

Borough Green **560471 157004** **22 November 2006** **TM/06/03474/FL**
Borough Green And
Long Mill

Proposal: Two storey and single storey side extensions and replacement conservatory
Location: 18 Staleys Road Borough Green Sevenoaks Kent TN15 8RL
Applicant: M J Fancett

1. Description:

- 1.1 This full application proposes to construct two storey and single storey side extensions and replacement conservatory on the site at 18 Staleys Road. The proposal includes a replacement, integrated garage. At ground floor level the proposed extensions will consist of a new kitchen, utility room, playroom, and replacement garage and conservatory, with one additional bedroom and ensuite bathroom at first floor level. The ground floor of the side extension extends up to the north-west boundary, with the first floor extension sited right on the boundary at the front of the site, but at the rear, due to the angled boundary, the first floor element would be 3.75m away from the boundary.
- 1.2 The proposed extension encroaches over the boundary with the adjoining property at 19 Staleys Road. An appropriate notice (Certificate B) has been served on the owners of that property.

2. The Site:

- 2.1 18 Staleys Road is a semi-detached property located at the end of a cul-de-sac. The site is a rather irregular, elongated pentagon shape, being very narrow at the road boundary and widening to the rear. The site slopes gently down from front to back. The property contains the existing semi-detached dwelling with detached garage, and several garden sheds. The site is located within rural settlement confines as defined in the TMBLP 1998. To the south-east and north-west the site adjoins other residential properties, and to the south and west the site adjoins Green Belt / Green Wedge / Area of Local Landscape Importance / Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty / Special Landscape Area. The site is fully fenced, with some landscaping and hedging along boundaries and to the south of the site is a coppice of woodland trees.

3. Planning History:

TM/81/10999/FUL Grant with conditions 13 May 1981
(TM/81/392)
Demolition of existing conservatory and provision of new conservatory.

TM/86/11743/FUL Grant with conditions 16 May 1986
(TM/86/485)
Porch extension at front.

4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: Object. Over-intensification of the site. Concern about insufficient on-site parking provision in an already frequently congested hammerhead. Plan as existing not submitted – query is there already an extension to this property?
- 4.2 KCC (Highways): No objections. The proposal will create a fourth bedroom and parking standards could require the provision of a further parking space. In this location I would be looking for the full provision of three parking spaces. The overall size of the proposed replacement garage is similar to the original garage, which is smaller than would now be expected. However, as a replacement garage it would be acceptable, being similar in size to the existing garage. On inspection it was noted that provision for at least two suitable curtilage spaces are available. Therefore, in this instance, I would on balance raise no objections.
- 4.3 Private Reps: 5/0X/1R/0S + Art 8. One letter of objection received raising the following issues:
- Size of the structure and its obtrusive impact on neighbouring property and this corner of Staleys Road.
 - The estate was planned and built on the basis of semi-detached properties without the overcrowding impact of buildings between each pair of houses. Whilst there are several properties with smaller side extensions, they do not dominate the immediate surroundings as this appears to do.
 - Proposed extension is an over-intensification of the site. Dwellings in this corner of Staleys Road were built closer together than elsewhere as there is no vehicle turning circle at the end of the cul-de-sac and driveways are of minimal dimensions for parking and access.
 - The single storey portion of the extension is approximately 20 centimetres from the north-west boundary and is 10 metres long and consists of a 3 metre high brick wall. The double storey appears to be on the boundary at the front. It would be unreasonable if as a consequence of the extension, access to the neighbouring garage and garden were to be restricted. A double storey dwelling should be a minimum of 1 metre from a boundary.
 - The proposal will result in daylight and sunlight restriction to neighbouring property.

- Application implies a public drain, when it is actually a private drain. Concern over connection and maintenance of manholes etc to drain.
- Concern over the ability to maintain neighbouring garage if proposed garage is erected 20 centimetres from boundary.

5. Determining Issues:

- 5.1 The site is within a residential area and the principle of an extension is acceptable. The main issues are whether the proposal will unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring residents and the street scene in general. Policy P4/12 and its Annexe are thus of relevance, particularly in regard to the issues of visual dominance and outlook from neighbouring properties, effect on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, effect on the street scene and car parking.
- 5.2 While the proposal will result in the two storey portion of the dwelling being located immediately adjacent to the boundary, I do not consider it to be detrimental to the character of the street scene. The proposal does not maintain a 1 metre gap between the whole length of the extension and the boundary. However, due to the site boundary being angled, and the existing dwelling and first floor extension being sited square to the street, a visual gap will remain at first floor level. In my opinion this meets the intention of PA4/12 (1) which is to decrease the effect of “terracing” and retain visual separation between dwellings. For the reasons discussed above, I consider that the proposal will not detract from the visual amenity of the street scene and surrounding area.
- 5.3 With regard to visual dominance of the proposed extension for neighbours, although the front of the two storey portion will be on the boundary, the majority of the building will be set back and meet the intention of PA4/12 (1). I also note that the extension is located adjacent to the driveway and garage of the neighbouring dwelling (No.19) and is located away from the main living areas and garden area of that dwelling.
- 5.4 The proposal will not result in the loss of privacy to adjoining properties as the only window proposed on the flank elevation is a high level window in the garage. I also note that on the adjoining property to the north-west, No.19, located directly against the boundary, is a driveway and garage which effectively screens views into the garden. The proposed windows in the rear and front elevations of the extension will not have a greater impact on privacy than the existing windows in these elevations, typical of semi-detached dwellings.
- 5.5 With regard to loss of daylight and sunlight, the proposed extension would not cause an unacceptable loss of either daylight and sunlight to the flank windows at No.19 Staleys Road. The ground floor utility window at No.19 would receive over 27% of daylight and over 25% of sunlight if the extension was built. These levels meet the BRE recommendations in terms of minimum levels of light available to habitable room windows.

- 5.6 KCC Highways has assessed the proposal with regard to parking and access and, although there are issues to be balanced with regard to car parking, no objections are raised.
- 5.7 The private representation received also raised concerns about maintenance of the neighbouring garage wall if the proposed garage were to be built close to the boundary. These and discharge issues are not material planning considerations in this instance.
- 5.8 Overall it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area, the residential amenities of the surrounding properties or the traffic / parking of the area. On this basis the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of P4/12 and its Annexe of the TMBLP 1998.

6. Recommendation:

6.1 Grant Planning Permission, 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. All materials used externally shall match those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or 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 north west flank elevation 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.

Contact: Kathryn Stapleton