

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

AREA 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 August 2011

Report of the Chief Solicitor

Part 1- Public

Matters for Information

1 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

- 1.1 Site **27 Godden Road, Snodland**
Appeal **Against the refusal of permission for a two-storey side and single- storey rear extensions, plus porch and garage to front**
Appellant **Mr Tony Chambers**
Decision **Appeal dismissed**
Background papers file: PA/20/11

Contact: Cliff Cochrane
01732 876038

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the amenities of adjoining residents.

Reasons

The appeal property is a semi-detached house on the western side of Godden Road within an established residential part of Snodland. There is a side access about 2.5m wide on the south side which currently gives access to a garage sited at the rear of the dwelling. The adjacent property, no.29, which is at a higher level and set forward of no.27, has a side access of similar width. The proposed two-storey side extension would reduce the space between the house and the side boundary to about 1 metre whilst the garage extension would project about 5.7m from the front of the house.

The houses in Godden Road are generally set back from the road frontage, giving an open aspect and there are far reaching views to the north towards countryside. The Inspector accepted that, because no.27 is well set back and the garage would only project about 1.25m beyond the adjacent property, the front extension would not obstruct the wider views to the north or the longer views up Godden Road. However, a front extension of this length would appear incongruous and over prominent when seen in its immediate context. In his view it would represent an inappropriate addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the immediately surrounding area.

Although the side extension would comply with advice in the Council's Policy Annexe PA4/12 that a 1m distance should be retained between a two-storey extension and the side boundary in order to prevent visual terracing, The Inspector considered that it would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the adjacent property.

No.25 has three clear glazed windows on the north side, serving a hallway, kitchen and first floor landing. The inspector accepted that, due to the position of these windows on the north side, there would be no significant loss of sunlight or daylight for the occupiers; however, the two-storey flank wall constructed 1.5m closer to their property would be overbearing and oppressive in their outlook, particularly from the kitchen window.

For these reasons the Inspector concluded that the proposal would be contrary to Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007, which says in particular that new development should respect the site and its surroundings.

Adrian Stanfield

Chief Solicitor

Screening for equality impacts:		
Question	Answer	Explanation of impacts
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community?	NO	Information report
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	N/A	Information report
c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		

In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above.