PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held at the site listed below on Monday, 14 May 2018 from 10.00am - 10.20am.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Bobbin, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor (substitute for Councillor Prescott), Mike Henderson, Nigel Kay, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern (Chairman) and Ghlin Whelan.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Derek Conway (Ward Member).

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey and Philippa Davies.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Cameron Beart, Andy Booth, Roger Clark, James Hall, Ken Ingleton and Prescott.

660 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

661 17/504618/FULL - 6 PARK AVENUE, SITTINGBOURNE, ME10 1QX

The Chairman welcomed the applicant and seven members of the public to the meeting.

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which set out amendments to a previously approved scheme, which included an additional single storey rear extension, increased roof height provision of the flat roof element, increased pitch of hips, additional front and rear facing roof lights, and provision of pitched roofs over the front facing bay windows.

He explained that the two-storey extension to the east of the property had not been built yet, and that the facing materials had been changed from brick to render. He also outlined the approved measurements, plus the additional proposed measurements, as outlined in the report, and as subsequently amended.

The Area Planning Officer considered the alterations to the scheme, plus the increased bulk of the extension did not give rise to harm to visual and residential amenity. He explained that there were already a number of white rendered properties along Park Avenue, that the property was set back from the highway, so was not too prominent, and the pitched roofs above the bay windows were a better design.

The Area Planning Officer outlined the objections that had been received and advised that the rear balcony had not required planning permission, and the nearest property to the site was 49 metres away. He added that a condition would prevent the flat roof of the currently proposed rear extension being used as a balcony, and although the increase in the pitch to the hip on the western side did have some

impact on the adjacent property, it was not substantial enough to refuse the application.

The Applicant advised that he had made the recent changes to the application for structural reasons, and that the balcony had been on the original scheme. The balcony on the new scheme was smaller in size than that on the original scheme, and would have solid walls to reduce overlooking.

A Ward Member spoke against the application and considered the change in the roof pitch should have been included in the original application, not amended later. He explained that it was unreasonable that there had been two years of on-going work on the development, constructed differently to the original plans. The Ward Member explained that the structure of the building meant that it had become an extremely imposing property, and there were concerns with both the height and pitch of the roof.

The owner responded by stating that the height of the building was lower than the original plans. He explained that construction had commenced in March 2017, and that build issues had come along later, which was why amendments had been made.

Local residents raised points in objection to the application which included: overlooking from the proposed balcony; the property should have been built to the submitted plans; the pitch of the roof was too steep/high; overlooking; the extending angle of the hips and roof should match, but they did not; the roof was 30 cm higher than it should be; the planning process had not been followed; and the impact on neighbouring properties.

The Applicant responded to the comments and explained that side flanks would be built on the terrace to address overlooking issues, and that the render had been approved under a planning amendment, as the brickwork used had not matched the original brickwork. He further explained that the size of the building had not changed, except for the addition of the single storey utility room.

In response to a question from a Member, the Area Planning Officer agreed to look further into the history of the site, and to establish a timeline of communication with the Applicant and the Planning Team.

Members toured the application site and neighbouring gardens with the Area Planning Officer.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel