

<b>REFERENCE NO - 21/504404/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Demolition of existing garage, erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extensions, including integral garage, insertion of front dormer and rooflights.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 47 Roseleigh Road Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1RS		
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> - Approve		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> Parish Council objection		
<b>WARD</b> Woodstock	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Tunstall	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr & Mrs Brooks <b>AGENT</b> The Little Drawing Company
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 15/10/21		<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 17/09/21

## 1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.1 47 Roseleigh Road is a three bedroom semi detached chalet bungalow with a single storey detached garage and long driveway to the side providing tandem parking for several cars. To the rear is a good sized garden. The property is located within the Local Plan defined built up area boundary of Sittingbourne and is the last property at the end of a cul-de-sac, such that its left hand side boundary forms the rear boundary of properties in Sterling Road which lies to the west.

## 2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for demolition of an existing single garage, and the erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension including an integral garage, along with a new front dormer and four rooflights.
- 2.2 The proposed side extension will create a new integral garage and create an extra bedroom with en-suite (lit by a rear window and rooflights on the side fading roofslopes), and a new bathroom. The first floor area would be clad in composite cladding. There are proposed high level windows at ground floor level and the proposal includes the removal of the existing side facing dormer.
- 2.3 The single storey rear extension would measure 3m in depth with a flat roof. There are two proposed rooflights in the rear roofslope.

## 3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

None

## 4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 policies:  
ST3 (The Swale settlement strategy)

CP4 (Design)  
DM14 (General development criteria)  
DM16 (Alterations and extensions)

- 4.2 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders' will also be a relevant consideration. Paragraph 5.0 of the SPG states:

*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 the area should not become 'terraced' in character, losing the sense of openness. Residents of such a street have the right to expect that the character should be retained. Houses should not be physically 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 first floor extension and the side boundary is normally required.*

- 4.3 Paragraph 5.3 states:

*'to make sure then extension to the front of our dwelling is of a good design, the Borough Council normally requires that it should have a pitched roof and that its projection should be kept to an absolute minimum. The Borough Council normally requires that front additions are kept to a maximum of 1.2m'*

- 4.4 Paragraph 5.5 states:

*Dormers should be in proportion with the roof and only as large as necessary to allow light into the roof space. As a guide the dormer should be no deeper than half the depth of the roof slope and have square proportions or a vertical emphasis. They should normally have pitched roofs with tiles to match the main roof.*

- 4.5 The SPG also states at paragraph 5.7:

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

- 4.6 Paragraphs 6.0 and 6.1 provide the following advice:

*Side windows should be avoided to reduce overlooking and mutual loss of privacy, although high level windows (with an internal sill height of at least 1.65m) may be acceptable. Obscured glazing to the toilet, bathroom and landing windows would overcome the problem. Windows to other ground floor rooms may be accepted if at least 2.4m from the side boundary and a screen fence or wall may be required to protect neighbour's privacy.*

*Windows to the rear should be at least 21m from the windows of other houses to the rear. Extensions which reduce such a distance will need to be carefully examined. It should be noted that the option of a high level window or high level rooflight as the only light and ventilation to a habitable room to overcome these problems is not normally accepted by the Council.*

## **5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

5.1 Four letters of objection from neighbours in Sterling Road have been received raising the following summarised concerns:

- Overshadowing
- Loss of light
- Design and materials are not in keeping
- The proposed garage will no large than the existing which is said to be too small
- Obtrusive and harmful to the character of the area
- Overbearing and imposing extension
- Adverse impact to residential amenity
- Non-compliance with the Council's policy for two storey side extensions
- The extension will be built over shared drains
- Recent loss of trees, and need to remove hedgerow to give access to the rear garden
- Noise and disruption during construction
- Loss of views, although it is recognised that this cannot be taken into account
- Effect on human rights by advantaging the applicant at the expense of the neighbours

5.2 Two letters of support from or on behalf of neighbours in Roseleigh Road have been received, one from the attached semi-detached property. One letter suggests that the applicants have done a 'beautiful job of trimming the existing unkempt high hedge', and that the extension is not overlooked by any parties and will not obscure or diminish light. The other says that we really enjoy seeing run down properties being brought back to life and that the plans are tasteful and won't stand out too much.

## **6. CONSULTATIONS**

6.1 Tunstall Parish Council has commented that the extension is large and not stepped in, and does appear too close to the boundary. Tunstall Parish Council has had representations from neighbours and the Parish Council asks that the Council takes these comments into account.

## **7. APPRAISAL**

7.1 The main issues to consider in this case are those of the principle of development and any impact on residential amenity.

- 7.2 The rear single storey element of the proposal would have a depth of 3m, with a flat roof and would sit close to the common boundary with no.48 Roseleigh Road. It would extend across the entire width of the property and create a kitchen and family room at ground floor level. This would comply with the Council's normal guidance.
- 7.3 With regards to the porch and from proposed ground floor I can see that the projection is approximately 1m including the canopy and pillars, so this would comply with the Supplementary Planning Guidance set out above
- 7.4 The proposed side extension would see the demolition of the detached garage and would create a new integral garage and, at first floor, would alter the existing main roof and create an extra bedroom with en-suite along with a new bathroom. The proposal would remove the side dormer and introduce an extra dormer on the front roofslope, over the integral garage.
- 7.5 The proposed two storey side extension is approximately 1m off the boundary to the side/rear and is approximately 1.5m off the boundary to the side/front. However, due to the length of the gardens that adjoin the side boundary, and the fact that Roseleigh Road is lower than Sterling Road here, I am of the opinion that there would be no significant impact on neighbouring amenities in terms of overshadowing or loss of sunlight from the side extension.
- 7.6 In relation to the attached neighbour at no.48 the two storey extension is on the far wall of the property and should not overshadow them, or result in a loss of privacy. On this basis, I am of the opinion there would be little impact on this neighbours' amenity.
- 7.7 The streetscene contains semi-detached dwellings of a similar style. Paragraph 5.0 of the Councils SPG entitled 'Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders' states that '*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 the area should not become terraced in character, losing the sense of openness.*' It goes on further to say '*A gap of 2m between a first floor extension and the side boundary is normally required.*' In this instance the existing property is at the end of the a cul-de-sac and the rear gardens of houses within Sterling Road abut the side boundary of the application site, so the 2m guidance is not applicable here as there would be no loss of openness between properties that would adversely affect the spacing of properties resulting from the side extension.
- 7.8 I note the comments made by the Parish Council but I believe the proposed development is of a modest scale in accordance with policy DM16, and that it would not be detrimental to the character of the immediate streetscene. There would be no significant sense of over dominance, or any loss of outlook or overshadowing created as a result of this application to any of the properties in Sterling Road.
- 7.9 The new garage is smaller than that recommended in the Swale Parking Standards 2020 but as it is additional to the two parking spaces appropriate for this extended property it is not necessary to consider it as part of the minimum parking standard.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 Having taken all the above into account, I consider the proposal to be well designed and of an appropriate scale, and I do not consider that it would have any significant impact on the surrounding neighbours.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION** Approve 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 approved shall be carried out in accordance with approved drawings RR/PA/02, RR/PL/06, RR/PL/07 and RR/PL/08.

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

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

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and proper planning.

- (4) The rooflights in the new first floor bedroom shall have a cill height not less than 1.7m above finished internal floor level in that room.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of neighbours.

### **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.

