

2.2 REFERENCE NO - 18/501004/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of proposed annexe.			
ADDRESS 69 Queens Road Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2EX			
RECOMMENDATION Grant subject to outstanding representations (closing date 13 June 2018), to receipt of amended drawings and to conditions.			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION Proposed development would constitute an annexe reliant on the main dwelling and 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 Jonathan Ward AGENT Anderson Design	
DECISION DUE DATE 11/05/18	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 13/06/18		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/503010/FULL	Erection of single storey front extension with the insertion of rooflights and erection of front porch.	APPROVED	03.08.15
SW/13/1172	Erection of first floor rear extension above existing flat-roofed extension, and erection of two-storey front extension.	APPROVED	20.11.13
SW/98/0655	Dormers and roof extension to existing chalet.	APPROVED	29.08.98

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 69 Minster Road is a chalet bungalow located on a corner plot within the built up area of Minster-on-Sea. There is amenity space to the front, facing Baldwin Road and to the side facing Queens Road, with private amenity space to the rear, facing the flank of 5-7 Baldwin Road. There is a detached garage situated at the end of the garden to the rear, which is accessed via Baldwin Road. Two parking spaces are provided to the front of the garage.
- 1.02 The property is in a mature residential area surrounded by dwellings of various scales and designs.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the garage at the property and the construction of an annexe in its place.

- 2.02 The originally submitted drawings proposed an annexe that had a width of 6m and a length of 5.6m, approximately the same footprint as the existing garage. The ridge height of the annexe would be 4.8m, 2.2m taller than the existing garage which would facilitate the creation of a mezzanine floor. The front elevation of the annexe will have windows that face onto Baldwin Road. Access to the annexe will be provided by a door in the southern flank wall of the development. Windows and bi-fold glazed doors will also be situated in the northern flank wall of the annexe, providing access to the rear garden of No. 69. The development as first proposed would provide a bedroom, bathroom, living room and kitchen on the ground floor, and a second bedroom on the mezzanine floor. The application form states the annexe will be constructed using weather boarding and brick work, and will have a slate roof. The two existing parking spaces to the front of the garage will be retained.
- 2.03 I considered the scale of the annexe as first submitted was excessive for a development of this type. Although the annexe could be considered to have a close relationship with the main dwelling, the level of accommodation provided could be considered to amount to a separate dwelling from the host dwelling No. 69. The agent was informed of this, and subsequently amended drawings were submitted that removed the kitchen and mezzanine floor from the proposal.
- 2.04 The proposal includes a flue in the annexe and consequently the Environmental Health Manager was consulted on the application. Concern was raised about the termination of the flue at this height close to the adjacent dwellings (see below) and I have therefore requested that the plans be amended omitting it. I am awaiting these and will update Members at the Meeting.
- 2.05 The description of the application originally read 'Conversion of double garage into self-contained annex', which was inaccurate as the existing garage is to be demolished and the proposed annexe erected. The description was altered to reflect this, and neighbours and the Parish Council were subsequently reconsulted on the application. The closing date for all comments is 13th June 2018, and this report is therefore subject to the receipt of any additional comments which will be reported at the meeting.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 None

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- 4.02 Policies CP4, CP7, DM14 and DM16 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan.
- 4.03 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders'

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 Minster-on-Sea Parish Council objects to the proposal, and provide the following comments:

“This is over-intensive development of the site. Parking will be inadequate for the existing and proposed if the proposed goes ahead. It will also result in a reduction in amenity area for the proposal.”

- 5.02 When the description of the proposal changed, the Parish Council were subsequently reconsulted, where they then provided the following comments:

“Minster-on-Sea Parish Council’s original objection submitted 6th April 2018 stands particularly in terms of parking.”

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 The Environmental Health Manager was consulted on the application and provided the following comments:

“Having looked at the proposal, I am of the opinion that the termination of the flue serving the heating appliance in the proposed annex is low relative to the adjoining property in Baldwin Road (Flats 5/6). There is significant potential for fume, odour or smoke nuisance to residents from this flue particularly if the intended appliance is a wood burning stove. I have some considerable reservations about approval of this application.”

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 Application papers for application 18/501004/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

- 8.01 The application site lies within the built up area boundary where the principle of development is accepted, subject to the relevant policy considerations. The main considerations in this case concern the impact to visual and residential amenity, the use of the proposal as an annexe and the impact of the loss of the garage as a parking space.

Visual Impact

- 8.02 The proposed annexe will be clearly visible in the streetscene, so its design is important. I consider the proposed design of the annexe is acceptable, due to the mixed design of the surrounding properties. I also take the view the proposed materials (cement fibre weather boarding on blockwork and slate roof tiles) are acceptable due to the diverse materials present in the streetscene.

Residential Amenity

- 8.03 The annexe will be situated 1.5m from neighbouring property No. 5-7 Baldwin Road. The annexe will have the same footprint as the existing garage; it will however be taller, which could have an increased impact upon residential amenity at No. 5-7. I note there are windows in the side elevation of this neighbouring property; however these are secondary windows so I do not consider any potential overshadowing impacts will be unacceptable. A single door and a small window which will serve the

bathroom are proposed in the south elevation of the annexe, which could overlook the aforementioned side windows at No. 5-7. To mitigate this issue, I will condition the door and window to use obscure glazed glass.

- 8.04 The proposed windows in the front elevation of the annexe will look onto the streetscape and would be located approximately 21m from the properties on the eastern side of Baldwin Road. Taking into account this distance, I do not consider the windows will give rise to any unacceptable overlooking at any neighbouring property.
- 8.05 The proposal will include a window and patio doors in the north elevation which will look onto the rear elevation of the host dwelling. There is a minimum of 9m between the annexe and rear wall of No. 69, which is a relatively small distance that could give rise to mutual overlooking, however when taking into account the relationship between the buildings, namely the fact the annexe will be ancillary to No. 69, I consider any overlooking will be acceptable.
- 8.06 In their objection, the Parish Council stated that the proposal will result in a reduction in amenity area for the proposal. As the development is to be an annexe ancillary to the main dwelling, the private amenity space for No. 69 will be shared with the annexe, and the proposal does not change the scale of this amenity space.
- 8.07 As set out above, the Environmental Health Manager has raised concern that the proposed flue has the potential to harm residential amenity by virtue of smoke and fumes. I have requested that the drawings be amended accordingly, and I am awaiting these and will update Members at the Meeting.

Use as an annexe

- 8.08 Following amendment, the proposed annexe will contain a bedroom, en-suite and living room and would constitute an annexe dependant on or ancillary to the main house. I consider that the amount of accommodation being proposed is at such a level that it will be dependent on the main dwelling, and as such cannot be considered to amount to a separate dwelling in its own right.
- 8.09 I consider that the use of this structure as an annexe is acceptable and recommend imposing condition (5) below which restricts the use of the building to purposes ancillary and/or incidental to the use of the dwelling.

Parking

- 8.10 The loss of the garage as a parking space needs to be considered. I note to the front of the garage there is block paving that provides parking for two vehicles and these spaces will be retained as part of this application. I note these spaces are not in accordance with standard KCC requirements, as the length of the spaces are 4m as opposed to the preferred 5m, however when I conducted the site visit, two cars were parked on the driveway. As such, I consider it would be unacceptable to refuse this application due to undersized parking spaces.
- 8.11 The property is currently a three bedroom house, and according to the Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 20 November 2008 – Residential Parking, two car parking spaces are required for a house of this size in this location. The parking requirements for the site do not increase with the addition of the proposed annex and as such I do not consider that there would be harm to highway safety or convenience as the result of the development proposed.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.01 On the basis of the above, I consider that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact upon the visual and residential amenities of the area. Subject to the receipt of amended plans deleting the proposed flue, I recommend 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 annexe hereby permitted shall match those listed on the application form.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

(3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing: 01/03/18 Rev D.

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

(4) Before the development hereby permitted is first used, the proposed window and door in the south elevation of the annexe shall be obscure glazed and shall subsequently be maintained as such.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjoining properties and to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

(5) The annexe hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary and/or incidental to the residential use of the dwelling known as 69 Queens Road.

Reason: As its use as a separate unit of accommodation would be contrary to the provisions of the development plan for the area.

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:

- Offering pre-application advice.
- 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 applicant/agent was advised of minor changes required to the application and these were agreed and submitted.

The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent has 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.



18/501004/FULL - 69 Queens Road, Minster
Scale: 1:1000
Printed on: 11/6/2018 at 14:56 PM by SaraP



© Astun Technology Ltd