

Item 4.6 – (14/04401/FULL6) – 29 Rolleston Avenue, Petts Wood**Comments from Ward Member Councillor Douglas Auld**

You have already heard from Mr Caple of the objections to this application from local residents. These residents include those who live at numbers 27 and 31 Rolleston Avenue on either side of the application's property. It will become apparent that I will also be opposing this application.

The proposal is to construct a 3.5m deep single storey rear extension, along with roof extensions comprising a partly hipped side gable extension, two rear dormers, front roof lights and a first floor flank window. It is the roof aspect in particular to which I will be objecting.

This roof extension will effectively convert the current semi-detached bungalow into a two storey dwelling and, as accepted by the planning officer, would affect the symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached bungalows. Surely these are undesirable changes. This would undoubtedly set a precedent in this avenue of houses which have largely remained unaltered since they were built probably fifty years ago or more.

Members you have read the officer's report. I would like to comment on a few matters contained in it:-

1. Under the heading 'Location' the last line states 'the road as a whole contains a mix of housing types'. It does not! The road in fact consists of fifty-six semi-detached bungalows interspersed with a smaller number of semi-detached houses. Nos. 2-18 and 1-35 are a slightly older design of semi-detached bungalows and houses of compatible and similar design, while nos. 20-80 and 37-87 are the same types of dwellings but of a slightly more recent design. There are a number of single storey side garages and two or three single storey side extensions. There are no two storey extensions in the whole length of Rolleston Avenue, this is especially relevant to the bungalows. Certainly none of the bungalows have an extension anything like that proposed.
2. Under the heading 'Planning History' you will have noted that an earlier application for a similar rear extension but with slightly larger roof extensions was withdrawn prior to determination. The withdrawal followed a meeting between the applicant and the planning officer. The revised application now has a partly hipped side gable facing no. 27. This is a marginal reduction to the withdrawn scheme.
3. Under 'Conclusions', the officer states that the proposals are not considered to significantly unbalance the pair. I totally disagree. If built this extension as viewed from the street scene would stick out like a sore thumb.
4. Mention is made of the proposed first floor flank window having obscure glazing. As an addition to that condition, should this application be successful, I would ask that the window should be permanently fixed shut.

For the reasons mentioned above, I believe this proposal if permitted would be detrimental to the character of Rolleston avenue.

Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. To those ends, proposals will be expected to meet ALL of the following criteria. These criteria include:-

- 1) Development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. (The result of this application would not be attractive to look at, eg symmetry and would not complement the scale, form, layout of adjacent buildings and the immediate area).
- 2) Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landmark features. (This development would be detrimental to the existing street scene.)
- 3) The development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. (This development would result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of the houses on either side by overlooking from the two proposed rear dormer windows and loss of natural light to the rear rooms, to the conservatory of one and to the patios of both these properties in the afternoon and evening.)

Policy H8 states the design and layouts of proposals for the alteration or enlargement to residential properties will be required to satisfy ALL of the following criteria:-

- 1) The scale, form and material of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with developments in the surrounding area. In this instance the development is not in the scale of the host building and not in the scale or form of developments in the surrounding area).

In conclusion this proposed extension is an over development and is out of scale with the host building and the houses in the immediate vicinity. As such it would be out of character in this location.

Further if built it would result in loss of amenity, in particular to the occupiers of the adjoining houses by reasons of loss of privacy/overlooking and loss of light and to other residents in the vicinity by reason of the appearance of this house in the street scene if the extension were to be built.

Members I ask that you refuse this application on the grounds of Policies BE1 and H8 as mentioned above.