

4. Planning History:

TM/13/03423/FL Application Withdrawn 12 December 2013

Side and rear extensions with roof extension

5. Consultees:

5.1 Private Reps : 12/0X/8R/0S

Objections centre on the following grounds:

- Will alter the street view and character of this property and is out of character with the bungalows in the immediate neighbourhood;
- Would create an unbalanced appearance of the two houses;
- Area will look like a housing estate with more disruption, cars, noise and inconvenience to people in the area who are mainly old and enjoy peace and quiet;
- Bungalows are for the elderly;
- Concern that the alterations will facilitate use of the property as a business as owner is a builder; any permission should include a condition that prevents running a business from property;
- Would overlook rear garden and affect privacy of 22 Greentrees Avenue and reduce sunlight;
- Should not have side windows;
- Extension is too large and ugly;
- Rear dormer unbalances the building and dwarfs the house next door and will result in a loss of light;
- Will turn into a family home and thus reduce housing stock for elderly;
- Will result in parking on the road;
- There will be an increased level of noise as the party walls are thin;
- The area is occupied by retired people who appreciate the environment as two-bedroom bungalows are in short supply. Older people want to stay in the community with other retired people;

- The rear dormer should be reduced in size and take out the window nearest to no.22 to give them more privacy and less shadow.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The site lies within the built confines of Tonbridge meaning that the general principle of an extension of this size is broadly acceptable in policy terms. The main determining issues are therefore the impact of the proposed extension on the visual amenities of the locality and whether the proposed extension would have an adverse impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring property.
- 6.2 Policy CP24 of the TMBCS requires all development to be well designed and of a high quality in terms of detailing and use of appropriate materials, and that it must through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings. Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP states that extensions to residential properties will not be permitted if they would result in an adverse impact on the character of the building or the street scene in terms of form, scale, design, materials and existing trees or if they would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of light and privacy.
- 6.3 Comments have been received from 22 Greentrees Avenue together with other objections from residents in Greentrees Avenue concerned about the size and bulk of the extension and that it would be out of character within the area.
- 6.4 The proposed extension has been designed to fall within the relevant 45° angle zone as taken from the nearest habitable room window of adjoining properties. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of light to the adjacent dwellings such as to justify refusal on these grounds.
- 6.5 Although the extension would not be so demonstrably harmful to levels of daylight/sunlight for the neighbours to warrant refusal, I am concerned that the rear dormer is a somewhat bulky extension itself by virtue of its overall size and design. However, it is located just over 1.2 metres from the shared boundary with 22 Greentrees Avenue. Although the dormer could appear dominant when viewed from both neighbouring plots I consider that, provided suitable materials are to be used in its construction, this would help to reduce its impact.
- 6.6 However, under permitted development rights, it must be also be borne in mind that a similar sized box shaped dormer could be constructed on the original roof of the house. Such a dormer would potentially be located closer to the party boundary with 22 Greentrees Avenue. As such the “fall back” position that could be employed should this proposal be refused, could result in a more unacceptable overbearing impact and a loss of outlook from both neighbouring properties than that now proposed.

- 6.7 The works to the front of the house are considered to be in keeping with the overall design of the bungalow; it is not considered to unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, nor is it considered to be detrimental to the bungalow, the street scene or the amenities of neighbouring properties. The works concentrated to the side/rear of the bungalow will be exposed to limited public views, and have evolved due to the particular configuration of the boundary at this point. However, although this has resulted in a rather disjointed appearance to the ground floor extension, I do not consider that its appearance is detrimental to the extent of warranting a refusal on grounds of loss of outlook from adjoining dwellings.
- 6.8 The proposed development shows a parking space in the garage and a driveway that accommodates two car parking spaces. Two car parking spaces are sufficient to serve a four bedroom dwelling in this location and comply with the Council's adopted car parking standards prescribed within the IGN 3. Accordingly, the proposed development also complies with policy SQ 8 of the MDEDPD which requires proposals to comply with adopted car parking standards.
- 6.9 Whilst I can understand the nearby residents' concerns that bungalows for the elderly are being extended and used as family homes, this is not a sustainable reason to refuse a planning application in this instance.
- 6.9 Therefore on balance, given the fall back position that could be implemented under permitted development rights and the size of the extension when viewed in the wider locality, I am satisfied that the extension complies with the requirements of policy CP24 of the TMBCS, policies SQ1 and SQ8 of the MDE DPD and saved policy P4/12 of the TMBLP. As such, the following recommendation is put forward:

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details:
Existing Plans and Elevations 2013/19(23) REV1 sheet A-1 dated 18.12.2013,
Proposed Layout 2013/19(23) REV 1 sheet A-2 dated 18.12.2013, Proposed
Plans and Elevations 2013/19(23) REV 1 sheet A-3 dated 18.12.2013, subject to:

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 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.

Contact: Rebecca Jarman