

Planning Application (part retrospective) 252476 at 28 Milton Road

Retrospective Application to take into account changes from Approved application 241588.
The changes concern the following:

1. lack of subservience of two storey side extension,
2. moved closer to the boundary of no26,
3. change to roof dormers losing roof character and increasing overlooking,
4. rendering over brickwork
5. changing roof tiles from red to grey.
6. Increased height of rear extension

Objection from ACER, The Whitegates Residents Association

The visual impact is radically different from that depicted in the approved plans in application 241588.

The submitted drawings **do not show the relationship to neighbouring properties** and therefore do not show the changed appearance compared to the conjoined semi-detached house at 30 Milton Road, or the encroachment and dominance over no 26



Fig 1: Frontage as built



Fig2: Front as Approved

Approved Application 241588 showed:

- the side extension roofline lower than the main property,
- retention of the brickwork at ground floor level in keeping with conjoined semi at no 30.
- the side wall inset from the boundary by 800mm (instead of the 1m normally required).
- Red tiles both matching the original tiles and that of the conjoined semi at no 30
- Three modest separated dormers with pitched roofs set back from the rear wall by 550mm which both retained the roof style and limited both overlooking and visual intrusion experienced by neighbours using their gardens

This current application 252476 has:

- The side extension roofline remaining the same as the main property
- All the brickwork at ground floor level rendered over, apart from the brick archway
- The side wall inset from the boundary by only 400mm, i.e. half the approved 800mm and well short of the 1m MINIMUM normally required.
- Grey tiles contrasting with the red tiles of the conjoined semi at no. 30
- One very large flat top dormer taking up most of the roof with Juliet balcony near the edge of the roof, plus a small adjacent dormer set back but taking up the rest of the roof width. These changes to the dormers both lose the roof character completely and facilitate easy overlooking into neighbouring gardens as well as appearing intrusive and overbearing to the neighbours.
- Increased height of rear extension from 3.2 to 3.5m



**Fig 3: Three Pitch-Roof Dormers
As Approved**



**Fig 4: Two Obtrusive Dormers As-Built
Note stack pipe**

Four Significant Impacts of changes

There are four significant impacts of these unapproved changes, all of which detract from the character of the area and are contrary to strategic policy CP3 which requires development to be *“of an appropriate build form and character to the area....-without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users and their quality of life”*.

1. The first significant impact is the lop-sided and terraced frontal appearance, emphasised by the loss of characteristic brickwork, the roof of the extension not lower than the main property and the grey tiles differing from the red tiles of the adjoining roof.
2. The second significant impact is the encroachment and domination of no 26, due to
a) the extension wall moving closer to the boundary, leaving a 400mm gap instead of 800mm as approved.

b)The roofline of the extension not being lower than the main property contributes to this domination, and

c), the lack of a sloping hip end roof on the extension in compliance with the Borough Design Guide. This latter requirement was originally negated by the planning officer as they considered the set back and lower roof of the extension to be sufficient to negate the terracing effect. A hip end has now been shown to be required to both reduce domination and fit in with the dominant character of the street.

It should be noted that no 26 is lower down the slope than 28, thereby adding to the dominance now that 28 has been built even closer than approved.



Fig 5: Dominance and overbearing of the side extension with respect to 26

3. The third significant impact is the replacement of three spaced out and set back dormers with one exceptionally large dormer with a Juliet balcony virtually in line with the back wall, plus a smaller dormer set back but taking up the remainder of the roof width. The effect is twofold, both losing the character of the roof completely, and secondly, facilitating enhanced overlooking field of regard into neighbouring gardens. In addition the windows in the dormers appear intrusive to neighbours in their relatively secluded suburban garden recreational space.
4. The Fourth significant impact is the increase in average height of the sidewall of the rear extension from 3.2 to 3.5m. This further reduces the direct sunlight onto the patio area of the rear garden, as the sun comes from the direction of No28. This lack of direct sunlight to this recreational area will further result in shaded damp areas caused by the wall being 1.5 metres higher than the original fence. Although the Borough Design Guide requires rear extensions alongside boundaries to be inset by 1 metre with a maximum height of 3 metres i.e. out of consideration for neighbours, the wall was allowed to be against the boundary and 3.2m high. To allow the wall height to increase to 3.5 metres above ground level is totally unacceptable.

Workmanship

For the record, although not strictly a planning matter, it should be noted that the finish of the rendering is patchy, and all the wall edges are poorly finished, plus all the edges of the window reveals and the end of the double crease tile run are not sealed. The scaffolding which is required for working at height has been removed. This poor standard of workmanship may be symptomatic of further shortfalls in the build standard of this development. It is a planning concern if sub standard properties are being built.



Fig 6: Poor workmanship examples prone to ingress of rainwater

Design

The location of the stack pipe down the middle of the gable end wall, as evident in Fig 4, appears to be an afterthought, looking both out of place and ungainly in the middle of a vast blank rendered wall. It is unsightly and contributes to the poor design of this development which is not in keeping with NPPF requirements for development to be of high-quality design.

Landscaping

The latest parking plan still omits any soft landscaping which is required in order to retain the character of the area in compliance with Policy CP3(f) *“The ability of the site to support Fauna and Flora”*, Policy TB06 a) iv) *“Soft Landscaping Particularly at site boundaries”*, and the Borough Design Guide which states that *“Parking spaces should include spaces for soft landscaping.”* . We do not want a barren car park devoid of foliage.

The latest drawing shows two trees. There is no indication where they exist, and indeed, the garden, which was full of trees and greenery has been stripped bare. The trees appear to be artistic licence not relating to any actual or planned trees.

SUMMARY

ACER requests refusal of this application as:

- a) it does not conform with Policy CP3 which requires development to be *“of an appropriate build form and character to the area,... without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users and their quality of life”* due to
- i. lack of subservience of two storey side extension,
 - ii. proximity to the boundary of no26,
 - iii. change to roof dormers losing roof character and increasing overlooking,
 - iv. rendering over brickwork
 - v. changing roof tiles from red to grey.
 - vi. Excessive height of the sidewall of the rear extension.
- b) The lack of soft landscaping in the front garden, to comply with:
- Policy CP3(f) *“The ability of the site to support Fauna and Flora”*
 - Policy TB06 a) iv) *“Soft Landscaping Particularly at site boundaries”*.
 - The Borough Design Guide which states that *“Parking spaces should include spaces for soft landscaping.”*