong as there is no rear extension at the property.
- Proposed plan extends across the building line in Wihtrud Road.
- Proposed plans would almost double the floor size of the bungalow making it out of keeping with other properties nearby.
- The proposed expansion to four bedrooms would overdevelop this site by over 50% leaving virtually no back garden for a large bungalow.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 None received.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 The application is accompanied by all necessary drawings.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

8.01 The property is located within the built up area boundary of Bapchild and as such the principle of development is acceptable. The main considerations in this case concern the scale of the proposal and its impact upon the street scene, on parking, and on neighbouring amenities.

Visual Impact

8.02 The proposed single storey front extension would be visible from public vantage points and as such there would be an effect on the streetscene so policy CP4 (Good design), is of utmost of importance. In this case the extension would have a pitched roof and the materials proposed would match the existing which I consider to be acceptable as I believe this reduces the visual impact of the extension.

8.03 Paragraph 5.3 of the SPG states that The Borough Council normally requires that front additions are kept to a maximum of 1.2m. The proposed front extension is substantially larger than this policy would normally allow for. However, in this instance I consider that the proposed extension is acceptable as there is already a strong forward projecting building line due to the front wing on the adjoining property, which this extension will largely mirror.

8.04 The side and rear extension is also designed with a matching pitched roof and should sit well here. Both extensions have been well designed and reflect the character and appearance of the existing property at an appropriate scale. I therefore consider the proposal acceptable and in line with the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Parking

8.05 Concern has been raised with regards to the provision of parking at the dwelling. The proposed extensions would provide two additional bedrooms resulting in a four bedroom dwelling therefore consideration is required concerning the provision of

parking, however according to the Residential Parking Advice (Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 – Residential Parking (November 2008)) the parking requirement would be 2 off-street parking spaces and this would be comfortably met by the existing parking at the side of the property.

- 8.06 The extent of the parking between the flank wall and the highway might be considered prominent. However, Wihtrred Road is characterised by large paved frontages and I do not think it would be reasonable to see the proposed parking arrangements as out of keeping with the area on this basis.
- 8.07 I note the front garden is not proposed for the provision of additional parking and so would not be adversely affected by the extensions.

Residential Amenity

- 8.08 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "*Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders*" paragraph 5.7 states;

"For single storey rear extensions close to your neighbour's common boundary, the Borough Council considers that a maximum projection of 3m will be allowed."

The SPG in paragraph 5.9 goes on to say that;

"On well-spaced detached properties or where an extension is to be built away from the boundary a larger extension may be acceptable".

The proposed extensions project beyond the recommended maximum 3m projection but as the front extension is 4.2m away from the boundary and the rear extension is 5.1m from the neighbouring boundary I believe that both extensions satisfy the intentions of the guidance. When it is also considered that the property is semi-detached on a large corner plot then I am of the opinion that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbours.

- 8.09 I note that the closest corner of the proposed rear extension would be approximately 0.5m away from the side wall of the neighbouring property to the rear, no.3 Wihtrred Road. However, there are no windows situated within the side elevation of this neighbouring property or within the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension, and therefore I am of the view this element of the proposal would not cause any loss of privacy.

Overdevelopment

- 8.10 With regards to the possible overdevelopment of the site I do not believe that the proposed expansion to four bedrooms would overdevelop this site and that the extensions are at an appropriate scale. The design is in keeping with the existing bungalow with materials to match the existing character of the building. Neighbours have expressed a preference for the bungalow to stay at two bedrooms, but I can see no reason to oppose its enlargement where adequate parking and garden arrangements are in place. The extension makes good use of urban land and does not in my view stand out as unusual or excessive. The same plans have in any event, been approved before and I can see no defence to a refusal of planning permission.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.01 I consider that there would be an acceptable impact on the streetscene, parking provision and on neighbouring amenity in terms of the scale and siting of the proposed extensions. I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – Grant subject to the following 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension 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 this application:

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Offering pre-application advice.
- Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
- As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance, the application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

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.

