

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**PART 3**

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 3Applications for which **REFUSAL** is recommended

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/502228/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Extensions to first floor and roof of residential dwelling including installation of solar panels.		
ADDRESS 110 Southsea Avenue, Private Street, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness, Kent ME12 2LU		
RECOMMENDATION Refuse		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL The development, due to its design, would result in an incongruous addition that would dominate the form, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would not be in keeping with the design of properties along the northern side of Southsea Avenue, which would adversely impact the streetscene. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of “Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017” and to the advice of the Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled “Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders”.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council supports the application		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Mr Caleb Watson AGENT Wyndham Jordan Architects
DECISION DUE DATE 28/06/19		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 30/07/19

Planning History

SW/80/0784

Erection of garage

Approved Decision Date: 30.07.1980

SW/79/1172

Erection of a house

Approved Decision Date: 11.02.1980

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 110 Southsea Avenue is a detached chalet bungalow located on the northern side of Southsea Avenue, within the built up area boundary of Minster. The property is set back from the road with vehicle hardstanding to the front and to the side. It has a

- hipped roof with three dormer windows located on the front and rear roof slopes. There is a large detached garage, an outbuilding, and a generous garden to the rear.
- 1.02 The application site is bounded by residential properties to the east, west and south. The Little Oyster Residential Care Home lies to the north. The streetscene is varied and has a broad mix of house types and designs. Conlin (to the west) is a bungalow with a shallow pitched roof; and Den Briel (to the east) is a chalet bungalow that has been extended at roof level.
- 1.03 Land levels slope upwards to the southeast here, so that Conlin is at a lower level than the application property, and Den Briel is higher.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The application seeks planning permission for extensions to the first floor and roof of the property including the installation of solar panels.
- 2.02 The existing pitched roof dormer windows on the property would be replaced with dual pitched roof extensions to the front and rear roof slopes. The ridgeline of the extensions would have an overall height to match the existing roof ridge; with a section of flat roof located between the newly formed gable ends. The eaves height of the dwelling would be raised by 2.5m.
- 2.03 Twelve solar panels would be installed on the property. Three would be located on the existing front roof slope; and the other nine would be located on the roof slopes of the proposed roof extension at the front of dwelling.
- 2.04 The application proposes a reduction in the number of bedrooms at the property from five to four; but increasing the size of the remaining bedrooms and creating an additional shower room and ensuite WC at first floor level. Three windows are proposed in the front elevation of the property at first floor; these would serve the two front bedrooms and the stairwell/landing. On the rear elevation at first floor level, a pair of Juliet balconies would be introduced to serve the two rear bedrooms; and two windows are proposed to serve the new shower room and ensuite WC.
- 2.05 The proposed materials would include plain brown tiles; cementitious weatherboard cladding to the cheeks of the extensions; and white pvcu fenestration.
- 2.06 The submitted plans also show that a new flat roof would be constructed above the existing ground floor window on the front elevation of the dwelling.
- 2.07 The proposal has been amended since receipt. The original submission proposed a large, flat roofed dormer to the rear elevation of the property, however, further to discussions between officers and the agent/applicant, this was amended to the current design. It was suggested to the agent/applicant that the flat roofed element of the proposed extensions be removed or reduced, however no further amendments were received. A re-consultation was carried out.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Potential Archaeological Importance

4.0 POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- 4.02 The Swale Borough Local Plan “Bearing Fruits 2031” (adopted 2017). Policies CP4 (requiring good design), DM7 (parking), DM14 (general development criteria) and DM16 (alterations and extensions).
- 4.03 The Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) titled “Designing an Extension” is also relevant and remains a material planning consideration having been through a formal consultation and adoption process.
- 4.04 Kent Vehicle Parking Standards (July 2006) and the Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 – Residential Parking (November 2008).

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.01 None received.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.01 Minster-on Sea Parish Council support the application commenting
“Minster-on-Sea Parish Council believes the proposal improves the streetscene”.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

- 7.01 Application papers and drawings referring to application reference 19/502228/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

Principal of Development

- 8.01 The site is situated within the defined built up area boundary of Minster where the principle of development is acceptable subject to amenity and other relevant policy considerations.

Visual Impact

- 8.02 The proposed solar panels would be prominent on the roof slope, located on the front and side elevations of the property. However, they would only project approximately 50mm above the roof plane. It is worth considering the fallback position. Given that the host dwelling is not a listed building and is not located within a conservation area; it appears that the applicant would likely be successful in applying for a Certificate of Lawfulness under Part 14 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended). Also, the proposed solar panels promote sustainable development in seeking to generate energy from a sustainable source.
- 8.03 The submitted plans show that a new flat zinc roof would be constructed above the existing ground floor window on the front elevation of the dwelling. This would project only 0.5m forwards of the front wall of the dwelling, and I do not believe it would harm the character and appearance of the property or be an intrusive feature within the streetscene.
- 8.04 The development seeks to add a first floor to the existing chalet bungalow, effectively turning the property into a two storey dwelling.

- 8.05 Properties along this part of Southsea Avenue are a mixture of detached two and single storey dwellings, and a mixture of materials is used in the road so that there is little uniformity to the road. Two storey dwellings are present on the southern side of the road, opposite the application site; whilst on the northern side, the form of dwellings comprise bungalows and chalet bungalows, which appear to increment in height and bulk as the land levels rise travelling east.
- 8.06 The host dwelling is sited adjacent to a single storey dwelling, Conlin, which has a shallow pitched roof and is situated lower than the host property; and there is a chalet bungalow the other side. Den Briel, the adjacent chalet bungalow, makes use of different roof forms to add interest and reduce the overall visual bulk of the building. However, the proposal, with an entire first floor being added provides no such relief or reduction in bulk through design; the section of flat roof located between the two gable ends serving to increase the vertical emphasis of the property, and only adding to its prominence in my view.
- 8.07 The maximum height of the dwelling would stay the same; however, the eaves height would be raised approximately 2.5m, (from 2.3m to 5m) and the dwellings bulk would significantly increase in width and depth. I consider that the proposed first floor extensions would totally dominate the original form of the dwelling which would be lost within the proposed design.
- 8.08 Whilst the local planning authority would support some form of enlargement of the dwelling, I do not consider that the plans as submitted are acceptable. I am of the opinion that the dwelling as designed is incongruous, with a design that appears bulky and is out of character with the dwellings on the northern side of the road; and dominates the original appearance of the dwelling. Whilst there are two storey dwellings on the southern side of the road, I do not consider it appropriate to replicate this here. I take the view that it would look particularly out of place when considering the design of the adjoining neighbouring bungalow, and then the neighbouring chalet bungalow, and the pattern along this side of the road where the size and bulk of the dwellings appear to increment as the land rises.
- 8.09 Due to the aforementioned design, I consider that the proposal would result in an incongruous dwelling that would not be in keeping with the dwellings on the northern side of Southsea Avenue, and the development would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would fail to comply with local planning policies.

Residential Amenity

- 8.10 The overall roofline of the dwelling would not increase as a result of the proposal; however, the eaves height would be raised from approximately 2.8m to 5.3m. In respect of the impact upon the amenities of the adjacent property Conlin (to the north west), I take into consideration that the proposed first floor extensions would not project forwards of the front wall of this neighbouring property; nor would they project beyond its rear elevation. Although the flank wall of the host dwelling would be built up at first floor level, and I note that there are windows located in the facing flank wall at Conlin; I take into consideration that these side windows do not serve habitable rooms. The proposal would be set back approximately 2.4m from the common boundary with this neighbouring property; and approximately 3.7m from dwelling itself. Due to this separating distance, I do not believe that the proposal would result in unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impacts for this neighbour.

- 8.11 Whilst the proposed first floor extensions would likely result in some sense of enclosure for the neighbouring dwelling to the south east, Den Briel, the extension to the front elevation would only project approximately 0.5m forwards of the recessed front wall at Den Briel; and there would be a separating distance of approximately 1.6m between the flank wall of the first floor front extension and the side wall of this adjacent dwelling. At the rear, the proposed first floor extension would project approximately 3.4m beyond the rear elevation of Den Briel, which is in excess of the guidance in the Council's SPG which recommends a maximum projection of 1.8m for first floor rear extensions. However, the proposed rear extension has been designed so that it is set back from the existing flank of the property, unlike the proposed front extension; meaning that it would sit approximately 2.4m away from the closest flank wall at Den Briel. Taking into account this separating distance, I am of the opinion that the proposal would not result in unacceptable unneighbourly impacts to Den Briel in terms of obstructing light and views.
- 8.12 The proposal would introduce new windows into the front and rear elevations of the dwelling at first floor, including two Juliet balconies at the rear; replacing the existing front and rear facing windows at roof level. There would be a distance in excess of 18m from the new windows in the front elevation to the boundary with the nearest facing property, Alchemy; and there would be a distance of approximately 35m from the proposed fenestration at the rear of the property to the rear boundary of the application site. Due to the distance involved, I consider that the proposal would not result in significant additional harm in terms of overlooking over and above the current arrangement.

Parking

- 8.13 The number of bedrooms at the property would be reduced from five to four as a result of the proposal, and the existing off-street parking provision would not be affected. The parking requirements for a four bedroom property in the suburban area according to the Kent Design Guide Review – IGN3 is for two off-street parking spaces, and this would be provided by the existing hardstanding to the front and side of the property. I therefore consider the parking arrangements to be acceptable.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 The development, due to its design, would dominate the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would result in an incongruous addition that would not be in keeping with the design of the properties along the northern side of Southsea Avenue. I therefore recommend that planning permission be refused.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for the following reason:

- (1) The development, due to its design, would result in an incongruous addition that would dominate the form, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would not be in keeping with the design of properties along the northern side of Southsea Avenue, which would adversely impact the streetscene. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of "Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017" and to the advice of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "Designing an Extension – A Guide for Householders".

The Council's approach to the application:

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2018 the Council take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by:

- Offering a pre-application advice service.
- 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 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 and the council's website.
The conditions set out in the report may be subject to reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.

