

Hildenborough
Hildenborough

556704 148790 23 July 2014

TM/14/02070/FL

Proposal: Proposed one/two storey rear, two storey side and front porch extension
Location: 7 And 8 Church Road Hildenborough Tonbridge Kent TN11 9JL
Applicant: Mr S Hooper

1. Description:

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the extension of 7 and 8 Church Road as a combined scheme. The extensions are proposed to wrap around the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings to the side and rear. The works are predominately two-storey in scale to the side and rear, with additional single storey outshoots to the rear, an open side porch serving 7 Church Road and an enclosed front porch serving 8 Church Road.
- 1.2 Materials are shown to be a mix of brickwork and render with the roofs shown to be finished in brown concrete tiles.
- 1.3 Preparatory works have recently been carried out to the front garden of No.8 to enable the provision of additional off-street parking. This development is shown on the submitted plans but is considered to be permitted development, and therefore does not form part of the current planning application for Members determination.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 At the request of Ward Members in order for consideration to be given to the impacts of the proposed development on the neighbouring dwellings.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The application site contains a semi-detached pair of houses on the north side of Church Road, within the village confines of Hildenborough. The Hildenborough Conservation Area is located to the south, on the opposite side of Church Road.
- 3.2 The semi-detached pair is set back from the road. Both dwellings have relatively large rear gardens of some 24m.
- 3.3 This section of Church Road is characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties many of which have been extended over the years.
- 3.4 Church Road is narrow and intimate, especially within the Conservation Area to the south east of the application site.

4. Planning History:

4.1 No.7 Church Road:

TM/14/01315/FL Application Withdrawn 13 June 2014

Proposed single and two storey rear and side extension to existing house

TM/14/02071/FL Application Withdrawn 22 July 2014

Part one/two storey rear, and two storey side extension

4.2 No.8 Church Road:

TM/14/00747/TPOC Pending Consideration

Require oak tree which is covered in ivy and crosses several boundaries on neighbouring gardens to be felled as perceived as being a danger to nearby properties owned by the housing association and council

TM/14/01316/FL Application Withdrawn 28 May 2014

Proposed two storey and single storey rear and side extensions plus single storey front porch extension to existing house

5. Consultees:

- 5.1 PC: The Parish Council have been made aware of the inaccuracy on the plan showing 9 Church Road's footprint. They would like to see the impact of any overlooking windows taken into consideration.

[DPHEH – The discrepancy referred to by the PC related to an originally submitted block plan which gave the impression that 9 Church Road was larger in footprint than it is due to the demarcation of a rear patio area. This has since been amended to omit the patio to avoid any further confusion.]

- 5.2 Private Reps: 8/0X/3R/0S plus site & press notice. The 3 letters were all received from 9 Church Road and raise the following objections:

- Extension is too large in relation to the existing property and its plot;
- Side and rear extensions are too close to the common boundary with No.9 and would be oppressive and dominating causing overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight;

- Plans are misleading and the apparent outline of the building shown at No.9 to the rear is a patio not a building;
- Second storey window at the back would overlook No.9 as the plans show the window to be only 2m from the boundary;
- Church Road is narrow and suffers parking congestion. The previous garage at No.8 is not being replaced and the new driveway could result in up to two on-street spaces being lost;
- Size of the extension is out of character with the road, which is an attractive street where new development has been carefully controlled;
- Development will harm the setting of Hildenborough Conservation Area;
- Proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to 9 and is contrary to policy;
- Extension would have a detrimental impact on 9 Church Road given its position within 1m of the boundary;
- Extension is very large, giving a large increase in floor area and will be overbearing.

6. Determining Issues:

- 6.1 The site is located within the village confines of Hildenborough where the principle of development of this nature is acceptable in the broadest of policy terms. The proposed extensions are relatively large but the location of the site within the confines of the village means that there is no upper limit to the extent to which a property may be extended, *in principle*. Furthermore, it should be recognised that both dwellings are situated within large plots which are sufficient in size to accommodate the proposed extensions without amounting to an overdevelopment of the site.
- 6.2 With the principle of the proposed development having been established, it is necessary to ensure that the proposal would not harm the street scene and that the development is appropriate for the site and its surroundings. In these respects, Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP requires residential extensions to not have an adverse impact on “the character of the building or the street scene in terms of form, scale, design, materials and existing trees; nor the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of light and privacy, and overlooking of garden areas.” Policy P4/12 also has an Annex (PA4/12) which sets out further design guidance and amenity tests.

- 6.3 Policy CP24 of the TMBCS relates to achieving a high quality environment and paragraphs 57 and 58 of the NPPF set out similar criteria. Regard must also be had to the impact of the development on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 6.4 The proposal to extend the pair of semi-detached dwellings has been submitted as a joint scheme although the extensions would not represent a mirror image of each other. There is however no requirement for the pair of dwellings to remain as a pair in terms of their external appearance when viewed from the street scene. Indeed, either dwelling could at any time be extended to the side (at single storey level) or incorporate a front porch through householder “permitted development” provisions without any control from the LPA with regards the specific design. Instead, it is necessary to ensure the extensions are visually in keeping with the host dwellings and wider street scene. Both extensions are significantly set back from the front of the main dwellings and would have a lower overall ridge height, incorporating hipped roofs. These factors, combined, would ensure that the extensions would appear visually subservient to the host dwellings, which is acceptable. Sufficient distance between the flank walls of the extensions and the site boundaries would be maintained, ensuring that the extensions would not appear cramped within the plots and avoiding any potential for a terracing effect to occur.
- 6.5 The extensions have been designed in such a way to ensure that windows serving habitable rooms would not face towards neighbouring properties. Only one window is proposed to be installed within a flank wall at first floor level (7 Church Road) and that is shown to be obscure glazed and top-hung opening only, given that it is proposed to serve a bathroom. This can be secured by planning condition should Members be minded to grant planning permission.
- 6.6 Saved policy annex PA4/12 of the TMBLP states that in order to minimise any reduction in daylight into adjoining dwellings, and any impact on the outlook from such dwellings, single storey rear extensions should be designed so as to fall within the 45-degree angle zone taken from a half of the way across the neighbouring habitable room window nearest to the boundary. Given the degree of separation that exists between the proposed extensions and the neighbours either side of the application site (6 and 9 Church Road), this test is met and as such there would be no demonstrable loss of daylight/sunlight which could be said to harm the residential amenities of these neighbours.
- 6.7 Furthermore, as 7 Church Road is angled away from the common boundary with 6 Church Road, I consider that the extensions to this dwelling would not appear as an oppressive or dominant feature when viewed from this neighbouring property. This is assisted further by the staggered and subservient nature of the extension.

- 6.8 Similarly, the extension to 8 Church Road is well separated from its neighbour and the presence of a single storey garage, which is sited along the common boundary, acts as an intermediary feature in terms of built form.
- 6.9 It should also be acknowledged that both 6 and 9 Church Road are also served by relatively large rear gardens meaning that the extensions would not unduly dominate to the detriment of their residential amenity.
- 6.10 I consider that these factors combined mean that although the extensions would be visible from these neighbouring properties, their presence would not be so oppressive or dominant as to cause harm to the residential amenities of these neighbours.
- 6.11 The plans indicate that two parking spaces will be provided to serve each of the resultant dwellings within the associated front gardens. Whilst I appreciate it may have been preferable to retain a greater amount of soft landscaping to the front of the plots, this development on a standalone basis is considered to be permitted development and therefore does not form part of the current planning application for Members' determination. However, it can be recognised that the provision of 2 off street parking spaces to serve each of the resultant dwellings is considered to be acceptable, taking into account the requirements of KHS IGN3.
- 6.12 In light of the above considerations, I recommend that planning permission be granted subject to the imposition of conditions.

7. Recommendation:

- 7.1 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details: Site Plan 1334/02 D dated 30.07.2014, Existing Floor Plans 1334/03 A dated 23.07.2014, Existing Floor Plans 1334/04 A dated 23.07.2014, Existing Elevations 1334/05 A dated 23.07.2014, Proposed Floor Plans 1334/06 B dated 23.07.2014, Proposed Floor Plans 1334/07 B dated 23.07.2014, Proposed Elevations 1334/08 B dated 23.07.2014, Proposed Elevations 1334/09 B dated 23.07.2014, Email dated 23.07.2014, Email dated 30.07.2014, Site Plan 1334/02 C dated 23.07.2014, Email dated 15.07.2014, 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 accord with the approved plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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 window at first floor level on the north-west flank wall of 7 Church Road elevation 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.

4. The extensions shall not be occupied, until the area shown on the submitted layout as vehicle parking space serving the associated dwelling has been provided, surfaced and drained. Thereafter it shall be kept available for such use and no permanent development, whether or not permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out on the land so shown or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to this reserved parking space.

Reason: Development without provision of adequate accommodation for the parking of vehicles is likely to lead to hazardous on-street parking.

Contact: Vicky Bedford