

---

<b>Offham Downs</b>	<b>565461 157429</b>	<b>31.05.2006</b>	<b>TM/06/01664/FL</b>
-------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

Proposal:	Ground floor extensions and provision of new roof to bungalow incorporating rooms within the new roof space and erection of double garage to front
Location:	The Bungalow Teston Road Offham West Malling Kent ME19 5PD
Applicant:	Mr J Moyce

---

## **1. Description:**

- 1.1 This application proposes the rear and side extension of an existing bungalow and the provision of a new taller pitched roof incorporating attic rooms served by dormers above that enlarged footprint. A new front bay window is also proposed on the right (NW) hand side of the bungalow to match a new bay incorporated into the side extension on the left hand side (SE). The property would be enlarged from a two bed bungalow to a four bedroomed chalet bungalow with the rear extension adding 4m of depth to the property and the side extension a further 4.2m width. The additions would result in an increase in floor area from approximately 96m<sup>2</sup> to 191m<sup>2</sup>. The new roof would increase the height of the enlarged building from 6.5m to 7.1m and feature a half hipped roof with two projecting rear gables. The elevations of the building would be rendered and the new roof clad with plain tiles.
- 1.2 The application also seeks permission for the erection of a double garage to the front. (It also originally included a new frontage wall and access gates but this element of the application has been withdrawn.) The garage would have a footprint of 35m<sup>2</sup> and stand 4.8m high at the apex of its gabled roof.
- 1.3 NB – the design of the proposals has been altered during the course of the application's life through the reduction in height of the roof from 8.5m to 7m and a reconfiguration of the rear balconies.

## **2. The Site:**

- 2.1 The site lies within a residential area within the built confines of Offham. The surrounding character is mixed with a range of house designs and materials, although this property does lie within a section of road that features a significant number of bungalows.

## **3. Planning History:**

- 3.1 No significant history relating to this property since its original construction.

#### 4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: Views on the revised design of the extensions are awaited and I hope to be able to report these in my supplementary report. The PC's views on the original proposals are however set out below to provide Members with an indication as to the PC's main concerns.

The PC strongly objects to the proposed works on the following grounds:

- The size of the proposed extension is totally out of scale with the existing building, both in terms of the additional ground floor accommodation and the creation of a second floor.
- We are aware this time, having learnt our lesson in the case of Pinewood, that the applicant obviously intends to increase the height of the roof and this is totally out of scale with surrounding properties, Pinewood now being an exception.
- The creation of two rear balconies is totally inappropriate and despite the "obscured glazed screen" will have a negative impact on adjoining properties, if not a privacy issue.
- If permission is granted, this property will no longer be a bungalow but is clearly of a scale more appropriately recognised as a house as despite the description of the application stating that it includes the "creation of rooms in the roof space", the applicant is seeking permission for a new roof of significantly bigger size and height to that currently existing.
- The proposed boundary wall, railing and gates are totally inappropriate in terms of the street scene along Teston Road and will have a damaging impact on the local environment which the applicant seems to be trying to urbanise.
- The positioning of a new garage in front of the property is totally inappropriate and detrimental to the immediate environment and street scene. We objected strongly to the application for a similar garage to be erected in front of Oakdene as we believed that such a design would have a negative impact on the local street scene. Standing and looking at the finished works to Oakdene it is quite clear that this is the case and the alternations to the bungalow and, in particular the building of the double garage, have had a totally negative impact on the local environment.
- Although this property does not lie within the Conservation Area, it is in close proximity to its boundary. The proposed alterations give no consideration to the local vernacular but seem totally focused on changing the existing bungalow into a large four bedroomed house totally out of keeping with surrounding properties in terms of both its scale and design.

- Bearing in mind the significant alterations, both approved and proposed to this property, The Bungalow, and two of its neighbours, Oakdene and Pinewood please in this instance can there be a dialogue between TMBC and Offham Parish Council. The three properties have been/will be altered beyond all recognition and are now totally out of keeping with surrounding properties both in terms of scale and design, all of which has had a negative impact on this part of Teston Road, itself a gateway into our historic village.

4.2 KCC (Highways): This application shows proposals to enlarge the existing single storey house, by creating new living accommodation within the roofspace. The proposals will double the number of bedrooms from two to four and include the construction of a new detached garage.

Current KVPS could require the provision of up to three parking spaces to meet the full provision for a four bedroom dwelling.

In this instance, the proposed double garage is of acceptable size; with suitable room for turning and alternative curtilage parking.

However, the proposals also include changes to alter the boundary treatment, including the erection of new entrance gates. The gates shown are suitably set back and inward opening, but the new wall is higher. The piers to be extended to 2.1m high, with iron work infill panels of an open design to match the gates.

The proposal will provide a wider splayed entrance that incorporates pedestrian visibility. Although the new piers are higher than the existing wall, visibility seems to be maintained through the open railing, where I suggest that low growth plant be maintained close to the boundaries.

I therefore raise no objections to this application subject to certain conditions being imposed.

4.3 Private Reps: 6 + Art 8 0R/0X/0S.

## **5. Determining Issues:**

5.1 The site is located within the settlement confines of Offham where the principle of residential extensions is acceptable in broad policy terms and there are no specific policy restrictions on the size that a property may be extended by. Accordingly, it is the matters of detail that must be considered in this case.

5.2 Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP 1998 requires extensions to residential properties not to have an adverse impact upon the character of the building or the street scene in terms of form, scale, design, materials and existing trees. It also requires proposals not to have an adverse impact upon the residential amenity of

neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or privacy. Additionally, the highway implication of the provision of additional bedrooms needs to be considered.

- 5.3 The proposals to extend the bungalow to the side and rear and add a further bay to the front would significantly increase the footprint of the bungalow but I am satisfied that the plot is large enough to accommodate this enlarged building without appearing unduly cramped or over-developed. The new garage would add further bulk but, again, I feel that the plot is large enough to accommodate this structure because it is of relatively generous proportions in comparison to the existing small bungalow which currently occupies it.
- 5.4 The main potential for harm to visual amenity in my view arises from the increased height and bulk of the building taking into account the characteristics of the surrounding locality. Currently, most of the bungalows along this section of road are relatively small structures standing approximately 6 to 6.5m high. These proposals would result in a much larger building and with a roof height of 7m high. This would be notably taller than its immediate neighbours. However, the locality features a range of building styles and heights with some two storey developments nearby and, indeed, a nearby dwelling called Pinewood which has recently been extended and increased in height to 7m. In these circumstances, I consider that the proposed alterations can be considered acceptable.
- 5.5 I note the concerns raised by the PC that the increase in size and height proposed is out of scale with the host dwelling and surrounding properties but, given that this site lies within an area of built confines, that the plot can accept the larger dwelling and that there is a range of styles of building found within the surrounding locality, I do not consider that this objection can be sustained. Indeed, it must be said that the existing bungalow and many of its neighbours that were constructed at a similar time in the 1960s, cannot be deemed to be of any significant architectural or aesthetic merit and many are constructed from relatively poor quality materials.
- 5.6 I have some sympathy with the PC's concerns regarding the impact of the new garage to the front of the existing dwelling since garages within front gardens can often be problematic in planning terms and sometimes appear out of character. However, there is no clearly defined uniform 'building line' here and indeed the dwelling is recessed behind most others. I do not therefore consider that the garage would cause an unacceptable visual intrusion to the streetscape. (A similar proposal has already been permitted at the adjacent property of Oakdene where a similar situation existed.)
- 5.7 In terms of residential amenity, the principal concerns relate to loss of privacy arising from the two rear balconies proposed. However, the balconies have been inverted into the roof rather than jutting out from the rear elevation and would be obscured with privacy screens formed by the rear roofslope. The balconies would therefore meet the normally adopted privacy standards.

- 5.8 The proposals are also acceptable in all other respects with regard to residential amenity with no undue loss of outlook caused and no undue loss of privacy caused by any new first floor windows. All potential overlooking windows are obscure glazed and/or the facing neighbouring windows serve non-habitable rooms such as bathrooms, kitchens and hallways.
- 5.9 No windows serving habitable rooms of neighbouring dwellings would be affected in terms of outlook save for a kitchen/diner window at 'Pilgrims' but this room has secondary windows.
- 5.10 Turning now to highways issues, KCC Highways has raised no objections on either access or parking grounds. I find the proposals to pose no harmful threat to highway safety, therefore.

**6. Recommendation:**

- 6.1 **Grant Planning Permission** as detailed in plans date stamped 15.05.2006, and subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 No development shall take place until details and samples of materials to be used externally have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the visual amenity of the locality.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the roof of the building without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control any such further development in the interests of the amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

- 4 The use shall not be commenced, nor the premises occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning

(General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order), no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the flank elevations of the building other than as hereby approved, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control any such further development in the interests of amenity and privacy of adjoining property.

- 6 The first floor windows within flank elevations hereby permitted shall be fitted with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung light shall be non-opening. This work shall be effected before the room is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To minimise the effect of overlooking onto adjoining property.

Contact: Kevin Wise