PLANNING COMMITTEE - 18 AUGUST 2022

PART 5

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 5

Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

Item 5.1 – 310 Minster Road Minster

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the large flat roofed side extension would be of significant scale and utilitarian appearance, and would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area in general.

• Item 5.2 – Land west of Greyhound Road Minster

APPEAL ALLOWED

COMMITTEE REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector took the view that this was an acceptable site for a Gypsy and Traveller pitch, taking into account that it remained well screened from Lower Road and the wider area in general and that the site, together with other Gypsy and Traveller sites on Greyhound Road, did not dominate the area or nearest settlement. The Inspector concluded that the development was in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Local Plan.

• Item 5.3 – 15 Horsham Lane Upchurch

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the scale and varied design of the extensions proposed to this dwelling were significant in scale, resulting in a bulky addition to the dwelling and a cluttered and disjointed appearance. The appeal was dismissed on this basis, although the Inspector did not agree with the Council that the scheme would harm neighbouring amenity as well.

• Item 5.4 – 1 Woodland Cottages Highsted Road Sittingbourne

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

Small storage/studio building sited forward of the front of the house, determined by the Council as being harmful to the character and appearance of the locality.

The Inspector took the view that the building has only minimal impact on the character and appearance of the location by reason of its low height, its green colour and its siting against the backcloth of tall mature dense vegetation.

Neither did he consider the setting of the neighbouring listed building known as Old Cottage would be harmed.

Item 5.5 – 118 High Street Eastchurch

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector applied the Council's guidance on side extensions and found that this scheme, which would result in a two storey side extension close to the site boundary, would substantially reduce the gap between dwellings and would disrupt uniformity and the sense of space between buildings in this part of the High Street.

• Item 5.6 – 33 The Willows Newington

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

This was a retrospective application for a garage conversion. Although a parking area was retained to the front of the property, the Council was concerned that this area did not meet the guidance for the size of parking spaces within the Council's SPD, and that cars would either overhang the pavement or alternatively park on the road if the garage was converted. In determining that the appeal should be allowed, the Inspector considered that the former garage did not comply with the Council's SPD for internal garage dimensions and that on this basis would not represent a loss of off-street parking (They did not accept the Council's argument that whilst the former garage did not meet the current SPD standards, it was still of a size that could be used for parking). The Inspector considered that the space to the front of the site could accommodate parked vehicles, and although some overhang of the footpath may occur that this would be marginal and not unacceptable. The Inspector also considered that any street parking on The Willows that may occur would not be harmful.

• Item 5.7 – 2 The Myrtles Summerville Avenue Minster

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed two storey side extension, which extended close to the side boundary with the neighbouring property, would result in the loss of a gap and a decrease in visual permeability between buildings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector did not consider the limited parking (1 space) to be of concern, given the lack of parking stress in the road and availability of on-street parking in the area.

• Item 5.8 – 1 Donemowe Drive Sittingbourne

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector allowed a 1.7m high brick and timber wall to the front boundary of this corner property in an open plan estate, citing the character of Newman Drive, which contains some high walls and fences to enclose rear gardens, as reason to allow this.

• Item 5.9 – Aldi Foodstore Tetternhall Way Faversham

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

Advertisement consent refused for illuminated sign on grounds of visual impact. Affixed to rear wall of supermarket where it faces not onto a commercial area, does not provide access to the supermarket, and is not characterised by commercial signage or activity.

Inspector upheld the appeal on the grounds that the sign is not overly prominent on an elevation facing towards fields and the M2 and relative to residential and commercial uses in the local area.