

Offham **565461 157429** **3 November 2006** **TM/06/03588/FL**
Downs

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

1. Description:

- 1.1 Members may recall that earlier proposals to extend and alter this bungalow were considered and refused at the August meeting of this committee. The applicant has appealed against that decision to refuse planning permission but has also sought to overcome the reasons for refusing the earlier application through redesigning the proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling. That revised scheme is the subject of this new application.
- 1.2 These amended proposals continue to seek approval for rear and side extensions to the bungalow and the provision of a new pitched roof incorporating first floor accommodation above the enlarged footprint but feature a notably different roof design with a traditional pitched roof featuring half hips and gables.
- 1.3 A new gabled bay is proposed on the right (NW) hand side of the bungalow with the main roof running from flank to flank. The dwelling would be enlarged from a two bed bungalow to a four bed roomed chalet bungalow with the rear extension adding 3m of depth to the property and the side extension a further 4.15 width. The height of the new roof over the extended bungalow would be limited to being the same as the ridge height of the existing dwelling which is approximately 6.5m high. The side elevations of the building would be rendered, the front elevation would be in facing brickwork and the new roof clad with plain tiles. (NB – this application originally featured proposals for a taller new roof that would have extended the height of the building to approximately 7.5 metres but this has been reduced during the course of the application to 6.5m).
- 1.4 The application also seeks permission for the erection of a double garage to the front and a new frontage wall. The garage would have a footprint of 35m² and stand 4.8m high at the apex of its gabled roof with the frontage wall being constructed with a range of heights with the principal sections being 1m high and brick piers 1.3m and 2.1m high.

2. The Site:

- 2.1 The site lies within a residential area located within the built confines of Offham. The character of the surrounding area is mixed with a range of house sizes, designs and materials found in this part of the village. This section of road predominantly features bungalows but also includes two storey properties.

3. Planning History:

TM/67/10629/OLD Grant with conditions 21 November 1967
(MK/4/67/428)

A bungalow and vehicular access. (as amended by letter dated the 10th October, 1967).

TM/67/10919/OLD Grant with conditions 21 February 1967
(MK/4/67/11)

Outline Application for bungalow and vehicular access.

TM/76/11022/FUL Grant with conditions 1 July 1976
(TM/75/775)

The erection of 6ft. boarded fence along front of property.

TM/06/01664/FL Refuse 24 August 2006
Appeal Undetermined

Ground floor extensions and provision of new roof to bungalow incorporating rooms within the new roof space and erection of double garage to front.

4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: The Parish Council strongly objected to the original design contained within this application but its views on the latest iteration of the scheme which show the reduced ridge height are awaited.
- 4.2 KCC Highways: No objections subject to conditions.
- 4.3 Private reps: 6 + Art 8 0R/0X/0S.

5. Determining Issues:

- 5.1 Given that site lies within an area within the built settlement confines, the broad principle of these alterations and extensions to this residential property must be considered acceptable. Indeed, within such a location, there is no restriction per se on the extent to which a dwelling can be enlarged and consideration of the proposal therefore needs to concentrate on matters of detail. The Council's policy guidance on such a proposal is primarily contained in P4/12 of the TMBLP 1998, which prescribes that additions to residential properties must not have an adverse

impact upon the character of the host building or the wider 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 implications of the provision of additional bedrooms need to be considered.

- 5.2 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. Additionally, a similarly sized and located garage can be found at a neighbouring plot.
- 5.3 The main potential for harm to visual amenity in my view arises from the increased extent of the roof and the resultant additional bulk at first floor level. Looking at the characteristics of the surrounding locality, there is a range of styles and designs of property – although this site lies within a group of bungalows. Currently, most of the bungalows within this group and section of the road are relatively small structures standing approximately 6 to 6.5m high. Whilst these proposals would result in a much wider and larger building, since its roof height would be comparable with the existing dwelling and some of its neighbours, and given that the locality generally features a range of building styles and heights including some two storey developments nearby, I consider that the proposals can be considered acceptable. In reaching this conclusion, I have noted the previous application that was refused by the Council because of concerns regarding the height, bulk and design of those earlier proposals. (It is also important to consider that the property appears to enjoy its full permitted development entitlements and, as such, significant extensions to the roof or a large side addition could be added without the need for this Council's permission - including potentially a large flat roofed extension).
- 5.4 Turning now to the visual impacts of the new garage to the front of the existing dwelling. Garages within front gardens can often be problematic in planning terms and sometimes appear out of character. However, in this case, there is no clearly defined uniform 'building line' here and, in fact, 'The Bungalow' is recessed behind most other properties in this part of the road. 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.)
- 5.5 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. I am also satisfied that none of the new first floor windows proposed would cause any loss of privacy. (All potential overlooking windows are obscure glazed and/or face neighbouring windows that serve non-habitable rooms such as bathrooms, kitchens and hallways).

- 5.6 I find the proposals to also be acceptable with regard to issues of light and outlook. The only window serving a habitable room of neighbouring dwellings that would be affected in any significant terms would be a kitchen/diner window serving 'Pilgrims'. However, that kitchen/diner room has two secondary windows so I consider that the impact upon the outlook of that room would not be unduly harmful.
- 5.7 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.
- 5.8 In summary, I consider that the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to highway safety, or to the amenities of neighbouring property and that the reduced height overcomes the objections raised in connection with a previous application.

6. Recommendation:

6.1 **Grant Planning Permission** as detailed in drawing nos. 1-06.1.; 1-06.2. & 1-06.3 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. 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.

4. 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.

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 south east or north west elevation(s) 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. Any gateway to the access shall be set back 5.0 metres from the edge of the highway.

Reason: To enable vehicles to stand off the highway whilst any gates are being operated.

Contact: Kevin Wise