

19/501493/FULL | Single storey front, side and rear extension with loft conversion to residential bungalow and creation of new parking as amended by drawings NB1917.06B and NB1917.07B. | New Bungalow Staplestreet Road Dunkirk Faversham Kent ME13 9TJ

Dunkirk Parish Council objects to this application, as do The Faversham Society and others.

This first came to SBC in 2013 and consent was finally given, against DPC advice and local knowledge. The application was to enlarge a one bedroom property to about three bedrooms with an additional three bungalows in the garden.

All four properties would use a 3.4metres driveway onto a rural lane. I don't think KCC commented on road safety, but it is of great concern locally.

Since then, only one bungalow has been built and no work has been undertaken from the consent. Very strange.

At the time, Southern Water objected to the treatment of foul water and neither we nor the planning committee have been shown any **evidence** that this has been dealt with. They also stated there should be no soak-aways within 5 metres of any sewer and, in an area known to have serious subsidence issues, with some properties being rebuilt, this is a serious concern.

The drawing/s you have been given do not show the planned further two bungalows OR the consented and built extension to the property known as Potters Corner. This is particularly pertinent from an overlooking point of view. There are a number of roof lights now and the extra height makes it easier to convert further; more bedrooms without extra parking.

DPC would ask that members could be mindful to consider a site visit, to understand the enclosed nature of the site and the proximity and nuisance it would cause.

This new application should be refused because:

1. It does not accord with DM14 in the Local Plan.
2. It will overpower the local buildings and has an increased floor area of some 326%
3. Should cause no significant harm to amenity and other sensitive uses or areas
4. It should be both well sited and in terms of scale, design, appearance and detail, be sympathetic and appropriate to the location;
5. Should respond to the constraints and opportunities posed from climate change and natural processes; there is no SUDS report/mitigation (64% of site covered + Southern Water constraints).
6. There is significant visual detriment to properties next to and nearby, along with a strong concern over smoke and dust, with reports being brought to our attention almost daily updating our knowledge on this.
7. There is no SUDS report and considering the area is liable to subsidence this should have been part of the application
8. It should accord with adopted Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance
9. Parking is for two vehicles, and I know the officer says there is also a garage, but this council has allowed the conversion of so many we would be looking at two spaces for potentially a 5 bed house.
10. The extra windows are a problem with overlooking.
11. The height of the whole building has been increased, yet again.

In places, the officer says "it's only higher/larger/ one more window". It just appears to be a little bit more plus a little bit more: but when added together the effects are huge.

If consent is given we would hope conditions would ensure obscured glass is used and General Permitted Development Rights would be suspended to ensure this kept in keeping with its surroundings, especially conversion of the garage.

With the previous application there were EIGHTEEN conditions. This time only 3, and they are not the important ones.

Missing conditions:

No working time directive

No hard and soft landscaping: Previously there were two hard and soft landscaping, 7 & 15 which included separation to neighbours, plus no direction on native species.

No material details to be passed by LPA

No mud on road for road safety

No site levels approval

No dust suppression plan for construction

No foul water treatment

No surface water disposal

No piling to be undertaken

The last one we mention is shocking, because of its omission, so please indulge it appearing in full:

"No development shall take place until details have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing, which set out **what measures have been taken to ensure that the development incorporates sustainable construction techniques such as water conservation and recycling, renewable energy production including the inclusion of solar thermal or solar photo voltaic installations, and energy efficiency.** Upon approval, the details shall be incorporated into the development as approved".

Having become one of the first authorities to become active over green issues it seems a lamentable exclusion.