

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10 October 2019**PART 3**

Report of the Head of Planning

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

3.1 REFERENCE NO - 19/503793/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of two storey rear and side extension and single storey side entrance lobby with associated new site access path.		
ADDRESS 6 The Broadway Minster-on-sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2RN		
RECOMMENDATION Refuse		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL The two storey rear and side extension would have a detrimental impact upon residential amenity at neighbouring dwelling, No. 4 The Broadway by virtue of its excessive scale and positioning.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Minster Parish Council support application		
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster-On-Sea	APPLICANT Hillton Dentistry AGENT Richard Baker Partnership
DECISION DUE DATE 02/10/19		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 04/09/19

Planning History

SW/94/0134

Change of use of first floor from residential to surgery use

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 28.03.1994

SW/93/1011

Use of first floor as clinic/surgery, including external stair to side

Refused Decision Date: 04.01.1994

SW/89/0616

Change of use of existing house to doctor/dentist surgery with flat over

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 30.05.1989

SW/89/0030

Erection of veterinary surgery

Grant of Conditional PP Decision Date: 28.02.1989

SW/88/1783

Erect of small branch veterinary surgery in the garden of no 6

Withdrawn Decision Date: 21.12.1988

SW/86/1305

Outline application for one detached dwelling

Refused Decision Date: 21.01.1987

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1.1 No. 6 The Broadway is a two storey semi detached building in D1 use, currently occupied by a dentist surgery. Attached building, No. 6A, is currently in use as a veterinary surgery. The building has a small garden to the front, and a car park to the rear, that is shared with No. 6A and is accessed from the driveway to the north of No. 6A. There is a detached bungalow to the south of the site and opposite lies a parade of shops along The Broadway, although I note the surrounding area is mainly residential in nature.

2. PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a small single storey side extension and a two storey rear and side extension. The side extension will be located to the south of the building and will have a footprint of 3.3m x 2.1m, with a mono pitch roof with an eaves height of 2.8m and a ridge height of 4.6m. It will provide a new entrance to the building, and the existing entrance in the front elevation will be replaced with a window.

2.2 The two storey rear and side extension will measure between 7.6m – 7.8m in length and 5.3m in width. The extension will have a hipped roof and will have an eaves height of 5.8m (matching the eaves height on the existing building) and a ridge height of 8m (0.4m lower than the ridge height on the existing building). The extension will allow the creation of a wheelchair accessible ground floor, larger surgeries, filing room and decontamination room on the ground floor, and an additional surgery and larger staff room on the first floor.

2.3 The application form confirms that the proposal will result in the loss of three parking spaces at the rear of the site, resulting in the property having four remaining off-street parking spaces.

3. PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

3.1 None

4. POLICY AND CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

4.2 Policies CP1, CP4, DM14 and DM16 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017

4.3 The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders'

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Four objections have been received. I will summarise their contents below:

- There are major problems with traffic flow and parking in this area - the extension

to the building will bring in more clients, therefore there will be more need for parking.

- The proposed extension will severely compromise parking which is already a problem for both businesses (dentist and vets). The plans do not show clearly where other cars would park (vet surgery) and there would not be enough space for 4x car park spaces as well as maneuvering safely and getting past spaces held by the vets.
- Drawings do not seem to be to 'true' scale and reflect the true building size or planned works in relation to the adjacent building.
- Proposal is doubling the original building this would also then block light to the external window of 6a The Broadway and local residents' gardens.
- A development of the proposed size should take place in a different site which can accommodate a larger building.

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Environmental Health – No comments or observations to make.

6.2 KCC Highways – *“The proposal offers one net additional consulting room, with a loss of existing on-site parking spaces. An important consideration in this case is the location of the facility, taking into account its accessibility by public transport, the adjacent on-street parking bays, parking restrictions in effect along this section of The Broadway and available on-street parking capacity in the nearby Saxon and Noreen Avenues for busier periods. Having therefore considered the development proposals and the effect on the highway network, I raise no objection on behalf of the local highway authority.”*

6.3 Minster Parish Council support the application subject to adequate parking being in place.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.1 Plans and documents relating to application 19/503793/FULL.

8. APPRAISAL

Principle of Development

8.1 The site falls within the built up area boundary of Minster where the principle of development is accepted. Furthermore, policy CP1 supports the growth of existing businesses and I consider the proposal (which will provide the dentist surgery with additional floorspace) is in broad compliance with this policy.

Visual Impact

8.2 When viewed from The Broadway, the proposal will not change the appearance of the property significantly. The side extension that will provide a new entrance to the building is minimal in scale, and I consider it would sit comfortably on the property. The rear and side extension will effectively double the footprint of the building, although due to the location of this extension, the full extent of this element of the proposal will only be visible from the rear and sides of the site. Taking into account the structure will have a hipped roof similar to the one on the main building and matching materials will be used in the construction of the extension, whilst the scale of the extension is large, due to its

location at the rear of the site, I do not consider it will cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the building itself, or the wider area.

Residential Amenity

- 8.3 The main properties that will be impacted by the proposal are those either side of the site and the property to the rear. Firstly considering the impact to No. 4 to the south of the site, the proposed single storey side extension will project up to the common boundary with No. 4. However taking into account its limited scale (its maximum height will be 4.6m), I do not consider it will have any unacceptable impacts upon residential amenity at this property. The two storey rear and side extension will project approximately 5m rearwards of No. 4. The Council's adopted SPG states that for two storey rear extensions close to the common boundary, the maximum projection allowed is 1.8m. I note there will be a gap of 1.2m between the extension and the common boundary, and No. 4 is set a further 3.3m away. However, even when taking into account the separation distance, I have serious concerns regarding the impact this 5m projection will have upon this neighbouring property, especially when taking into account No. 4 is a shallow roofed bungalow. I believe the proposal will have a significantly harmful overbearing impact on this neighbouring property and its private amenity space which will be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers of this property. I take the view this harmful impact will amount to a reason for refusal.
- 8.4 The attached property, No. 6A is occupied by a veterinary practice. The rear extension will project 5.3m past the rear wall of this property, and there will be a gap of 3.6m between the extension and No. 6A. Taking into account this neighbouring property is not in residential use, whilst the extension will have some impact by virtue of an overshadowing and overbearing impact, I do not consider it would amount to a reason to refusal in this case given the commercial use of the building.
- 8.5 The proposed two storey rear and side extension will lie roughly 10m from the rear boundary of the site which is shared with St. Kilda, Saxon Avenue (a detached bungalow) and approximately 17m at an angle from the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling. Taking into account these separation distances, I do not consider the proposal will have any significant impacts to residential amenity at this property.

Highways

- 8.6 The proposal will reduce the number of parking spaces at the rear of the site from seven spaces to four spaces. KCC Highways have been consulted on the application and raise no objection to this loss of parking, due to the availability of parking bays on The Broadway, unrestricted on-street parking in nearby Saxon and Noreen Avenues and the close proximity of public transport links. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge the concern raised by objectors regarding the loss of parking to the rear of the site, I do not consider the scheme will be unacceptable from a highways perspective.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The development will be acceptable with regard to visual amenities and highway safety and convenience. However due to the scale and positioning of the proposal, it will have a significantly harmful overshadowing and overbearing impact upon neighbouring

dwelling No. 4, which will be detrimental to the amenity of its occupiers. I therefore recommend planning permission be refused.

10. RECOMMENDATION - Refuse for the following reason:

- (1) The proposed rear and side two storey extension, by virtue of its excessive scale and positioning would amount to an oppressive and overbearing structure that would give rise to a loss of outlook and would therefore have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of No. 4 The Broadway. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of “Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017” and 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 takes 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 and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.


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.



19/503793/FULL 6 The Broadway Minster on Sea Sheerness Kent ME12 2RN
Scale: 1:1250
Printed on: 27/9/2019 at 12:37 PM by MandP



© Astun Technology Ltd