

MC/20/3216

Date Received: 15 December 2020
Location: 65 Norman Close Wigmore
Gillingham Medway
Proposal: Construction of a single storey extension to front with part single
part two storey extension to side and rear
Applicant: Mr Nicholas Ward
Agent: G and C Designs
Mr Tim Grant 135 Rainham Road
Gillingham
ME7 5NQ
Ward: Hempstead And Wigmore Ward
Case Officer: Sam Pilbeam
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 31st March 2021.

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: 65NC002a-REV3, 65NC004b-REV3, 65NC006-REV2, and 65NC007a, received 11 February 2021.

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 amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the extension herein approved shall remain in use with the rest of the house as a single family dwellinghouse falling within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) and no change of use to C4 shall be carried out unless planning permission has been granted on an application relating thereto.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control such development in the interests of amenity, 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 proposal has been revised whereby the front projection has now been amended to be in line with existing garage/porch but extending across the whole of the front of the property. The side/rear extension would be set back from the front over the existing side garage and extend approx. 2.3m on the back at ground and first floor level.

The proposed building works would facilitate an additional bathroom and storage area alongside an extension to the kitchen and living room on the ground floor and a fourth bedroom on the first floor.

Relevant Planning History

NK3/72/397

Erection of a new garage and porch

Decision: Refuse

Decided: 22 February 1973

Representations

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

Two letters of objection were received, from 64 and 66 Norman Close. Following the revision to the front projection, further notification was undertaken.

Two additional letters of objection, from 64 and 66 Norman Close, maintaining their objection to the application on the following grounds:

- Loss of light
- Loss of outlook
- Out of keeping
- Overshadowing

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 2019 and are considered to conform.

Planning Appraisal

Background

The application was initially presented with a large single storey front extension, together with a first-floor side and rear extension. Following concerns raised by the case officer the application was subsequently amended to reduce the front projection as such keeping it in line with the existing garage/porch.

Design

Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan states that development should be satisfactory in terms of scale and mass and should respect the visual amenity of the surrounding area, this is further supported by paragraph 124 of the NPPF which emphasises the importance of good design.

It is considered the proposed development would not detract from the host property or streetscene. The front projection is of a modest size and scale which is sympathetic to the character of the area.

The proposed side extension, by reason of the set back from the front and slight set in from the edge of the garage walls, is also considered to be of an acceptable design quality that appears subordinate to the host property.

There are similar side extensions on the street and the proposed extension would generally be in keeping with this existing character and would not have a negative impact on the streetscene. Therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Amenity

Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 127 and 127f of the NPPF relates to the protection of these amenities.

Concerns have been raised that the rear extension would have an overbearing impact upon No.66, however, on account of its modest projection and the size of the neighbouring rear garden, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an intrusive or overbearing form of development. The extension would be set in away from the boundary with No. 66 and would be similar in projection to the existing development on that property. As such, further mitigating the effect of the development on the occupiers of that property.

Another concern highlighted by No.66 was that the extension would result in overshadowing and a loss of light. An overshadowing test has been conducted, illustrating that while there will be some impact upon No.66 this would be for a limited period of the day and mostly concentrated towards the rear of the garden. Therefore, would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or shadow cast.

In relation to loss of light to habitable rooms, the immediate adjoining window serves as a non-habitable room, consequently any potential impact would not be detrimental to the continued enjoyment of the dwelling. The remaining windows – situated further away from No.65 – would not be significantly impacted by the proposal. There are also concerns that the front extension would reduce the quantity of light and outlook from 64 Norman Road. It is not considered that the modest scale of the proposal would result in significant harm.

With regards to overlooking, it is considered that whilst the proposal would overlook into the adjoining neighbours' rear gardens it would not significantly exacerbate the current situation. Furthermore, the window to the rear would serve the new bedroom in addition to a primary window which faces the front. Consequently, this secondary window to the rear could be conditioned to be fitted with obscure glass if necessary, however it is not considered that the development would result in unacceptable levels of overlooking that would be harmful to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers by way of loss of privacy.

It is noted that the proposal would result in increased living accommodation for the dwelling house. As such, given the increase in the size of the property, there is potential for the property to be converted to a small HMO in the future, which in turn may result in a harmful impact to the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is therefore recommended that permitted development rights be removed with regard to the change of use between use class C3 and C4.

On basis of the above and subject to condition, the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact to neighbouring amenity and is considered to accord with Policy BNE2 of the Local Plan and paragraph 127f of the NPPF.

Highways

Whilst the proposal would increase the number of bedrooms and result in the loss of a garage it would still retain two off-street parking spaces within the site. Therefore, the proposal would comply with the Councils Interim Parking Standards. The proposal would therefore be in line with Policy T13 of the Local Plan and paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Local Finance Considerations

There are no local finance considerations.

Conclusions and Reasons for Approval

The proposed development would not detract from the character or appearance of the street scene or the host property. Likewise, it would not have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring amenities or highways safety. Therefore, the proposal would accord with Policies BNE1, BNE2 & T13 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 and paragraphs 109, 124 & 127f of the NPPF.

The application would normally be determined under delegated powers but is being referred for Committee determination at the request of Councillor Rodney Chambers raising concerns to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (echoing the concerns raised by the objectors).

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://publicaccess1.medway.gov.uk/online-applications/>