

MC/16/2593

Date Received: 16 June, 2016

Location: 66 Birch Grove, Hempstead, Gillingham ME7 3RB

Proposal: Construction of a single storey front extension, together with a two-storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension - demolition of garage to rear

Applicant: Mr Higglesden

Agent: Mr Jordan Wyndham Jordan Architects Heron House 8 Faversham Reach Upper Brents Faversham ME13 7LA

Ward Hempstead & Wigmore

Case Officer Robert Neave

Contact Number 01634 331700

---

**Recommendation of Officers to the Planning Committee, to be considered and determined by the Planning Committee at a meeting to be held on 21 September 2016.**

**Recommendation - Approval with Conditions**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

BG1611.01, BG1611.05, BG1611.06, BG1611.07, BG1611.08 and BG1611.09 received on 16th June 2016.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 All materials used externally shall match those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and without prejudice to conditions of visual amenity in the locality, in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the side elevations, at first floor level, of the two storey rear extension.

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, in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

**For the reasons for this recommendation for approval please see planning appraisal Section and Conclusions at the end of this report.**

### **Proposal**

This application is for the construction of a single storey front extension, together with a two storey side/front extension and a single storey/two storey rear extension – with the demolition of garage to rear.

The single storey aspect of the proposed front extension would have a projection of approximately 1.5 metres and have a width of approximately 8m. The mono-pitched roof is proposed with an eaves height that will be approximately 2m with the height and 3m to the ridge.

The two storey side extension would project 1.4m from the existing side elevation with a depth of 12.1m. The side extension would continue the gable roof and would match the existing eaves at approx. eaves 5m and the existing ridge at 7.5m.

The two storey rear extension would project 1.7m from the existing rear elevation with a width of 8.2m. The ground floor extension would project slightly further at 4m from the rear elevation and would have a width of 8.2m. The ground floor rear extension would have a pitched roof, which would have eaves of 2.3m and a ridge of 3.5m.

Overall, the proposal would create at ground floor level an enlarged kitchen/dinner, study, W.C, utility room and bin storage and at first floor level it would enlarge two bedrooms, one with an ensuite and a larger family bathroom.

### **Relevant Planning History**

GL/78/247A	Removal of flat over lounge and porch and part of garage to be replaced with sloped tiled roof. Decision Approval with Conditions Decided 07/11/1988
GL/78/247	Rear extension and garage (amended plan received 16/10/78) Decision Approval with Conditions Decided 17/11/1978

GL/76/87

Single storey rear lounge/kitchen/w.c., extension.  
Decision Approval with Conditions  
Decided 09/06/1976

## **Representations**

The application has been advertised by individual neighbour notification to the owners and occupiers of neighbouring properties.

**Four letters** (two from the same address) of representation were received, which object to the proposal:

- Loss of light to front lounge;
- Loss of light to rear conservatory;
- Impact on character;
- Other applications have been refused.

## **Development Plan**

The Development Plan for the area comprises the Medway Local Plan 2003. The policies referred to within this document and used in the processing of this application have been assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012 and are considered to conform.

## **Planning Appraisal**

### *Design and Streetscene*

Birch Grove is residential in character with large detached and semi-detached properties set within a relatively leafy street in Hempstead. The property lies within the urban area as defined in the Medway Local Plan 2003 (Local Plan). The street scene is made up of predominantly two-storey, semi-detached dwellings.

Policy BNE1 (General Design Principles For Built Development) of the Medway Local Plan 2003 (MLP, 2003) states that the design of development should be appropriate in relation to character, appearance and functioning of the built and natural environment by being satisfactory in terms of use, scale, mass, proportion, details and materials.

There have been a number of applications for two story side extensions within Birch Grove, No. 95 Birch Grove had a two storey side extension refused, however a subsequent planning application (MC/10/0824) was granted. Furthermore, an application for No.39 Birch Grove was refused on design grounds. A similar proposal at No.62 Birch Grove (NK3/70/34B) was granted, which extended the side extension up to the boundary.

The layout of Birch Grove is such that there are visual gaps between the properties. The proposed extensions would be visible from the highway and would enclose an existing gap. Whilst the proposed side extension would abut the side boundary, as the neighbouring property has a single storey garage, the visual gap at first floor level

between No.66 and No.68 would remain, therefore no concerns regarding a terracing effect would be raised.

With regard to the front extension element, the proposal would mirror similar development within the local vicinity. The proposed front extension is considered to be of an appropriate size and scale in the context of the surrounding streetscene and the pitched roof would be in keeping with the existing streetscene.

In relation to the design of the rear extension, the overall design would appear acceptable.

Therefore taking into account the above, when assessed against policy criteria, the extent of the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact in terms of design impact on the property or the surrounding streetscene. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and the objectives of the design principles set out in the NPPF.

### *Amenity Considerations*

Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 relates to the protection of amenities for existing residents within the locality. The impact on neighbouring properties is considered with regard to privacy protection, visual dominance and potential loss of outlook, loss of daylight and shadow cast/loss of sunlight.

*Impact on no. 68:* The property to the south, No.68, has a garage located adjacent to the boundary. It is considered that there would be minimal impact to the neighbouring property in relation to visual dominance and potential loss of outlook, loss of daylight/sunlight, due to the distance between the proposal and the neighbours' habitable windows and the modest projection of the extensions. The neighbour has two first floor windows to the side elevation, serving non-habitable rooms, so there would be no unacceptable impact into these rooms.

Due to the orientation of the extensions to the north of no. 68, there would be no significant increase in shadow cast. The extension, although partly two storey in height, would be set away from the dividing boundary and would not result in an enclosing or overbearing impact for the neighbours whilst in their rear garden or dwelling, due to the separation distance and location. The impact of the extensions is considered to be acceptable.

With regard to loss of privacy, whilst the proposal would see an additional window inserted to the rear elevation, it is not considered that this impact would not be sufficient to refuse the application.

*Impact on no. 64:* The adjoining neighbour No.64, located to the north of the application site, has a modest single storey rear extension. The proposed ground floor extension would project back a similar distance as the neighbour's extension. The proposed two storey element would only be 2m in depth and would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook from the neighbours' first floor room that is served by a rear window.

In relation to loss of light and overshadowing, it is considered that whilst there would be an impact, it is not of a sufficient level that would warrant refusal of the application. This is due to the host property casting a shadow during the morning hours already.

With regard to loss of privacy, whilst the proposal would include an additional window inserted to the rear elevation, this is not considered unacceptable.

Concern was raised in relation to the impact of the extension on the neighbours' lounge, in respect of loss of daylight and sunlight. The extension would project only 1.5m and is not considered to result in an unacceptable level of harm.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development conforms to the objectives of Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### *Highways*

The property as a result of the proposed extension would have three bedrooms. There would be no change to the existing parking arrangement, which is for one off-street parking space. However, being located in a sustainable location close to public transport and in a relatively quiet street with some on-street parking, failure to provide an additional off street parking space is considered not to have any impact on the highway and the proposal is in accordance with Policy T1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### **Conclusion and reasons for approval**

It is considered that the proposed extension is well designed, in keeping with the street scene and character of the immediate surrounding area. Taking into account the spacing of the property with its immediate neighbour, as well as the general pattern of development in the vicinity, the proposal would not cause over-development of the plot or harm to the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties and therefore accords with the provisions of the aforementioned policies.

This application would normally be determined under delegated powers but is being referred for determination by Planning Committee due to the number of representations which have been received expressing views contrary to the Officer recommendation.

This application was considered by Members at the Planning Committee on the 24 August 2016, when it was determined to defer a decision to enable a Members' site visit to be held.

---

### **Background Papers**

The relevant background papers relating to the individual applications comprise: the applications and all supporting documentation submitted therewith; and items identified in any Relevant History and Representations section within the report.

Any information referred to is available for inspection in the Planning Offices of

Medway Council at Gun Wharf, Dock Road, Chatham ME4 4TR and here  
<http://publicaccess.medway.gov.uk/online-applications/>