

2.5 REFERENCE NO - 16/507561/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Conversion of loft with insertion of two front dormer windows and erection of single storey rear extension.			
ADDRESS 11 Wards Hill Road, Minster-on-Sea, Kent, ME12 2LL			
RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposal would not give rise to unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenity.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection			
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-on-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Evan Simkus AGENT Architek Design & Planning	
DECISION DUE DATE 29/12/16	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 06/12/16		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
16/507562/LAWP RO	Lawful Development Certificate (proposed) for a single rear dormer window.	Approved	30/11/16
16/506289/FULL	Conversion of loft with insertion of two front dormer windows and one rear dormer window and erection of single storey rear extension.	Refused	10/10/16
SW/02/0125	Off-road parking	Approved	02/04/02
SW/01/1206	Off-road parking	Refused	29/01/02

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application site is a detached, modest sized bungalow situated to the southern end of Wards Hill Road.
- 1.02 There is a small driveway to the front with larger amenity space to the rear.
- 1.03 Much like the majority of Minster, the street scene is characterised by a mixture of dwelling types. The design, size and use of materials are varied throughout.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposal seeks planning permission for a loft conversion to include the erection of 2 pitched roof dormer windows on the principal elevation and a single storey rear extension.
- 2.02 The overall height of the roof would increase by 0.4m, and would project no higher than the existing chimneys. The dormers would measure a maximum of 2m in width x 2.2m in height, and would be placed in line with the ground floor windows.

- 2.03 The existing rear projections would be removed and replaced a full width extension which would square the dwelling off. The maximum depth of the property would not increase, but the gap created by the existing projections would be filled in. The alterations to the rear would include the insertion of 3 roof lights.
- 2.04 The proposal would allow for additional living accommodation in the roof space, and the number of bedrooms would increase from 3 to 5.
- 2.05 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces would match those on the existing dwelling.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 None relevant

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): The NPPF and NPPG are relevant in that they encourage good design and seek to minimise serious amenity concerns.
- 4.02 Development Plan: Saved policies E1, E19, E24 and T3 of the adopted Swale Borough Council Local Plan 2008 and policies CP 4, DM 7, DM 14 and DM 16 of the emerging Swale Borough Council Local Plan Bearing Fruits 2031 are relevant in that they relate to general development criteria and design, alterations and extensions, and parking considerations.
- 4.03 Supplementary Planning Documents: The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "Designing an Extension" is also relevant, and remains a material consideration having been through a formal review and adoption process. The Adopted SPG entitled "Designing an Extension - A Guide for Householders", was adopted by the Council in 1993 after a period of consultation with the public, local and national consultees, and is specifically referred to in the supporting text for saved policy E24 of the Local Plan. It therefore remains a material consideration to be afforded substantial weight in the decision making process.
- 4.04 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 4.05 The NPPF was released on 27th March 2012 with immediate effect, however, para 214 states "that for 12 months from this publication date, decision-makers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework."
- 4.06 The 12 month period noted above has now expired, as such, it is necessary for a review of the consistency between the policies contained within the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 and the NPPF.
- 4.07 This has been carried out in the form of a report agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel on 12 December 2012. Saved policies E1, E19, E24 and T3 are considered to accord with the NPPF for the purposes of determining this application and as such, these policies can still be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.01 The surrounding neighbours were sent letters notifying them of the application. One letter neither supporting nor objecting to the proposal was received within the consultation period. This is summarised below:

- There is a 50 foot tree which should be retained as part of the character of the neighbourhood.
- There is the potential for the rear elevation to be extended beyond reasonable proportions.
- The conversion of this small home to a family home would add to the housing problem in that the older generation have nowhere to downsize. This in turn blocks the release of their family homes for the next generation.
- The characters and car shown on the drawings are out of scale and give a false impression of the parking situation and window height.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 Minster-on-Sea Parish Council objects to the application and considers it over-intensive development of the site. It also considers that the front garden is too small to provide parking for a 5 bedroom dwelling.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 Application 16/506289/FULL was refused because the original dormers were proposed to have flat roofs. It also proposed a large rear dormer, all of which were contrary to the adopted SPG on extensions and found to be harmful to visual amenity.

7.02 Application 16/507562/LAWPRO applied for a Lawful Development Certificate for the rear dormer. The proposal complied with all the relevant criteria and has therefore been approved. I consider this to be a fall-back position for the applicants should this application fail.

7.03 Application SW/02/0125 was an approval of planning permission for the existing parking situation (it had previously been refused under application SW/01/1206).

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The application site is located within the defined built up area boundary of Minster in which the principle of development is acceptable subject to amenity and other relevant policy considerations. I believe the main considerations here to be the impact of the proposal upon the residential and visual amenities of the area, including the impact upon residential parking.

Residential Amenity

8.02 The dwelling would extend no further rearwards of number 13 and less than 1.5m rearwards of number 9. There would remain a gap of just under 2m to the boundary here. As such, and due to the minimal increase in overall footprint when compared to the existing situation, I consider that there would be no significant harm in terms of overshadowing or an overbearing impact upon the immediately adjacent dwellings.

- 8.03 There would be roof lights and new windows/doors to the rear, however there are no properties directly to the rear and there would be approximately 17m to the boundary with the rear garden of 1 Highview Road. The dormers to the front, being upon on a bungalow, would not be excessively high, and there would remain approximately 25m to the block of flats opposite. As such, I consider that there would no serious concern in terms of overlooking. I consider the proposal acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Visual Amenity

- 8.04 The proposed dormers to the front would now comply with the SPG in that they would have traditional pitched roofs, have a vertical emphasis, and would be only as large as necessary to allow light into the rooms that they would serve. I consider the previous reason for refusal has been overcome in this regard and that they would amount to pleasant additions to the dwelling. As a result, I am of the view that they would sit comfortably in the mixed street scene.
- 8.05 The alterations to the rear would create a traditional, symmetrical and square shaped bungalow. Though plain in design detail, there are no public views here and I consider it would be acceptable.
- 8.06 Overall, I am of the opinion that the dwelling would remain of a scale and form appropriate to its original form and surroundings, and would not amount to over intensive development. I also note the presence of other altered and variably designed bungalows within the vicinity. It would be acceptable designed in matching materials. I consider the proposal acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Parking

- 8.07 I note the objections and concerns raised in respect to parking. The existing property has 3 bedrooms, while the proposal would create 5 bedrooms. According to the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards, the parking requirements for a 5 bedroom dwelling in a suburban location would not increase over those of a 3 bedroom dwelling. I also note that the existing parking situation for the 3 bedroom dwelling was approved via planning permission in application SW/02/0125.
- 8.08 As such, while I accept that the existing parking situation is tight and not ideal, because of the fact that it was previously approved via planning permission, and the fact that the adopted parking advice states that the expected parking requirements should not increase, I do not believe the parking arrangements could reasonably amount to a reason for refusal. They were also not considered as a reason for refusal in application 16/506289/FULL.
- 8.09 I also note the recently approved LDC for a large, flat roof rear dormer as the fall-back position. This would lead to the same 5 bedroom dwelling with no consideration for parking, but with a much more poorly designed scheme than that proposed here. This is a significant material consideration, which aside from the fact that the parking provision accords with KCC standards, weighs heavily in favour of approval here.

Other Matters

- 8.10 I note the comment submitted regarding the tree, which I assume is the large tree in the back garden. The retention or otherwise of this tree is not material to this application.

- 8.11 I note the comment submitted regarding the vehicle and people shown on the plans. They are purely for indicative purposes and would not amount to reasons to query the plans, in my opinion.
- 8.12 I note the comment regarding loss of a smaller house which could be used by the older generation. The Council does not have any policy basis for refusing planning permission to preserve the supply of a particular dwelling type. Members should not refuse planning permission on such a basis.
- 8.12 I note the comment regarding the potential for a much larger and unreasonable rear extension in the future. This is purely speculative and cannot be taken into account in the determination of this application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 I take the view that the proposal has overcome the previous reasons for refusal. For the reasons set out above, I do not believe the parking arrangements could amount to a reason for refusal, and I am mindful of the fall-back position, as set out above, which would result in the same number of bedrooms and the same parking provision as proposed here, but with a very poor quality design. I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing numbers ADP16/P02/02, ADP16/P02/05 and ADP16/P02/06.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

The Council's approach to this application:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
- As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the Committee and promote the application.

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.
The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.