

Design, Access and Planning Statement 13 Kimberly Drive, Sidcup, Kent, DA14 4PP Revised following refused planning application 21/00636/FUL

Proposed Development

The proposed works are to demolish a small rear kitchen projection and a side garage extension and construct a rear single storey pitched roof extension, a two storey side extension to replace the existing garage and a single storey extension across the front to enlarge the porch area and study. The two storey extension will have a pitched roof and a parapet wall to the side adjacent to the boundary. The front porch section will have a mono pitch roof.

Site Assessment

The existing building has been extended previously by the addition of the garage to the side, which is constructed between the neighbouring property and the host dwelling. It comprises of a garage door to the front, with the residual wall being constructed from timber, and a rear wall which is also constructed from timber with a single rear access door, the roof is of timber construction and slopes to the rear. To the rear there is an extensive area of decking, which is located above a garden which slopes to the rear. The property is located on a slope, with the house on the Left Hand Side when viewed from the front, higher than the subject property, which is in turn higher than the property to the Right Hand Side when viewed from the front. There have also been alterations made internally to the property which has resulted in an open plan layout and no separation between ground and first floors. Which could be considered an issue in terms of smoke distribution in the case of a fire.

Proposal & Design Features

The property is considered to be limited in terms of living space, the bedrooms are reasonable sizes, however the existing bathroom is quite small, and there is only one upstairs WC. The ground floor has been arranged such that the space for the Living Area in the Kitchen is quite small. The Kitchen is also limited in terms of space for a family house. Since the recent pandemic, there is also an increased need for home working space. The applicant has growing children and three similar sized bedrooms are considered essential. Consideration was initially given to converting the loft space, but upon inspection it was discovered that this wouldn't be possible due to the height of the ridge. The two storey side extension element of the proposal is conventional in concept and design, the smallest first floor bedroom is to be extended sideways to enlarge it and to give it parity with the other rooms. The front wall does not have a first floor set back, but this does match the neighbouring extension which doesn't have a first floor set back either. The rear part is to be used as a general dressing area and for wardrobe space. It was decided this was a better use of space than extending the existing bathroom which is small but adequate. It was felt that with the addition of a ground floor shower room the bathing and sanitary needs would be adequately met.

The front of the property has been extended to provide additional space within the hall, and this has been continued across the front to give additional room to the proposed study, also enabling the shower and utility rooms to be larger in size. The shower room and utility are internal rooms and will be mechanically ventilated. The single storey rear extension has been extended by 5m, which we believe to be acceptable under the neighbour consultation scheme, had it only been extending the existing house and not the two storey extension as well. This has been reduced from the originally applied for 6m taking on board the LPA's comments, It has been designed to be as neighbourly as possible, account has been taken of the change in levels between the houses and principally the property on the down slope. The internal layout features a step between the kitchen and lounge, so that the proposed extension can be kept lower than it would otherwise be, the eaves height has been kept to a minimum and the roof shape designed so that it causes minimum issues with light and outlook to the immediate neighbours. We considered that a mono pitch roof, against the existing building might be too oppressive in this instance. In addition we are given to understand that the neighbours on the up slope may be considering a rear ground floor extension and if this were to be undertaken, it

would potentially leave a dark, dank area between the potential extension to this property and the neighbour. It was decided to seek permission for a single storey rear extension, full width, to harmonise the design and to 'future proof' the situation should the neighbours decide to go ahead with similar extensions in the future. The difference in levels is such that the height between the subject property and that on the downslope, could create overlooking and we would contend that an extension in this area would enhance the privacy of the neighbour with little detrimental effect. Please note the dimensions taken from the adjoining neighbours side on the down slope. We have tried to be as considerate as possible to the neighbour on this side.

Access & Transportation

There are no changes to the access to the property for pedestrians and vehicles and the public transportation situation remains as existing and will not be affected by the proposals.

Conclusion

Whilst this is an enlargement of the property, we don't consider it disproportionate in its size, relative to the plot as a whole, especially as it has been reduced from the original application from a 6m projection to 5m. We consider the design sensitive to its surroundings and an enhancement to the area and an improvement on the current building in terms of design and materials. We hope the local planning authority can see that much thought has been given to the design of this building and its affect on the surroundings and the street scene generally. We always remain amenable to any discussions with regard to any aspect of this application.

Further Comments following refusal of application under 21/00636/FUL

The previous application was refused on three grounds which we would like to address below:

1. We fully understand that the extension does not align with current policy. However, it does fit in with architectural style of the immediate area. There are numerous extensions without the first floor set back, indeed the immediate neighbour, against which this would be built if permitted, does not have a set back, neither do the two properties immediately opposite, indeed the majority of the extended houses up hill from the application site do not have a first floor set back, we have produced a photo montage to illustrate this point. In addition the only extended houses without the set back to have a lower ridge line, have dummy pitches and flat roofs behind. We consider that a pitched roof is far superior to a flat roof and looks better within the street scene and when viewing the houses from the rear. It is more durable and therefore more sustainable. We hope that the photo montage illustrates that far from being an unbalanced and unsympathetic addition, it is indeed quite the opposite. The proposed extension mirroring other such extended properties in the immediate vicinity, using styling cues prevalent in the locale to help the proposed extension blend in. We would also refer the LPA to the planning appeal for 92 Penhill Road (APP/D5120/D/21/3267724), which was recently allowed in similar circumstances, where no particular architectural style was prevalent, the inspector in this case feeling that the addition would assimilate without causing undue harm. Indeed, Bexley planning did not raise any objection to the proposed ridge line on this application or insist on the set back. We feel, very strongly, that there are similarities between this proposal and that granted at 92 Penhill Road, and whilst being fully supportive of the objectives of the planning policies, we feel that a 'first floor set back' is neither necessary, nor desirable in this instance.
2. We note the comments and have reviewed the design, we have reduced the projection depth by 1m from the original application.

3. We don't believe that the extension will adversely affect number 11 Kimberley Drive as it is on the 'up slope' from the application site, that is to say the extension will appear smaller from their side. With regards to number 15, we do not believe it will impact greatly, we have brought the wall in from the immediate boundary, and have also designed the extension using dimensions taken from the lower, neighbouring, ground level to accord with permitted development guidance and therefore the neighbour consultation scheme guidance. The reduction in the rearward projection will also help to mitigate any impact on the neighbours. The roof sloping away from the boundaries makes the proposed extension less impactful than one with a mono pitch roof. The neighbours at number 15 are already over looked by the garden area of number 13 being higher than them. This garden area would be removed if the extension is permitted, increasing their privacy. The orientation of the building is such that shadowing from the sun as it moves during the day will not be an issue, and the roof design again helps with this.