
West Malling **567706 157746** **7 March 2011** **TM/11/00607/FL**
West Malling And
Leybourne

Proposal: Creation of a pitched roof above a pair of semi detached
properties (including additional accommodation to number 28)
Location: 28 And 30 Sandown Road West Malling Kent ME19 6NS
Applicant: Mr David Clayton And Mr Arthur Chamberlain

1. Description:

- 1.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the creation of a pitched roof on no's 28 and 30 Sandown Road.
- 1.2 The pitch of the proposed roofs is 40°. It is shown that the proposal would create two additional bedrooms and an en-suite bathroom in no. 28. Two rooflights would be inserted in the front roofslope and two in the rear.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 The application is locally controversial and at the request of Councillor Worrall.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The subject site is located on the southeast side of Sandown Road in West Malling. It accommodates 2 no. two-storey flat roofed semi-detached dwellings. The locality is entirely residential with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terrace houses of varying styles, some with flat roofs and some with pitched roofs.

4. Planning History:

TM/07/01859/FL Approved 30 July 2007

First floor front extension over existing porch and two storey rear extension

TM/10/02834/FL Approved 14 December 2010

Single storey front extension (Retrospective)

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: Members were aware of objections from neighbours but nonetheless had no objections themselves.

5.2 Private Reps + Art 8 Site & Press: 16/0S/11R/0X. Eleven objections received, objecting on the following grounds:

- The proposal does not aesthetically enhance the existing dwelling and is out of keeping with the low profile flat roof houses surrounding it as a result of its scale, layout, character and appearance.
- The gable ends will give an expanse of brickwork.
- The proposal will add to existing extensions already granted and result in over intensive development of the site with houses out of scale with their neighbours and is contrary to Policy CP11 of the TMBCS.
- This pair of semi-detached houses are built on a higher ground level than the adjacent dwellings, which would make the proposed roof extension considerably higher than their flat roofs.
- The proposal would impair the right of light of adjacent dwellings due to the higher roof.
- The proposal would result in a loss of outlook.
- The proposed window on the roof extension of no. 30 will look directly into the upper windows of adjacent properties.
- The proposal would result in overshadowing of adjacent gardens.
- The proposal would result in a loss of light to adjacent properties.
- The proposal would result in a loss of view.
- The proposed en-suite in the roof space would result in a decrease in water pressure.
- If the proposal is approved it would create a precedent.
- The dwellings to the rear of the site in Offham Road are bungalows and the proposal would be overbearing on these properties.
- The loss of light that would result would result in additional frost during the winter.
- The proposed new side windows should be obscure glazed to avoid loss of privacy.
- Contrary to a condition that the dwellings be flat roofed.
- Loss of aesthetics and charm from the unusual construction of the units.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The main determining issue is whether the proposed extension would have any detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling and street-scene or on neighbouring amenity.
- 6.2 Policy CP1 of the TMBCS requires new development to result in a high quality sustainable environment and policy CP24 requires development proposals to be of a high quality and to be well designed to respect the site and its surroundings in terms of scale, layout, siting, character and appearance.
- 6.3 Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP and policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD also require development to respect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and to protect, conserve and enhance the local distinctiveness and interest of the area respectively.
- 6.4 The adjacent dwellings have flat roofs. However, there are a number of dwellings surrounding the site that have pitched roofs, of varying degrees of pitch, and therefore I am of the opinion that the proposal is in keeping with the surrounding locality.
- 6.5 Whilst I note concerns about the loss of the 1960's aesthetics, in the absence of a specific designation (eg Conservation Area), Members may agree that is not an issue to warrant refusal of this scheme.
- 6.6 No. 28 has previously benefitted from a two storey rear extension and a single storey front extension. However, I am of the opinion that the proposal will not result in over-intensive development of the site, or be out of scale with the adjacent dwellings and, as such, accords with Policy CP24 of the TMBCS.
- 6.7 Issues relating to a 'right of light' are not material planning considerations. I am of the opinion that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of sunlight and daylight and accords with saved Policy PA4/12 of the TMBLP.
- 6.8 There is a distance of 32m between 28 & 30 Sandown Road and the dwellings to the rear of the site in Offham Road. The dwellings in Offham Road, to the rear of the application site, are single storey. However, given the distance between the subject dwellings and those in Offham Road, I am satisfied that the proposal will not result in a loss of outlook nor will it be significantly overbearing.
- 6.9 Given the distance between the proposed roof extension and the dwellings to the rear of the site in Offham Road, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of privacy to these dwellings, and is thus in accordance with saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP. A window is proposed in the side gable of each of the dwellings. It appears that this would face towards a principal privacy area in

the rear garden of 26 Sandown Road and towards the front garden areas of adjacent dwellings in Sandown Road. A condition can require that the glazing of these windows is obscured glazing.

- 6.10 I note the objections that the proposal would result in a loss of view. However, this is not a material planning consideration. Issues relating to the proposal resulting in a reduction of water pressure are not a material planning consideration.
- 6.11 Whilst the proposal may result in other dwellings wishing to carry out similar extensions, each case would be considered on its own merits.
- 6.12 I note the concerns that the proposal would result in additional frost in the vicinity. However, this is not a material consideration.
- 6.13 The current houses have 3 and 4 bedrooms respectively and so the enlargement does not increase the parking requirements, based on adopted standards, which is 2 independently accessible spaces per unit.
- 6.14 In light of the above considerations, I am of the opinion that the proposal is acceptable.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Location Plan dated 07.03.2011, Proposed Plans and Elevations PA/10/016/01 dated 07.03.2011, Existing Plans and Elevations PA/10/016/02 dated 07.03.2011, 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. The windows on the south-west and north-east elevations shall be fitted with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung light shall be non-opening. This work shall be effected before the extension is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.

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

Contact: Glenda Egerton