

<b>2.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/501692/FULL</b>		
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of side and rear extension, creation of first floor including dormer windows and rooflights to North and South Elevations.		
<b>ADDRESS</b> 30 Woodside Gardens Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1SG		
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> - Approve		
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b> Proposed extension would be of an acceptable scale and design and would accord with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance.		
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> Neighbour objections		
<b>WARD</b> Woodstock	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Doug Smith <b>AGENT</b> Coteq Ltd
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 23/04/15	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 17/04/15	<b>OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE</b> 27/03/15

## 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 30 Woodside Gardens is a semi-detached bungalow situated on a modern housing estate within the built up area of Sittingbourne. It is set back from the road with parking to the front and side, a detached side garage, and a front garden. The rear garden is irregular in shape due to the position of the property within the cul-de-sac.
- 1.02 The surrounding properties are all of a similar design, save for a handful on the main section of Woodside Gardens (i.e. not within the cul-de-sac). No. 22 (opposite) features a hip-to-gable extension and large flat-roofed front dormer window; and no. 20 (also opposite) features a large flat-roofed side dormer window – I have not been able to find any planning history for either of these extensions.
- 1.03 Land levels rise slightly to the south, so that numbers 32 – 38 (inclusive) are set above the application property. I estimate the change in levels to be a maximum of 1m.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for demolition of the existing detached garage; erection of a side extension; a hip-to-gable roof conversion; erection of front and rear pitched-roof dormer windows and insertion of roof lights to enable use of the roof space as additional accommodation.

- 2.02 The side extension would project approximately 4m to the side at the front of the property, and 5.8m at the rear. This will result in a roughly L-shaped extension with the rear (kitchen) projecting further to the side. The roof will be converted from hipped to gable, and the proposed roof ridge will match existing in terms of height.
- 2.03 Two pitched-roof dormer windows (measuring approximately 2m wide x 2.5m deep x 2m high) will be inserted into the front roof slope. A matching dormer window and two roof lights will be inserted on the rear roof slope.
- 2.04 External materials are proposed to match existing.
- 2.05 The development will provide an integral garage, larger kitchen / diner; study / fourth bedroom and larger living area at ground floor; and three bedrooms, bathroom and ensuite within the roof space.
- 2.06 Members should note that the works would not extend the property further to the rear, and that no side windows are proposed.

**3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION**

	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Site Area (ha)	0.04	0.04
Approximate Ridge Height (m)	7	7
Approximate Eaves Height (m)	2.5	2.5
Approximate Depth (m)	11.2	11.2
Approximate Width (m)	6.6	12.5 (max)
No. of Storeys	1	1 (with rooms in roof)
Parking Spaces	3+	3

**4.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

- 4.01 The site lies within the built up area boundary, as defined by the adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008, and the emerging Local Plan; “Bearing Fruits 2031.”

**5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 5.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) are relevant in terms of encouraging sustainable housing development within existing urban areas. They also encourage good design standards and minimising the potential impacts of any development upon the amenity of neighbouring residents.

- 5.02 The adopted Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 echoes a similar sentiment, and policies E1, E19, E24, H2 and T3 in particular encourage the provision of high-quality housing development within sustainable locations, provide guidance on design and on extensions, seek adequate parking provision, and advise on minimising potential amenity impacts for local residents.
- 5.03 The publication draft of the emerging Local Plan, entitled Bearing Fruits 2031, was agreed by Members at Full Council late last year and, as such, carries some weight in the determination of planning applications. Policies DM14, DM16, DM19 are relevant in this instance.
- 5.04 The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "Designing an Extension" is relevant in that it stipulates that there should be a minimum rear-to-rear separation between dwellings of 21m in order to reduce the potential for mutual overlooking.

## **6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 6.01 The application was advertised by way of letters to surrounding neighbours and erection of a site notice.
- 6.02 Thirteen letters of objection have been received in response, raising the following summarised concerns:
- The proposed works would be out of character with the surrounding properties;
  - Bungalows should be retained for the aging population;
  - Obstruction of highway during construction;
  - The change in levels will allow clear views into the rear windows of properties to the south;
  - Loss of privacy and overlooking;
  - Overshadowing of neighbouring properties;
  - Noise and disturbance to elderly residents if the property is turned into a family home;
  - Noise and disturbance during construction;
  - Door to proposed study / bedroom will be close to bedroom window on adjoining dwelling;
  - Local sewers are inadequate;
  - External materials should match existing;
  - Who would pay the cost of any construction damage to neighbouring properties;
  - The development is financially motivated; and
  - The applicant did not notify neighbours of his intentions.

## **7.0 CONSULTATIONS**

- 7.01 None.

## **8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS**

- 8.01 The application is supported by an existing block plan, and proposed block plans, elevations and floor plans.

## **9.0 APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of Development**

- 9.01 The application site lies within the built up area boundary, where local and national policy encourages the provision of new housing, and the principle of development is therefore acceptable.

### **Visual Impact**

- 9.02 The proposed works would alter the profile of the property from a hipped roof bungalow to a pitched roof bungalow with a gable end. This would be a contrast to the surrounding character but would not, in my opinion be so seriously negative as to justify a refusal of planning permission on such grounds.
- 9.04 Such hip-to-gable extensions are not uncommon within chalet bungalow style estates across Sittingbourne (Sterling Road being an example) and if done sensitively can sit comfortably within the street scene. In this instance the proposal would not increase the height of the dwelling; the proposed dormer windows feature pitched roofs and are in accordance with the advice of the adopted SPG; and the position of the property to the rear of other dwellings (as well as the layout of the surrounding properties) means that terracing or loss of openness is unlikely even if the neighbouring properties follow suit.
- 9.05 I did have some initial concern in regards to the side projection of the kitchen, which projects beyond the side extension at the front of the property. However the angle of the plot means that this would not be prominent in views from the highway and would thus have little impact upon the character of the street scene.
- 9.06 It is also worth noting that planning permission would not be required for the erection of the proposed rear dormer window in isolation, and refusal of planning permission on this basis would accordingly be difficult to defend on appeal.
- 9.07 I am therefore firmly of the view that the proposal is acceptable in visual terms.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 9.08 I note local objections in regard to the potential for overlooking or loss of privacy. However, the proposed development complies with the Council's adopted guidance in terms of minimum separation distances between properties. The adopted SPG requires a minimum rear-to-rear separation of 21m, and in this instance there will be a minimum of 23m between the rear of the proposed new dwelling and the rear of 48 and 50 Woodside (to the rear).
- 9.09 The distance to the rear of other surrounding properties is more than this, and also at an oblique angle due to the position of the property within the cul-de-sac and within the wider estate.
- 9.10 I would also reiterate that, as at 9.06 above, planning permission would not be required for the erection of the proposed rear dormer window in isolation.
- 9.11 No windows have been proposed within the flank elevation, and the condition recommended below prevents insertion of any openings in this elevation in future. Overlooking of the properties to the side is therefore highly unlikely.
- 9.12 The extended dwelling would not give rise to any harmful mutual overlooking between rear existing and proposed windows, in my opinion.
- 9.13 The position of the property and the scale of the extension are such that the development is unlikely to give rise to any serious overshadowing of neighbouring properties in my opinion.

### **Highways**

- 9.14 The development will provide parking in accordance with current adopted Kent Parking Standards. The development would therefore be unlikely to give rise to any serious highway safety or amenity concerns in the long term.
- 9.15 I note local concern in regards to highway amenity during construction and, whilst I recognise these worries and acknowledge that some inconvenience is likely, this will be short-term during construction only and does not amount to a reason for refusal of planning permission here.

### **Other Matters**

- 9.16 Noise and disturbance arising from potential use as a family home is not a planning consideration, and would be addressed through other legislation if disturbance arose.
- 9.17 Additional bedrooms could be added within the dwelling and the property used as a larger family dwelling without the need for planning permission (as noted at 9.06 and 9.10, above).

9.18 There is no policy basis for the retention of bungalows in the built up area.

## 10.0 CONCLUSION

10.01 The proposed extensions are of an appropriate scale and design and accord with the advice of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document entitled "Designing an Extension." Whilst I note local objections I conclude that the proposal is acceptable and recommend that planning permission should be granted.

## 11.0 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.

Reasons: 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.

Reasons: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (3) No additional windows, doors, voids or other openings shall be inserted, placed or formed at any time in the south facing gable wall hereby permitted unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons: To prevent the overlooking of adjoining properties and to safeguard the privacy of their occupiers.

- (4) The integral garage hereby approved shall be kept available for the parking of vehicles and no permanent development, whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) or not, shall be carried out on the land or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access thereto.

Reasons: Development without adequate provision for the parking or garaging of cars is likely to lead to car parking inconvenient to other road users and in a manner detrimental to highway safety and amenity.

### The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 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.