

3.5 Robin Hood Lane has a variety of house types and it is not considered that it is characterised by a certain house style or design.

4. Planning History:

TM/46/10084/OLD grant with conditions 3 April 1946

Bungalow.

TM/86/10519/FUL grant with conditions 3 December 1986

Rear extension (double and single storey).

TM/86/10980/FUL grant with conditions 19 February 1986

Double and single storey rear extension.

TM/02/02870/FL Grant With Conditions 21 November 2002

Front single storey extension and garage, rear conservatory and first floor side extension

TM/02/03384/LDC Certifies 28 November 2002

P

Lawful Development Certificate Proposed: Proposed gymnasium

TM/07/04406/FL Approved 4 February 2008

First floor extension to front elevation

5. Consultees:

5.1 PC: Objection. This would be built directly on the boundary and too close to the neighbouring property.

5.2 Private Reps: 3/0X/3R/0S. Three letters of objection received raising the following points:

- The erection of the extension would provide an expanse of brick wall along the common boundary with the adjoining property.
- Due to variations in ground level the flank wall would be overbearing at approximately 9ft high.

- The flank wall of the extension would be very close to the boundary and abut the neighbouring property's garage wall giving the appearance of a link detached property, which is out of keeping with the locality, may devalue the neighbouring property and disturb their garage foundations.
- One of the proposed velux windows would be directly opposite one of the windows in the neighbouring property.
- The property has been extensively extended and is over developed for the size of the plot and surrounding area, and the sheer scale of the property overwhelms the bungalows on either side of it.
- Inadequate room on the driveway for the family's cars and work vehicles, meaning they often have to park on the road.
- Other properties have applied for consent for an annex and had to assure the Council suitable off street parking for all cars belonging to the property.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The relevant policies for consideration are Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 and Saved Policy P4/12 and Policy Annex PA4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998.
- 6.2 Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007 seeks to ensure that all new development is well designed and respects the site and its surroundings.
- 6.3 Saved Policy P4/12 and Policy annex PA4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998 requires that residential extensions are in keeping with the character of the building and the street scene, and that residential extensions should respect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 6.4 The proposed side extension has been designed so that it is in keeping with the host dwelling and is set behind the existing garage. Therefore it is unlikely to be visible from the front of the property, unless looking up the road from the neighbouring property to the east.
- 6.5 Whilst the proposed extension is set relatively close to the common boundary line with no.209, to the east, it is considered that it would reduce the potential of overlooking of the neighbouring property, as the only windows are velux windows located in the roof slope and these replace a door and window in the existing side elevation. The extension would not result in a loss of outlook from the neighbouring property as the extension would be viewed against the form of the existing house only and not lead to any greater sense of enclosure. Additionally,

although the proposed extension is to be set close to the common boundary line with no.209, this property is also extended and has an extension, providing a garage, located within very close proximity to the boundary line.

- 6.6 Concern has been raised that the proposed side extension will cause a terracing effect due to its proximity with the common boundary. However, due to the detached form and staggered layout of the properties in this location it is not considered that this will be the case. Also, the works are positioned behind the existing building so would not alter the overall character and appearance of the development.
- 6.7 As the proposed extension has a maximum height of 3.4m, sloping away from the neighbouring property, and a height to eaves level of 2.4m, and is separated from the neighbouring property by their garage, it is not considered that the proposed extension will cause loss of daylight/sunlight to the neighbouring property. The extension would only be viewed against the existing side wall of the existing property so would not increase overshadowing.
- 6.8 Whilst it is acknowledged that the host dwelling has been significantly extended, it lies within the urban confines and as such additional works are acceptable in principle. It also needs to be recognised that the side extension is predominantly hidden from the main road by the existing garage. Whilst, it would be possible to view the proposed extension from the front garden area of the neighbouring property to the east, the works are not considered to be so detrimental to the overall character of the area to warrant refusal.
- 6.9 There are no highways issues caused by the proposal, as no additional bedrooms are created, and no additional parking is required in any event as the property provides ample parking facilities.
- 6.10 Therefore, in light of the above, the recommendation is for approval of this application.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Proposed Plans and Elevations 213/200 dated 12.09.2011, Floor Plans And Elevations 213/500 dated 12.09.2011, Location Plan 213/100 dated 12.09.2011, Block Plan 213/101 dated 12.09.2011, subject to:

Conditions / Reasons

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.

Contact: Vicky Bedford