

MC/16/4833

Date Received: 29 November, 2016

Location: 66 Birch Grove Hempstead Gillingham ME7 3RB

Proposal: Construction of a part two storey part single storey rear extension; single storey front and side extension and widening of front access and vehicular crossover (demolition of existing garage)

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 15 March 2017.**

**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:

Drawing numbers BG1611.01A, BG1611.05A, BG1611.06A, BG1611.07A, BG1611.08A and BG1611.09A received on 21 February 2017.

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.

**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/side extension and a single storey/two storey rear extension and vehicular crossover – with the demolition of garage to rear.

The single storey aspect of the proposed front/side extension would have a projection of approximately 1.3m and have a width of approx. 4.4m. The hipped roof is proposed with an eaves height of approx. 2.2m and ridge height of approx. 3.m. The side extension would continue the hipped roof to the rear extension and project approx. 1.7m from the side elevation.

The two storey rear extension would project approx. 1.7m from the existing rear elevation with a width of approx. 6.5m. The ground floor extension would project slightly further to the rear at approx. 4m from the rear elevation and would have a width of 7.9m. The ground floor rear extension would have a hipped roof, which would have an eaves height of approx. 2.2m and a ridge of approx. 3.5m.

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

## **Relevant Planning History**

MC/16/2593	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
	Decision Refusal Decided 21 September, 2016

## **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;
- Loss of outlook

## **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**

### *Background*

This planning application attempts to overcome the reasons of refusal of the previous application (MC/16/2593). The previous application had two reasons for refusal which are as follows:

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site due to the following:

- The proposed side extension will substantially close the gap between properties at first floor level, setting a precedent that will change and harm the character of the immediate area and street scene which is characterised by semi detached properties set apart with space at first floor level.
- The rear first floor extension will result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook that the occupiers of the neighbouring property at 64 Birch Grove can reasonably expect to enjoy.

This application differs from the previous application as follows:

- The single storey front extension has been reduced in size;
- the two storey side extension has been reduced to a single storey; and
- the first floor part of the two storey rear extension has been reduced in depth from approx. 2m to 1.8m.

The application has been amended further after comments raised by the Planning Committee on 15th February 2017. The applicant has reduced the project of the first floor by approx 1.3m projection and reduced the roof pitch of the ground floor extension by 2 degrees.

### *Design and Streetscene*

Birch Grove lies within the urban area as defined in the Medway Local Plan (the Local Plan). The street is residential in character, with the section that comprises the application property, being characterized by semi detached properties

Policy BNE1 (General Design Principles For Built Development) of the Local Plan 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.

The layout of Birch Grove is such that there are visual gaps between the properties. The proposed front and side extensions would be visible from the highway. As the side

extension would only be single storey, it is considered that the remaining gap between properties at first floor level is sufficient to retain the character of open space at first floor level that is visible within the street scene.

With regard to the front extension element, there are other examples of similar development within the local vicinity. The proposed front extension is considered to be of an appropriate design in relation to both the street scene and the existing property particularly with regard to size and scale.

In relation to the design of the rear extension, the overall design is cohesive therefore no objection in terms of design would be raised.

Therefore taking into the account the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and is therefore in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan 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. This 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 siting of the extensions to the north of no. 68, there would be no significant increase in shadow cast. The extensions 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 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 first floor aspect would project approx. 1.8m from the existing rear elevation. An outlook test was conducted and demonstrated that it would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook from the neighbours first floor rear window.

In relation to loss of light, it is considered that there would be no significant impact that would warrant refusal of the application. With regards to shadowing, it is considered

that the proposal would have an impact however the host property already shadows during the morning hours and therefore any additional shadowing would not be considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.

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

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

### *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 Local Plan.

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

It is considered that this proposal is well designed in relation to the streetscene and the existing property and has addressed the previous reasons of refusal, The proposal would not be considered over-development of the plot nor is it considered to 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 15 February 2017, when it was determined to defer for further negotiation.

---

### **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/>