

2.4 REFERENCE NO - 15/505554/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL 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 - (resubmission of 15/501692)			
ADDRESS 30 Woodside Gardens, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 1SG.			
RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION Proposed extension would be of an acceptable scale and design and would accord with the Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Councillor Conway			
WARD Woodstock	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL None (Sittingbourne)	APPLICANT Ascot Park Ltd AGENT Coteq Ltd	
DECISION DUE DATE 03/09/15	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 07/08/15		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/501692/FULL	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.	Refused.	17.06.15
The application was refused by Members on the grounds that <i>“the proposed extension, by virtue of its scale and close proximity to the side boundary of the property, would amount to an overbearing and obtrusive structure that would cause harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring dwellings.”</i>			

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 This property 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). Number 22 (opposite) features a hip-to-gable extension and large flat-roofed

front dormer window; and number 20 (also opposite) features a large flat-roofed side dormer window. There is no 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; 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 6m at the rear. This will result in a roughly L-shaped extension with the rear (kitchen) projecting further to the side. The extension will not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the property.
- 2.03 The side extension will have a hipped roof projecting away from the side boundary, and the rear extension will have a flat roof.
- 2.04 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.
- 2.05 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.

3.0 SUMMARY INFORMATION

	Existing	Proposed
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, with adequate parking provision, and 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 Twelve letters of objection have been submitted by local residents, raising the following summarised concerns:
- Application is identical to the previous refusal other than the hipped roof;
 - Amendments do not address the previous reasons for refusal;
 - The additional bedrooms will convert the property to a family dwelling, introducing additional cars and causing parking problems;
 - A chalet bungalow is out of character with the area;
 - The extension will unbalance the pair of dwellings;
 - A site meeting should be held;
 - Loss of privacy and overlooking from dormer windows;
 - Bungalows should be retained for older people and not converted;
 - Noise and disturbance to elderly residents if the property is turned into a family home;
 - The foundations are not suitable to take a two-storey dwelling [NB: this is not a planning consideration and would be addressed at Building Regulations stage];
 - Door to proposed study / bedroom will be close to bedroom window on adjoining dwelling; [NB: replacement of windows with doors does not require planning permission]; and
 - Who would pay the cost of any construction damage to neighbouring properties?

7.0 CONSULTATIONS

7.01 None.

8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

8.01 As noted above: planning application 15/501692 sought permission for a similar development, but including a hip-to-gable roof conversion. That application was supported by officers, but refused by Members on the grounds that *“the proposed extension, by virtue of its scale and close proximity to the side boundary of the property, would amount to an overbearing and obtrusive structure that would cause harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring dwellings.”*

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 extensions are relatively small scale and would not seriously alter the bulk, scale or appearance of the property in my opinion.

9.03 The application property is situated on the side of a cul-de-sac, and to the rear of properties fronting onto the main section of Woodside Gardens. It is not prominent within the street scene, and is not really noticed until you are actually standing within the cul-de-sac itself. I therefore believe that the proposed works would therefore not adversely affect the character of the wider area, or significantly affect the established street scene.

9.04 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 I would therefore strongly recommend that Members do not consider refusal of planning permission on this ground.
- 9.07 I am therefore confident that the proposal is acceptable in visual terms, and can think of no reasonable or justifiable reason for refusal on such grounds.

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. Neither would planning permission be required for conversion of the existing bedroom to a study and replacing the existing window (on the common boundary with no.28) with a door.
- 9.11 No windows have been proposed within the side roof slope, 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. The extended dwelling would not give rise to any harmful mutual overlooking between rear existing and proposed windows, in my opinion.
- 9.12 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.
- 9.13 Local residents and Members raised concern on the previous application (ref. 15/501692) in regards to the proposed hip-to-gable conversion which would have resulted in a flank wall facing nos. 32 to 36. It was considered that this would be overbearing and obtrusive in the outlook from those dwellings. The current scheme now proposes a hipped roof, pitching away from the common boundary, which, together with the substantial separation distances between the site and adjacent dwellings, overcomes the previous reason for refusal 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 Normal noise levels from a family home is to be expected in a suburban residential estate. The area is not allocated for housing of particular groups of people, nor is the occupancy of dwellings in the area restricted in such a manner. This issue does not amount to a reason for refusing planning permission.
- 9.17 Furthermore, 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 and this does not amount to a reason for refusal.

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." The revised proposal also overcomes the reasons for refusal stated on the previous proposal (ref. 15/501692).
- 10.02 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:

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 roof slope 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) (England) Order 2015 (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 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.