

MC/17/1989

Date Received: 7 June, 2017

Location: 32 Silverspot Close, Rainham, Gillingham, ME8 8JS

Proposal: Construction of a two storey side and first floor rear extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Theobald

Agent: Mr Tamsett Architectural Designs 76 Ufton Lane Sittingbourne  
ME10 1EX

Ward Rainham South

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 30 August 2017.**

**Recommendation - Refusal**

- 1 The development by virtue of its size, scale and siting close to the west boundary with No. 33 Silverspot Close, would result in an unacceptable infilling of the gap above the garage that currently provides visual relief between properties. As a result, the proposal would erode the open character between the properties detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and the surrounding area in general, and would conflict with the objectives of Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework and, Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.
- 2 The property is set on higher gradient to the neighbouring semi to the west, No. 33 Silverspot Close, and this difference in land levels coupled with the height and depth of the side/rear extension, together with the fact that the application semi steps slightly behind this adjoining semi to west, means that the extension would potentially have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of that property when viewed from their rear first floor window or rear amenity space. The proposal would conflict with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

**For the reasons for this recommendation for refusal please see Planning Appraisal Section and Conclusions at the end of this report.**

## **Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two storey side and first floor rear extension.

The proposed extension would be constructed above existing side garage and in a wrap around manner over the single storey rear extension. The side extension would be approximately 2.5m wide with a set back of 1m from the front. The extension would be constructed with a gable end roof profile with a slightly lower ridge. The first floor rear extension would be constructed over the flat roof of the existing ground floor extension and would be 3m in depth with a 5.5m width (linked to the side element). The rear extension would be at least 2.5m away from the east boundary and would be constructed with a low pitched roof falling to a hip end on the east and west side. The extension would have height of 7.7m on the side and 6.7m on the rear element.

The proposal would create additional living space for the dwelling house in form of garage, utility and playroom on the ground floor and, two bedrooms and enlarged family bathroom on the first floor.

It should be noted that the reason of the large difference between the side extension ridge height and rear extension ridge height is due to the land level changes that are prevalent within the area.

## **Relevant Planning History**

GL/76/61	Garage and car port. Decision Refusal Decided 7 June, 1976
----------	--

## **Representations**

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

**4 Letters** of representation have been received from Nos. 31 and 33 Silverspot Close objecting to the proposed development. The objections are summarised under the following:

- Overdevelopment
- Impact to streetscene
- Impact to privacy
- Loss of light

The following matters raised are non material planning considerations:

- Impact to foundations
- require access to neighbouring property during build

## **Development Plan**

The Development Plan for the area comprises the Medway Local Plan 2003 (the Local Plan). 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*

By virtue of the siting of the proposed extension, the development would be visible from the highway. This side of Silverspot Close consists predominately of semi detached properties. The properties are spaced by their linked garages and set back from the highway providing an open feel between the semi-detached properties. It is noted that there are no first floor side extensions in the immediate surrounding.

The proposed extension would be built up to the boundary west boundary over the existing garage and whilst the design incorporates a 1m set back and lower ridge, this is not considered to be sufficient to overcome the impact that the extension would have on the character and appearance of the streetscene. The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale and siting close to the boundary, would erode this openness between these properties and, would result in a terracing effect, if the property to the west were to carry out a similar extension.

Consequently, the proposed two storey side extension would set an undesirable precedent that would be harmful to the character of the area. Therefore not in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

The applicant has put a case that two storey side extensions have been permitted in the area. It is noted, from available planning record, that permission was granted in 2000 for a two storey side extension to the property at No. 17 Silverspot Close. This site (No. 17) shares no similarities with the application site. No. 17 Silverspot Close is an end of terrace house set within a broadly triangular shaped plot and the extension approved has a significant set back from the front building line, in this case, if the neighbouring property carried out a similar development no terracing effect would occur. As such, it is not agreed that this approved extension shares similarity with the current proposed scheme and, therefore, should not be accepted as setting a precedent for this proposal.

### *Amenity*

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.

Due to the relationship with the neighbouring properties and their windows, no flank windows within the proposed extension, the orientation of the properties, path of the sun and time of shadow it is considered that there would be no significant additional impact from the development in terms of potential loss of daylight and shadow

cast/loss of sunlight. However, the proposed first floor rear extension would extend approximately 3m beyond the back building line. The application property is set on higher gradient to the neighbouring property to the west, No. 33 Silverspot Close and this difference in land levels coupled with the height and depth of the side/rear extension, together with the fact that the application semi steps slightly behind the adjoining semi to west, means that the extension would potentially have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of that property when viewed from their rear first floor window or rear amenity space.

Consequently, the proposal would not be in accordance with Policy BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### *Highways*

The proposal would result in the increase in the number of bedrooms from three to five. The property benefits from a garage and parking space for up to cars at the front of the property. The proposal would retain the garage parking space and in addition available spaces to the front, the development would be in line with the Council's Interim Parking Standards. The proposal would comply with Policy T13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

### **Conclusions and Reasons for Refusal**

The development by virtue of its size, scale and siting close to the west boundary with No. 33 Silverspot Close, would result in an unacceptable infilling of the gap above the garage that currently provides visual relief between properties. As a result, the proposal would erode upon the open character between the properties detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and the surrounding area in general. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar extensions that would have a negative impact on the area.

In addition, the application property is set on higher gradient to the neighbouring property to the west, No. 33 Silverspot Close and this difference in land levels coupled with the height and depth of the side/rear extension, together with the fact that the application semi steps slightly behind the adjoining semi to west, means that the extension would potentially have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of that property when viewed from their rear first floor window or rear amenity space.

The proposal would conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, especially paragraph 64, and Policies BNE1 and BNE2 of the Medway Local Plan 2003.

The application would normally be determined by delegated officers, however is being referred to Committee on the request of Cllr Royle.

---

## **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/>