

MC/17/4243

Date Received: 11 December, 2017

Location: 59 Twydall Lane, Twydall, Gillingham ME8 6JE

Proposal: Retrospective application for the construction of part single part two storey rear extension and side extension at first floor level windows at first floor level to side, roof light to front - demolition of conservatory to the rear

Applicant: Mr McLelland

Agent: Mrs T Brown 34 Fallowfield Wayfield Chatham ME5 0DX

Ward Twydall

Case Officer Dylan Campbell

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 14 March 2018.

Recommendation - Refusal

- 1 Due to the height and angle of pitch requiring the use of flat (table top) roof, the first floor side and two storey rear extension appear bulky, dominant and of a contrived design when viewed from the street scene, but particularly when viewed from the rear gardens of the application property itself and surrounding neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered detrimental to the appearance of the existing property and the visual amenity of the locality contrary to paragraph 56 of the NPPF and Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan.

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

Proposal

Retrospective application for the construction of part single part two storey rear extension and side extension at first floor level windows at first floor level to side, roof light to front - demolition of conservatory to the rear

Relevant Planning History

MC/17/4229 Application for non-material amendment to planning permission MC/16/4202 for alterations to roof pitch, window

locations and colour of external cladding
Decision Withdrawn - Invalid
Decided 8 December, 2017

MC/16/4202

Construction of part single part two storey rear extension and side extension at first floor level windows at first floor level to side, roof light to front - demolition of conservatory to the rear
Decision Approval With Conditions
Decided 14 December, 2016

Representations

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

Three letters have been received raising the following concerns:

- Loss of daylight and sunlight
- Out of character and appearance with the original dwelling and streetscene
- Encroachment
- Loss of privacy due to overlooking

Other objections are not material planning matters and have not been taken into consideration.

Twenty-six letters of support have been received. **Six** of these letters were received from dwellings located in Twydall Lane.

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

Background

59 Twydall Lane is a semi-detached property that has recently been granted planning permission for the construction of a part single storey part two storey rear extension and side extension at first floor level with windows at first floor level to side, roof light to front - demolition of conservatory to the rear under planning application reference MC/16/4202.

During the construction of the proposed development it was brought the Council's attention that the development was not being built in accordance with the approved plans.

Following an enforcement site visit it was noted that the following elements are where

the development appeared to deviate from the approved plans:

- Ridge higher than approved plans.
- Angle of roof slope is steeper than approved plans.
- Roof extension is wider than approved plans.
- Two roof lights on the side elevation of roof slope.
- Wider roof overhang.
- Grey uPVC cladding not black as stated on approved drawings and planning application

In an attempt to address the differences the planning agent submitted an application for a non-material amendment to the approved scheme. The discrepancies were not considered non-material and the planning agent was advised to submit a planning application. The application for a non-material amendment was withdrawn on 8 December 2017.

This current application for planning permission was submitted on 12 December 2017. Following the initial site visit on 21 December 2017 by the case officer and a review of the submitted drawings it was considered that the submitted drawings didn't accurately reflect what had been constructed on site. The planning agent was advised to submit accurate drawings. Further drawings were submitted but again, did not appear to accurately reflect what was constructed on site.

Another site visit was carried out by officers along with the planning agent and applicant on 13 February 2018 to assess the accuracy of the drawings. Following this site visit, revised drawings have now been received that appear to reflect the development on site.

Design

The streetscene consists of residential dwellings of mixed design. The immediate area around the host property comprises 1930s chalet bungalows and terraced dwellings. The host property was a semi-detached, two-storey, two bedroom property sharing a gable roof with its neighbour to the south. The property has been extended in the past in the form of a rear single storey rear extension. The overall proposal is visible from both the highway and neighbouring properties.

Single storey rear extension

The single storey rear extension projects approx. 2m from the two storey rear extension and has a ridge height of approx. 2.9m. It is not visible from the streetscene and it is not considered to be a prominent form of development. The single storey rear extension is not considered harmful to the appearance of the existing dwelling.

Two storey rear and first floor side extension

The proposed two storey rear and first floor side extensions are the main area of concern with regard to design and shows the most substantial change to what has previously been approved. The previous proposal showed the ridge of the extensions to be lower than the ridge height of the house; to have an angle of pitch

more reflective of the pitch of the existing house; and for the rear extension to be set slightly off the boundary with the semi detached neighbour at number 57. The two storey rear and first floor side extensions that have been constructed on site are of a similar ridge height to the existing house; the angle of pitch is such that top of the rear extension has a flat roof which is just under 2m wide; and the rear extension has been constructed right up to the boundary with number 57. From ground level it appears that the guttering of the extension encroaches onto number 57.

It is acknowledged that the rear extension is not visible from the streetscene but can be seen from the rear gardens of surrounding properties. The first floor side extension is visible from the street scene. By granting approval to the previous scheme, the Council is clearly not adverse to allowing householders to enlarge their properties with substantial extensions. However, amongst other material considerations, set out below, this is subject to the design being considered acceptable when taking account of paragraph 56 of the NPPF and Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan. Due to the height and angle of pitch requiring the use of flat (table top) roof, the first floor side and two storey rear extension appear bulky, dominant and of a contrived design when viewed from the street scene, but particularly when viewed from the rear gardens of the application property itself and surrounding neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered detrimental to the appearance of the existing property and the visual amenity of the locality contrary to paragraph 56 of the NPPF and Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan.

Amenity

Whilst there would be an increased impact on neighbouring residential amenities in terms of loss of sunlight, daylight and privacy it is not considered to be a significant increase to what has previously been granted planning permission under reference MC/16/4202 and therefore no objection is raised with regard to paragraph 17 of the NPPF and Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan.

It is noted that it appears that the eaves and guttering encroach onto number 57, however, this is a civil issue.

Highways

There are no concerns with regard to highways. The proposal is in accordance with Policy T13 of the Local Plan.

Conclusions and Reasons for Refusal

Due to the height and angle of pitch requiring the use of flat (table top) roof, the first floor side and two storey rear extension appear bulky, dominant and of a contrived design when viewed from the street scene, but particularly when viewed from the rear gardens of the application property itself and surrounding neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered detrimental to the appearance of the existing property and the visual amenity of the locality contrary to paragraph 56 of the NPPF and Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan.

This application would normally be determined under officer delegated powers, but is

being referred to Members for consideration due to the number of letters of representation received contrary to officers' recommendation.

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/>