

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 19/505077/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.		
ADDRESS 80 Norwood Walk West Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1QF		
RECOMMENDATION - Approve subject to conditions		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection		
WARD Borden And Grove Park	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Bobbing	APPLICANT Mr P Farrell AGENT CJS Design Services
DECISION DUE DATE 09/12/19	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 06/11/19	

Planning History

SW/06/1363

Two storey side extension to create a new kitchen & dining room at ground floor level and bedroom & extended bathroom at first floor level and conservatory to rear.

Approved Decision Date: 23.01.2007 (Not implemented)

SW/05/1144

Retrospective application for rear garden retaining wall

Approved Decision Date: 14.12.2005

SW/78/1075

Reposition fence

Approved Decision Date: 27.11.1978

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.1 80 Norwood Walk West is a modern two storey end of terrace property located within the built up area boundary of Sittingbourne. There is a small garden to the front of the property, and private amenity space to the side and rear. Norwood Walk West sits perpendicular to Hilton Drive so that the side wall of number 80 faces Hilton Drive, and the dwellings along the walk sit on lower ground than Hilton Road.

1.2 The surrounding area is characterised by terraced dwellings of a similar scale and design.

2. PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension and single storey rear conservatory extension. The side extension will project 3.7m from the side wall of the property, and will have a length of 6.4m. It will be set back 0.6m from the front elevation of the building, and has a roof that follows the same pitch and eaves height as the main roof on the property, although the ridge height will be set slightly

lower on the extension. This side extension will form a kitchen and dining room on the ground floor and an additional bedroom on the first floor.

- 2.2 The proposed conservatory will measure 2.4m x 5.1m and will have a mono-pitch roof with an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height of 3.1m.
- 2.3 I note this proposal is almost identical to the side and rear extensions proposed under SW/06/1363, which was approved but never implemented at the site. The only difference between the applications is the loss of a first floor window in the rear elevation of the two storey side extension.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.1 None

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- 4.2 Development Plan: Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 - policies CP4, DM14 and DM16
- 4.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders'

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 Six objections have been received from neighbouring properties. Their contents are summarised below:
- The proposal is a very large extension, at the side and the rear of the property which will effectively this will double the size of the property – it would represent overdevelopment of the site. It will look imposing and look out of keeping of the rest of the houses in close proximity.
 - All of the houses have a green space between the path and the end of the terraces.
 - It will lead to the loss of existing views from neighbouring properties.
 - It will encroach on the privacy and overshadow the properties that are neighbouring the proposed extension.
 - The rear extension is proposed to abut our boundary – in order to dig the foundations, our party wall will be exposed and undermined. We request that if this extension is allowed to be built it is built at least 1m from the party boundary and fence.
 - The rear single extension will cut off the natural light to the kitchen of our property and overshadow the rear of our house.
 - There is no parking on site – parking is in the road on a very busy estate road. To extend a 2 bedroomed house into a 3 bedroomed house will potentially increase the parking problems.

- Parking on Hilton Drive is already an issue and is especially unsafe for the large number of school children passing through this neighbourhood.
- I appreciate the property opposite has a small single side extension - this is much more acceptable as it is barely noticeable.
- There are already flooding and drainage problems in Norwood Walk – the sewer pipes are not fit for purpose now, let alone having another bathroom connected.
- I would like to signpost to the recent planning application by 7 Wellington Road which is very close to this property. This application was refused based on the bulk and scale, and I would urge you to consider the refusal report for that property when considering this application too.
- Precedent has been set by the refusal of planning permission at No. 17 Norwood Walk for a two storey side extension and replacement of 3m high hedge with 2m high wall (ref. SW/08/0684).
- The loss of a 2 bedroom house, popular with first time buyers is a great loss.

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Bobbing Parish Council object to the application, proving the following comments:

“Bobbing Parish Council objects to this application on the grounds that the proposed development, its size and bulk, will be out of character with the existing street scene.

The proposed development would not be served by adequate car parking spaces and would possibly give rise to vehicles parking on the highway (the property itself is not located adjacent to the highway but on a pedestrian walk through). The Parish Council requests that a site visit be undertaken to understand the full implications of this application. See SW/08/0684 - 17 Norwood Walk, which was refused on similar grounds.”

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.1 Plans and documents relating to 19/505077/FULL and SW/06/1363.

8. APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

8.1 The site lies within the built up area boundary of Sittingbourne where the principle of development is accepted. The main considerations in this case involve the impact of the proposal upon visual and residential amenities.

Visual Impact

8.2 Due to the location of the property the side extension will be prominent in the streetscene and will be highly visible from Hilton Drive. There is currently a substantial gap between the existing property and the side boundary of the site with Hilton Drive. The side extension will reduce this gap to between 2m - 3.5m, and will be set back from

the front elevation and set down from the roofline slightly. There will remain an area of soft landscaping to the side of the extension. Whilst the extension will increase the scale of the property, due to the size of the plot and the distance to the side boundary, I believe the side extension will not cause adverse harm to the character and appearance of the property or wider area. The rear extension is of a limited scale, and will have a mono-pitch roof. I believe it will sit comfortably on the property and therefore have no concerns from this regard. Matching materials will be used on all elements of the build which will ensure the extensions blend in with the existing property.

- 8.3 I acknowledge the objectors' concern regarding the scale of the side extension and subsequent impact of the proposal on the wider area, but as summarised above, I do not believe it will cause unacceptable harm to the character of the area.

Residential Amenity

- 8.4 The side extension will not project rearwards or forwards of the existing dwelling, and therefore I consider the impact upon attached dwelling No. 78 will be limited. The extension will lie roughly 19m from the nearest residential dwelling to the west, and taking into account this distance, I believe any impact to dwellings along Hilton Drive will be minimal. No windows are proposed in the side elevations of the extension, and the windows proposed in the front and rear elevations will not lead to any unacceptable overlooking in my view as they will provide views similar to the existing windows in the property.
- 8.5 The single storey rear extension projects 2.4m to the rear. This is in line with the Council's SPG, which recommends rear extensions close to the common boundary have a maximum projection of 3m. The height of the extension is limited, and whilst it may have some impact on attached property No. 78, I do not consider it will cause unacceptable harm to residential amenities at this neighbouring property. I note the objectors' concern with regard to an overshadowing impact, however due to the limited projection of the extension, I do not consider it will cause substantial overshadowing. With regard to the extension being situated along the common boundary and the potential impact this will have during the construction phase, this would be a private matter and cannot be taken into account here.

Highways

- 8.6 The extension will result in the property having three bedrooms. Due to the location of the site fronting a walk, residents of Norwood Walk are required to park in Hilton Drive, the road perpendicular to the walk or other surrounding estate roads. I note there are no parking restrictions on the roads surrounding the site and, whilst the property has no off-street parking I do not consider the additional bedroom will cause sufficient harm to the parking provision in the surrounding roads to warrant a reason for refusal.

Other Matters

- 8.7 An objector has referred to an application that was recently refused at 7 Wellington Road, close to the site (application ref. 19/504488/FULL). This application was for a hip to gable roof conversion and the erection of a flat roof dormer window. These works are

materially different to the side and rear extensions proposed here and therefore I do not consider this application is relevant.

- 8.8 The Parish Council and an objector have also referred to a refused application at 17 Norwood Walk (ref. SW/08/0684) which is an end of terrace property located in close proximity to the site. This application sought permission for a two storey side extension and 2m boundary wall, and was refused due to the unacceptable size and bulk of the extension and wall and the lack of adequate parking for the extended dwelling. However I consider the scheme proposed here is different to this refused application. Number 17 is situated on a plot which changes in width, which results in the front of the extension being located roughly 1m from the boundary of the site. In combination with the 2m boundary wall proposed along the side boundary with Hilton Drive, the proposal was deemed unacceptable from a visual amenity perspective. The development proposed here leaves an adequate gap to the boundary, and would sit comfortably on the property. With regards to the parking issue, as outlined at paragraph 8.6 above,
- 8.9 It is important to give weight to the fact that both extensions have already gained consent under planning permission SW/06/1363. Although this was a number of years ago, Local Plan Policies in respect of domestic extensions remain the same. The Council's SPG was also a material consideration at the time of the previous application.
- 8.10 One objector has raised concern regarding the loss of views from neighbouring properties. This is not a material planning consideration and therefore cannot be considered here.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This application will not cause adverse harm to either visual or residential amenities in my view and the addition of another bedroom at the property will not have significant impacts on the parking provision of nearby roads. I therefore recommend this application be approved.

10. 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 extensions 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 2018 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.

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.

