

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 15/510368/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Single storey and first floor rear extensions, insertion of lift and front first floor extension.			
ADDRESS The Willows, The Broadway, Minster-on-Sea, Kent, ME12 2DE			
RECOMMENDATION - Approve			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposal would not give rise to unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenities, including highway safety and inconvenience.			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Parish Council objection.			
WARD Minster Cliffs	PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Minster On Sea	APPLICANT Mrs Ruby Chambas-Annan AGENT Mr Dave Chamberlain	
DECISION DUE DATE 01/03/16	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 04/02/16		
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites):			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
SW/86/1188	Change of use to residential care home and extension	Approved	29/10/1986
SW/91/0126	Extensions and alterations	Approved	08/08/1986
SW/95/0209	Extension to bedrooms	Approved	02/03/1995
14/500124/FULL	Single storey rear extension and lift shaft from ground floor to first floor	Approved	09/12/2014

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The Willows is a two storey detached building situated on a corner plot forming the junction of Southsea Avenue with The Broadway. It has been used as a residential care home following a change of use approval in 1986.
- 1.02 The property has a small frontage with a generous amount of private amenity space to the rear. This can be accessed via the main building or a side gate facing onto Southsea Avenue.
- 1.03 It is set well forwards of the adjacent row of terraced dwellings in The Broadway, all off which have much larger front gardens than rear gardens.
- 1.04 The street scene here is particularly mixed, characterised by residential dwellings on either side of varying designs and sizes, and land adjacent to Park Lodge opposite which is currently seeking retrospective planning permission for the grazing of horses and the associated outbuildings.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension, a first floor front extension and the installation of a lift shaft from the ground floor to the first floor to the rear.
- 2.02 The extension at ground floor level would have an additional rear projection of 3.5m and would be 7.6m in width with a flat roof measuring 2.7m in height.
- 2.03 The first floor rear extension would extend 4.25m over the existing ground floor flat roof and would be 7.5m in width. It would have a pitched roof measuring 5.1m in height to the eaves with an overall height of 8m to match the existing ridgeline.
- 2.04 The lift shaft to the rear would have a projection of 1.5m and would be 1.95m in width with a flat roof measuring 5.4m in height.
- 2.05 The first floor front extension would project 3m over the existing balcony and would be 3m in width. It would have a pitched roof measuring 5.1m in height to the eaves with an overall height of 6.6m.

3.0 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- 3.01 Environment Agency Flood Zone 3

4.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): The NPPF and NPPG are relevant in that they encourage good design and seek to minimise serious amenity concerns.
- 4.02 Development Plan: Saved policies E1, E19, E24, C1 and T3 of the adopted Swale Borough Council Local Plan 2008 are relevant in that they relate to general development criteria and design, community services and and parking considerations.
- 4.03 Supplementary Planning Documents: The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "Designing an Extension" is also relevant, and remains a material consideration having been through a formal review and adoption process. The Adopted SPG entitled "Designing an Extension - A Guide for Householders", was adopted by the Council in 1993 after a period of consultation with the public, local and national consultees, and is specifically referred to in the supporting text for saved Policy E24 of the Local Plan. It therefore remains a material consideration to be afforded substantial weight in the decision making process.
- 4.04 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 4.05 The NPPF was released on 27th March 2012 with immediate effect, however, paragraph 214 states "that for 12 months from this publication date, decision-makers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework."
- 4.06 The 12 month period noted above has now expired, as such, it is necessary for a review of the consistency between the policies contained within the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 and the NPPF.

4.07 This has been carried out in the form of a report agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel on 12 December 2012. Saved policies E1, E19, E24 and T3 are considered to accord with the NPPF for the purposes of determining this application and as such, these policies can still be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.01 None have been received.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.01 Minster-on-Sea Parish Council objects to the proposal on the grounds that it would lead to over intensive development of the site. It also comments that there is insufficient parking for the existing service, leading to parking on a dangerous corner.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS AND PLANS

7.01 Application 14/500124/FULL sought planning permission for the same ground floor rear extension and lift shaft applied for in this application. This was approved but not built.

7.02 The application to which this proposal refers to is 15/510368/FULL.

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The application site is located within the defined built up area boundary of Minster in which the principle of development for residential extensions is acceptable subject to amenity and other relevant policy considerations.

8.02 Policy C1 of the Local Plan seeks support for proposals which maximise the use of existing public and private community services and facilities. In this case, I have no reason to doubt the fact that there is a continued need for expansion here and consider that the proposal would certainly maximise the use of the existing site. I am therefore of the opinion that any amenity and highway concerns should be considered carefully against the benefit of this essential community facility.

8.03 The site is situated within Flood Zone 3. There would however be no additional bedroom space on the ground floor and the agent has confirmed that the finished floor levels would be no lower than the existing.

8.04 The main considerations here would be the impact of the proposal on residential and visual amenity, including the impact upon parking in regards to highway safety and convenience.

Residential Amenity

8.05 In reference to rear extensions, paragraph 5.8 of the SPG states that:

“If your neighbour’s house projects rearward of yours or already has an extension on the back, then the Borough Council may allow a rear extension to the distance of the adjacent property or extension...”

Paragraph 5.9 of the SPG states that:

“On well spaced detached properties or where an extension is to be built away from the boundary a larger extension may be acceptable.”

In this case, the property is a large detached property which is set 4m forwards of the adjacent dwelling, 7 Coastguard Cottages. There would remain a 1m gap to the boundary and the extension would bring the rear of the building almost in line with the front of number 7. To the north, Southsea Avenue separates the building from the nearest residential building on this side.

I also note that this element of the proposal was approved under the last application, and I therefore take the view that there would be no significant harm to residential amenity in terms of overshadowing.

- 8.06 This element of the proposal would be served by patio doors and windows in the rear elevation, a window in the southern flank elevation, and a window and door in the northern flank elevation.

There are no other buildings directly to the rear of the site. To the north, there is a level change so that the boundary fence is higher than the top of the proposed window and door. To the south, the neighbouring property is set significantly back from the host site so that any new windows would face into the front garden.

Again, I consider the fact that this element of the proposal, with this layout of windows and doors, was approved in the last application. I subsequently take the view that there would be no harm to residential amenity in terms of overlooking.

- 8.07 The lift shaft would be built in an existing inset part of the building on the northern flank elevation. It would be partly hidden by the boundary fence which is set higher than the building and there would be no external windows or doors. I therefore take the view that there would be no harm to residential amenity in terms of overshadowing or overlooking. Again, this element of the proposal was approved in the last application.

- 8.08 In reference to first floor rear extensions, paragraph 5.7 of the SPG states that:

“A first floor extension should not exceed 1.8m. Leaving a gap to the boundary with your neighbour may offset this requirement slightly depending on the distance allowed.”

The first floor extension would have a rear projection of 4.25m over the existing ground floor extension. However in this case, the neighbouring property is set significantly back from the host site.

There would remain a gap of approximately 7m from the first floor extension to the front of number 7 Coastguards Cottages to the south. I therefore take the view that there would be no harm to residential amenity in terms of overshadowing.

There are no side windows proposed and number 7 has 1 ground floor window in its flank elevation. This is set further back however, and due to the level change here, is set lower than the host site. I therefore take the view that there would be no harm to residential amenity in terms of overlooking.

- 8.09 In reference to front extensions, Paragraph 5.3 of the SPG states that:

“The Borough Council normally requires that front additions are kept to a maximum of 1.2m.”

In this case, the extension would project 3m, however this would be over the existing balcony and would be in line with the existing front, first floor extension. There would remain 4m of balcony space and there are no other buildings directly on either side or to the front of the site. I am therefore of the opinion that there would be no harm to residential amenity in terms of overlooking or overshadowing, although as this element would form a new bathroom, I consider it necessary to condition the window to be obscure glazed.

Visual Amenity

- 8.10 All elements of the proposal would be built in materials to match the existing house. The ground floor extension and lift shaft would have flat roofs while the first floor extensions would have pitched roofs to match the existing. I therefore consider that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the wider area in this regard.
- 8.11 The various elements of the proposal would amount to a significant addition to the building. That being said, this is a large detached building situated on a corner plot. Furthermore, the first floor elements of the proposal would project over the existing building meaning that the increase in footprint would be limited to the ground floor rear extension and lift shaft. On balance, I take the view that scheme of extensions would sit comfortably on the existing building and would be appropriate in scale.
- 8.12 As a spacious corner plot, all elements of the proposal would be visible from the street scene. The street scene here is particularly mixed with other dwellings of varying designs and sizes, open land opposite currently being used to graze horses, and a holiday park and hotel nearby.

However, The Willows, in my opinion is already a relatively prominent feature of the street scene, being set so far forwards and I do not feel that the proposed scheme of extensions would make it any more prominent than it already is, especially given that the main increase in space would be to the rear. I therefore take the view that the proposal would retain the traditional appearance of the building and would not be harmful to the character of the street scene.

Highway Safety and Convenience

- 8.13 Paragraph 7.0 of the SPG states that:

“Extensions which reduced available parking space and increase parking on roads are not likely to be accepted.”

In this case, there is 1 off street parking space provided to the rear of the property, accessible via gates off Southsea Avenue. The proposal would not reduce available parking space and the main consideration here is the potential for any additional parking.

The number of full time staff would increase from 2 to 3, potentially giving rise to an additional parked car during staff working hours. The number of bedrooms would increase by 3, potentially giving rise to additional, albeit temporary, visitor parking.

- 8.14 The Broadway is a main, classified road and I would not normally consider an increase in on street parking here to be acceptable. However, the site also lies adjacent to Southsea Avenue which is an unclassified, residential road. The road is wide enough for the safe parking of vehicles as well as traffic flow in my opinion, and is clearly used for on street parking already. I therefore take the view that the potential slight increase in on street parking here would not give rise to any significant problems in terms of highway convenience or safety.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.01 Taking into account all of the above; the proposal would not, in my view, give rise to any significant harm to residential or visual amenity. While there may be a small increase in on street parking on Southsea Avenue (although not in a manner detrimental to highway safety in my opinion), I consider the benefit of maximising the use of this community facility to outweigh any harm in this regard.

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.

Reasons: 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 extension hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, colour and texture.

Reasons: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing numbers DC/065 and DC/120.

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

- (4) Before the development hereby permitted is first used, the proposed bathroom window in the first floor western elevation to the extension shall be obscure glazed and shall be kept as such in perpetuity.

Reasons: To safeguard the privacy of current and future occupiers

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 application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

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.