
Report of 23 February 2006

Aylesford
Aylesford**571884 157838****07.10.2005****TM/05/03097/FL**

Proposal: Double storey rear extension and single storey front extension
Location: 231 Woodlands Road Aylesford Kent ME20 7QF
Applicant: Mr T Drennan

1. Description:

- 1.1 This full application proposes a two storey rear and a single storey front extension to a detached property. The application has been amended from the original submission to reduce the size and position of the rear extension. The rear extension would be approximately 4m deep and 4m wide with a pitched roof over. The ridge line would be 1m lower than that of the main house and the works would be set in approximately 0.5m from the existing side wall of the house and would therefore be 1.8m from the existing boundary of the site. The works to the front involve a pitched roof over the existing garage and the addition of a covered porch to the side. A high level window is also proposed to the north elevation of the existing house – this does not require the approval of the Council.

2. The Site:

- 2.1 The site is within the built confines of Aylesford and is outside the Holtwood Conservation Area. The land slopes up steeply towards the west (rear) of the plot. The area is characterised by detached houses approved and built in the 1960's and are of a standard design of little architectural merit.

3. Planning History:

- 3.1 None relevant.

4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: No objection to original or amended plans.
- 4.2 Kent Highway Services: No objection.
- 4.3 KCC (Heritage): No objection.
- 4.4 Private Reps: (original submission) 5/0X/1R/0S. One letter of objection received raising the following points:-
- Loss of light to house and garden due to overshadowing.
 - Loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight.

-
- Impact on the street scene.
 - Overlooking from new first floor windows.
 - No other houses have two storey extensions.
 - Would result in a terracing effect.
 - Loss of privacy.
 - Matching materials are no longer available that would lead to visual disharmony.
 - Disruption during construction.

One letter of objection received regarding the amended plans stating that the amendments are minor in nature and do not overcome the objections.

5. Determining Issues:

- 5.1 The site is in a residential area and the principle of an extension is acceptable. The main issues are whether the actual proposal will unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring residents and the local area in general. Policy P4/12 and its Annexe are thus of relevance.
- 5.2 The works would not be detrimental to the character of the street scene. The works to the front of the property do not significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling and are similar to other front extensions in the area, such as no. 229 adjacent. The rear extension would not be closer to the boundary than the existing house and would therefore not close the gap between the houses leading to a terracing effect.
- 5.3 The extension has been designed in accordance with Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP and the guidelines contained in Policy Annexe PA4/12. The works accord with residential outlook angles and conform with the BRE sunlight and daylight tests. Given the orientation of the development and distance from the boundary the extension would not significantly increase overshadowing of the house and garden. Plotting the potential shadowing from the works during the day indicates that the works would not block afternoon sun between March and September and have a small increase at other times. The existing house results in the loss of morning sun and this overshadowing would not be altered by the proposal.
- 5.4 Given the slope up to the west of the rear gardens and the trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the neighbouring garden there is already a sense of enclosure and it is considered that the proposed extension would not exacerbate this.

5.5 The overlooking of concern arises from an existing window. A new high level window is proposed which can be installed under permitted development rights. In any event as this is a high level window it prevents outward views.

5.6 Given the fact that the works accord with both Policy P4/12 and also pass the BRE tests the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

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 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.

Contact: Robin Gilbert

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS**AREA 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE****DATED 23 February 2006**

**Aylesford
Aylesford****TM/05/03097/FL****Double storey rear extension and single storey front extension at 231 Woodlands Road Aylesford Kent ME20 7QF for Mr T Drennan**

Letter has been sent to Members from neighbour highlighting issues of concern. This letter has already been formally submitted by the objector as part of their objections to the scheme.

DPT comment: Members should be aware that the photo montages attached to the neighbours letter cannot be considered accurate and do not provide a true reflection of the size of extension proposed. The extension when viewed from the front would be partially obscured by the existing dwelling and its depth would be foreshortened due to the positioned viewed from. The montage appears also not to be a true reflection of ridge height as the ridge would not be visible from this angle – the gable end wall of the existing house would obscure it. The view from the rear does not indicate the side wall of the extension stepped in from the existing side wall of the house. Approximately one third of the overall shaded length would be angled away and would also appear to reduce in height because of the effect of perspective.

RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED
