

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 NOVEMBER 2017****PART 2**

Report of the Head of Planning

**PART 2**Applications for which **PERMISSION** is recommended

<b>2.1 REFERENCE NO - 17/502419/FULL</b>			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Proposed single storey side extension to provide utility room and storage room and new porch/canopy.			
<b>ADDRESS</b> 50 Southsea Avenue Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2JX			
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> - Approve			
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b> Proposed development would not give rise to unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenity.			
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b> Parish Council objection			
<b>WARD</b> Minster Cliffs		<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Minster-On-Sea	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr Moon <b>AGENT</b> Mr Jonathan Williams
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 20/07/17		<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 07/09/17	
<b>RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):</b>			
<b>App No</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
14/501767/FULL	Single storey rear and side extension, first floor side extension	GRANTED	26 Nov 2014
SW/04/0744	Two detached houses to replace existing and demolition of existing	GRANTED	4 August 2004

**1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

- 1.01 50 Southsea Avenue is a relatively modern, two storey detached dwelling. Parking is located to the front of the property with private amenity space to the rear.
- 1.02 It is located close to the junction with Minster Drive and Southsea Avenue and lies within the built up area boundary of Minster.
- 1.03 The area is characterised by residential properties, mainly detached bungalows/ two storey dwellings with off- street parking and landscaped gardens to the front of properties.
- 1.04 The property has previously been extended to the right hand side (south-east side).

## **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single storey side extension running for the full depth of the left (north-west facing) side of the house. The application also seeks retrospective planning permission for a new front porch/canopy and garage conversion.
- 2.02 The single storey side extension would sit close to the common boundary with no. 48 Southsea Avenue. It would project sideways by 2.4m and be 10m in length. The pitched roof would be constructed in clay coloured roof tiles to match existing. The proposed side extension would provide a store room to the front and a utility room to the rear. Double opening doors are proposed at the front and rear. No side windows are proposed.
- 2.03 Amended drawings were received after discussions with the agent regarding concerns about the impact of the side extension on the neighbouring property. In addition to this, after carrying out a site visit, it became apparent that the proposed plans had inaccuracies. The amended drawing 17.02.02B received 10 August 2017 addresses both these issues. The side extension would be set back from the existing two storey gable at the front by 1.7m and extend 1.6m beyond the existing rear elevation. As such, the side extension would not extend beyond the front and rear elevation of the neighbouring property at no. 48 Southsea Avenue. The amended drawing also now includes the already constructed porch/canopy and has been subject of re-consultations.
- 2.04 In addition to this, the agent was advised that planning permission was required for the conversion of the garage as a condition was placed upon the original planning permission (SW/04/0744). The amended drawing 17.02.01C received 12 October 2017 indicates the position of the garage before it was converted into living space and has been subject to further re-consultations.

## **3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

None

## **4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 4.01 Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017: Policies DM7, DM14 and DM16
- 4.02 Supplementary Planning Documents: Planning Guidance entitled “Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders”. The Council’s SPD on extension and alterations explains that “Extensions or conversion of garages to extra accommodation, which reduce available parking space and increase parking on roads is not likely to be acceptable.” It further explains that “To make sure the extension to your front of your dwelling is of a good design, the Borough Council normally requires that it should have a pitched roof and that its projection should be kept to an absolute minimum. The Borough Council normally requires that front additions are kept to a maximum of 1.2m.”

## **5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.01 One letter of objection has been received from a local resident on the grounds of overshadowing. A summary of their comments is as follows:

- The brick wall of the extension would be built right on the common boundary. Being no more than 0.98m from the partly glazed kitchen door, this would be very oppressive and result in loss of light.
- The proposed extension is close to the neighbouring property and may be subject to the Party Wall Act
- The close proximity of the extension could cause water to drain from the roof onto the neighbouring property.
- On the amended plans, the pitch and position of the roof has been altered and will block light into the bathroom window
- The extension will run the whole length of the side of the neighbouring property resulting in a very narrow, dark alleyway to the rear garden. In addition to overshadowing, this is unacceptable because it poses a security risk and potential health impact resulting in a claustrophobic development
- It will cause a serious imbalance to the appearance of the houses in this section of Southsea Avenue
- The garage conversion has now set a precedent such that any future applications by residents of this road will be met with approval

5.02 The amended drawing 17.02.01C has been the subject of re-consultations and the deadline for comments is now 2 November 2017. This report is subject to the receipt of additional comments which will be reported at the meeting.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 Minster-on-Sea Parish Council originally supported the application subject to adequate parking being in place for a 4 bedroom property. However, following the re-consultation period, the Parish Council objected stating “*A site meeting is required to investigate issues relative to loss of light*”. The Parish Council quotes a local resident’s concerns regarding loss of light to the neighbouring property, suggesting this should be investigated.

6.02 Natural England had no comments.

## 7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 Application papers and drawings referring to application reference 17/502419/FULL

## 8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The main considerations in the determination of this planning application concern the impact of the side extension and porch/canopy on the visual amenities of the building and the surrounding area and the impact on residential amenity, together with the loss of the garage as a parking space upon the character and the appearance of the streetscene.

### **Design, impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and visual amenity**

8.02 The proposed side extension would be visible from the front of the dwelling and from public vantage points to the south of the site. I consider this has been appropriately designed, I see no objection to the design approach taken here and I do not envisage harm to visual amenity.

- 8.03 The retrospective conversion of the garage has resulted in the loss of the property's only single garage. The question then is what impact that has on the streetscene and on parking provision at the property. In this road, provision has been made for the parking of cars within the curtilages of all dwellings. I note that the garage fell below the current minimum required width for parking vehicles. As a result, the retrospective conversion has not displaced parking to the front of the dwelling – it is already located there. In my opinion, it has not resulted in additional on-street parking or visual harm as the area of hardstanding is adequate for the parking needs of the property. Whilst the garage conversion has clearly resulted in all the car parking to the front of the dwelling, I do not consider this a reason for refusing planning permission here.
- 8.04 The retrospective application of the porch/canopy infills the small recessed area at the front of the building and is in line with the front building line. It projects 1.7m from the front elevation of the house and measures 2.7m wide and 3.6m high. It has a pitched roof constructed of red roof tiles. Whilst the projection of the front porch does not strictly conform to the Council's SPG, I am of the opinion that it is acceptable in this case as it is not a prominent feature on the street scene and does not extend beyond the front building line of the property. The red coloured roof tiles are not in keeping with the roof tiles on the main roof, however I consider it is acceptable in this case as there is a mix of materials used on the surrounding properties.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 8.05 The proposed side extension will be built off the side boundary between the property and the neighbouring property, no.48. There is a side fence separating the two properties and the neighbouring property has a glazed door on the ground floor facing the fence which is 1.0m away from the side boundary. This door serves a kitchen which is not considered to be a habitable room and in any case, the main source of sunlight will be from the rear facing window which will be unaffected by the proposal. The side extension will be single storey with a low pitched roof; therefore I do not consider there to be any overshadowing issues. The side extension will have a brick built wall facing the side boundary therefore overlooking will not be an issue either.
- 8.06 There is no identifiable harm regarding the impact of the proposal upon the amenity of the residents of the other adjacent dwelling at no.52

### **Highways**

- 8.07 There are two car parking spaces to the front of the dwelling which accords with adopted Kent County Council Highways and Transportation standards for a dwelling with 4+ bedrooms. There would be no resulting harm to highway safety and convenience.

### **Other Matters**

- 8.08 Local concern makes reference to drainage issues. The plans show gutters to the front and rear side elevation and whilst the downpipes are not shown, they would have to be provided and would run into a soakaway. The plans also show that the roof will not overhang the fence line therefore there is no identifiable harm here.
- 8.09 Another local concern is the potential security risk. I acknowledge that security/crime is a material planning consideration, however in this case there is already a narrow alleyway to the side of the property and I do not consider the proposed side extension will materially increase this security risk.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.01 This application for a single storey side extension to provide utility room and storage room, retrospective conversion of garage to living accommodation and porch/canopy is considered acceptable and I therefore recommend that planning permission be granted.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions;:**

### **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 development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved drawing no: 17.02.02B received 10 Aug 2017.

Reasons: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- (3) The materials used in the extension shall match exactly in type, colour and texture those of the existing property unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Grounds: In the interests of visual amenity.

### **Council's approach to the 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:

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

In this instance

The application was acceptable after amended drawings were submitted and no further assistance was given.

- 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.

