

2.3 REFERENCE NO - 17/504618/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Amendments to previously approved scheme (reference 14/502055) additional single storey rear extension, increase in roof height provision of flat roof element, increase in pitch of hips, additional front and rear facing roof lights, provision of pitched roofs over front facing bay windows.			
ADDRESS 6 Park Avenue Sittingbourne Kent ME10 1QX			
RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to the receipt of amended plans, and any additional representations received (closing date 25 th April).			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The development does not cause unacceptable harm to visual or residential amenity.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Called in by Ward Member			
WARD Woodstock	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL N/A	APPLICANT Mr Robert Ingram AGENT	
DECISION DUE DATE 18/01/18	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 25/04/18		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
14/502055/FULL	Two Storey side extensions to both sides of dwelling, roof extension and loft conversion with associated dormers and roof lights. Detached garage and workshop with first floor play room and washroom to front of property	Approved	22.12.2015

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 6 Park Avenue is a large, detached two storey house, located in the built up area of Sittingbourne. It is set back from the highway by approximately 21 metres, with parking to the front.
- 1.02 Access to the King Georges Field recreation ground lies to the east of the site, and the recreation ground itself lies to the rear. To the west, nos 2B and 4 Park Avenue, a pair of semi-detached houses, are set substantially closer to the highway than no.6.
- 1.03 As set out above, planning permission was granted under reference 14/502055/FULL for two storey side extensions to both sides of the dwelling, for a loft conversion with dormer windows and roof lights, and for a large detached garage to the front of the dwelling. The garage is currently under construction, and the dwelling has been extended. The eastern extension has not been constructed. However – the remaining development as built differs from the approved plans in a number of ways, (as does the development yet to be constructed) as set out below, such that planning permission is required, and hence why this current application has been submitted.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The description of the development has recently been amended (the previous description was vague and did not adequately describe the proposals). Neighbours have been reconsulted and the closing date for any further comments is 25th April.
- 2.02 The proposed development amounts to amendments to the design of the approved scheme, together with additions – specifically:
- Pitched roofs above the (approved) flat roof front facing bay windows;
 - Continuation of the ridge height of the original dwelling across part of the western side extension;
 - An additional front facing roof light;
 - Two additional rear facing roof lights;
 - A steeper pitch to the hips to both the eastern and western extensions;
 - The use of the roof of an existing first floor rear extension as a balcony, with accompanying railings etc;
 - Facing materials have been changed from brick and tile to render and slate grey tiles.
- 2.03 The proposed single storey rear extension, which projects to the rear of the western side extension, measures 4 metres deep, (matching the depth of the existing flat roof extension) 5.1 metres wide and 3.3 metres in height (matching the height of the existing rear extension).
- 2.04 Together with the additions set out above, other minor changes include a small reduction to the ridge height of the dwelling, as set out (and highlighted) below:

	Approved (14/502055/FULL)	Proposed
Eastern two storey side extension (yet to be constructed)	5m wide, 8.8m deep, and 10.2m to ridge height	5m wide, 8.8m deep, 9.9m to ridge height
Main ridge height of dwelling	Increased from 9.7m to 10.2m	Increased from 9.7m to 9.9m
Western two storey side extension	7m wide, 9m deep and 8.6m to ridge height	7.1m wide, 13m deep (incorporating the additional rear extension) , 8.6m to ridge height

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Trees to the front and eastern side boundary of the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order – TPO 4 of 2015.
- 3.02 The site lies in an area of archaeological significance

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Swale Borough Local Plan 2017:

Policies DM14 (General Development Criteria) and DM16 (Alterations and Extensions) are relevant here.

Supplementary Planning Guidance :Designing and Extension: A Guide for Householders

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.01 Six representations, all raising objection, have been received to date. These can be summarised as:

- The proposed changes to roof structure now obstruct our sight being higher than originally proposed;
- The planned veranda on the single storey rear extension will affect our privacy;
- The proposed height of veranda will allow those sitting or standing there to over look our garden and spoil our privacy, both in our garden and the back of the house including rear bedrooms;
- The overall visual appearance of the property has changed significantly and was built against the original planning consent from the outset. The pantry extension was also built against the original plan;
- In particular I raise a particular objection to the rear extension built without permission and the change in colour to roof and walls;
- The house in question is huge and completely dominates the immediate area, including our house;
- The planning application process is there for a reason. If it is allowed to be ignored in this way then it brings the whole system into disrepute. My view is that the building should be modified together the approved design or back to its original design.
- The roof has been built a lot higher than was originally passed;
- There are new additions that have also appeared, which are not on the original plans, such as a door near to our fence instead of a window, and an additional velux and 2 dormers added which also aren't on the original plans.
- The existing house has a red roof and red bricks, this was also on the original to remain;
- Because the roof has been built to this height and the hip angle almost straight and not vertical, it is now blocking out any light until 11.30am/12 Noon, whereas before we would get the sun all day. We have a 75 ft wide garden and it shadows all of it until midday;
- When we are in close proximity to the extension, it appears as a block of flats. We have actually had strangers ask us why we approved it – it's so ugly and is it going to be a nursing home?
- For us this confirms our viewpoint that it is overshadowing us and imposes on our sunlight, privacy and also the overall feeling of our house and the area
- We feel that the controls around planning are there to control inappropriate development. There has been no regard to the planning rules or the effect it may have on neighbours in the surrounding area.
- The building overshadows and blocks views from neighbours gardens;
- There are a number of discrepancies in the plans;
- Enforcement action should be taken regarding the roof alterations;
- Planning permission should have been obtained first – this sends a poor message to other developers/builders.

5.02 One of the Ward members, Councillor Conway has also requested that this application be considered by the Planning Committee.

5.03 The description of the development has recently been amended and reconsultation has taken place. The closing date for representations is 25th April. In addition, I am awaiting amended plans to address a number of discrepancies with the submitted details. I will update Members at the meeting.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 The County Archaeologist confirms that no archaeological measures are required.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 Application papers, plans and correspondence for applications 14/502055/FULL and 17/504618/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The site lies within the built up area of Sittingbourne, where extensions and alterations are considered acceptable as a matter of principal. In addition, the site benefits from an acceptable provision of off street parking.

8.02 The key issues here are the impact of the scheme on visual and residential amenity.

Visual Amenity

8.03 The change in materials is acceptable. The rendered finish with plain slate tiles will not appear out of character with the surrounding dwellings, many of which are rendered and painted white.

8.04 The increase in pitch to the hips and the continuation of the main ridge of the roof of the house across part of the western extension has undoubtedly increased the bulk of the roof. However – I do not consider that in itself it harms the visual amenities of the streetscene. The design is not “top heavy” nor is it a fundamentally unattractive design and it does not appear cramped in the plot. In addition, the dwelling is set some considerable distance from the highway, such that in views from public vantage points, the roof does not in my view appear prominent or harmful.

8.05 The pitched roofs over the approved flat roof bay windows is to be welcomed, providing a more traditional design.

8.06 The additional roof light to the front would not give the roof a cluttered appearance, nor would those to the rear.

8.07 The ground floor rear extension would marry well with the existing flat roof extension, and would not be visible from public vantage points.

8.08 Given the above, in my view the proposals do not cause harm to visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

8.09 I note the objections raised on the basis of the rear balcony. However – the closest dwelling to the west in Park Drive lies approximately 49 metres from the application site, and as such no materially harmful overlooking will take place. If the flat roof of the new ground floor rear extension were to be used as a balcony or sitting out area, this

could have potential for overlooking to the neighbouring dwelling at no.4 Park Avenue, Condition 1 below would prevent such a use from taking place.

- 8.10 With regards the single storey rear extension, this is located approximately 25 metres from the closest dwelling, no.4 Park Avenue. As such, it will not give rise to overshadowing. There may be a slight impact on the garden of no.4, but this would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of planning permission.
- 8.11 The relationship between the front facing ground and first floor windows in the western side extension and no.4 Park Avenue remains as per the previous approved scheme. As such, planning permission should not be refused on this basis. In any event, the windows are separated from no.4 Park Avenue by approximately 20 metres and at an angle to this dwelling. The impact in this respect is acceptable.
- 8.12 The increase in pitch to the hip on the western side extension, and the continuation of the ridge height of the main part of the dwelling further to the west does have some impact on no.4. However – as set out above, the extension is set approximately 20 metres from the dwelling, and any increase in harmful overshadowing is likely to be slight. Equally, with regards impact on the garden of no.4, I do not consider this to be so substantial as to warrant refusal of planning permission. The roof alterations would not make a substantial difference to the light reaching the garden of this dwelling.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 I have considered the impact of the development on visual and residential amenity, and conclude that the development would not have so harmful an impact that planning permission should be refused. As such, I recommend approval, subject to the receipt of any further representations (closing date 25th April) and to the conditions listed below.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following condition

- 1) The flat roof area of the ground floor rear extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area and there shall be no other use of the roof area unless for maintenance.

Reason: In order to prevent overlooking and loss of amenity to adjoining properties.

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.



17/504618/FULL - 6 Park Avenue, Sittingbourne ME10 1QX
Scale: 1:1250
Printed on: 16/4/2018 at 15:56 PM by AngelaA



© Astun Technology Ltd