
PLANNING WORKING GROUP

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the at the site listed below on Monday, 29 February 2016 from 10.00 - 10.36 am

PRESENT: Councillors Cameron Beart, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Mike Henderson, James Hunt, Peter Marchington, Prescott (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair) and Ben Stokes

OFFICERS PRESENT: Rob Bailey and Kellie MacKenzie

APOLOGIES: Councillors Bobbin, Andy Booth, Roger Clark, Sue Gent and Bryan Mulhern

536 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interest were declared.

537 **15/503342/FULL - 16 STILES CLOSE, MINSTER-ON-SEA, KENT, ME12 2TQ**

The Vice-Chairman in the chair welcomed the applicants, the applicant's agent, and eight members of the public to the meeting.

The Area Planning Officer introduced the application which proposed a two-storey side and single storey rear extension at 16 Stiles Close, Minster-on-Sea. He explained that the two-storey side extension would match the depth and height of the dwelling, with a gable end, no first floor flank windows, and project approximately 3.6 metres to the side of the dwelling, abutting the side boundary of the site with rear boundaries of nos. 10 and 12 Appleford Drive. The two-storey extension would, at its closest point, be approximately 11.5 metres from the rear elevation of no. 12 Appleford Drive, and 11 metres from the rear elevation of no. 10 Appleford Drive. To the rear of the application site, the proposed two-storey extension would be 14 metres from the blank elevation of no. 15 Stiles Close.

The Area Planning Officer reported that the single-storey rear extension would project approximately 1.7 metres to the rear, and would be approximately 7 metres wide, with a pitched roof (maximum height 3.6 metres).

The Area Planning Officer further reported that the plans had been amended since the application was submitted. The application originally sought consent for a two- storey-side and single storey front extension. The front extension had been deleted and the single-storey rear extension added to allow more parking to the front. Consequently parking for two vehicles was shown to the front of the dwelling.

The Area Planning Officer advised that 10 objections had been received, as set out in the report and the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 February 2016. Minster Parish Council also raised objection as set out in the report and minutes. The Area Planning Officer explained that one further objection had been received since the Planning Committee meeting, setting out that the result of the application was a fait accompli, and that officers providing advice and seeking amendments to planning applications was highly dubious in a free society and should not be tolerated by anyone that valued democracy, that the planning system was explicitly unfair and biased, and was being driven by the

desire of whomever or whatever instigated this policy to the detriment of society as a whole, and Stiles Close in particular.

The Area Planning Officer stated that in terms of material considerations, the key issues were the principle of development, the impact on residential and visual amenity, and the impact on highway safety and convenience. The site was located in the built-up area where development was acceptable in principle and although the site was in an area at risk of flooding, any harm in this respect could be dealt with by conditions, as set out in the report. The design of the proposal was considered acceptable, also as set out in the report.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the design of the proposal was considered acceptable, as set out in the report. In terms of impact on residential amenity, the proposed single-storey rear extension, would not in his opinion have any impact on residential amenity. It would not give rise to overshadowing or overlooking.

The Area Planning Officer reported that the dwellings that the proposed two-storey side extension may have an impact on were nos. 10, 12 and 14 Appleford Drive, and no. 15 Stiles Close. The Area Planning Officer dealt with each of these in turn, as set out in the Committee report.

The Area Planning Officer further reported that there would be two independently accessible parking spaces to the front of the dwelling which was wholly in accordance with Kent County Council (KCC) Vehicle Parking Standards (as set out in Interim Guidance Note 3), which set out that, in suburban areas such as this, 2 spaces was the minimum requirement for a 4+ bedroom dwelling. Given that the parking provision would be in accordance with KCC standards, he did not consider this to amount to a reason for refusal. Whilst all of the parking would be provided to the front of the dwelling, due to the relationship of the site to Stiles Close, the parking would largely be screened from view on approach from the west. As such, the Area Planning Officer did not consider that the parking arrangement proposed would have a harmful visual impact and recommended that planning permission be granted.

Local residents raised the following points: would have a detrimental impact on the garden of no. 8 Appleford Drive affecting their privacy; if the plots were large enough to accommodate four and five bedroom houses, then surely the developer would have built them; believe there is something in the deeds for each property about not extending the properties; would have an adverse impact on no. 10 Appleford Drive with just a brick wall as a view; application was a fait accompli; concern that the committee report was not available on the planning website, was this a deliberate oversight?; were not aware of the officer's recommendation for approval; Parish Council were wholly opposed to the development; 70% loss of parking area and note the garage was not considered as part of future parking as it was too small, this was confirmed by letter from Head of Planning Services; must have two independently accessible spaces and to do this you would have to cross-over the landscaped area; where would the wheelie bins be stored as there would be no side access?; why did the committee report not state very small garage? This lets the reader assume it's a full sized garage; need to consider visitor parking; would lead to parking on a blind bend potentially blocking the road to emergency services; Paragraph 1.02 of the committee report states the property is 'side-on' to the road it is not, also the driveway is not mainly to the front it is to the side of the road; was within a flood zone flooding might be a problem; garage has been missed-off the description for the application; paragraphs 9.02, 9.03, 9.04, 9.05 and 9.07 were full of opinions and not facts; dust would be a problem during construction; the original application form was deliberately not filled-in correctly; trees and hedges would be affected by the proposals; would be impossible to build the extension without destroying the bottom gardens of 10 and 12

Appleford Drive; would be contrary to policies E1, E19 and E24; no. 12 Appleford Drive would be affected by digging foundations; planning application was flawed; the committee report talks about improving the quality of the applicant's life but this should not be at the detriment of other residents; would exacerbate the current parking problems; and the applicant's visitors already park on the road and drive over the grass verge.

In response to queries from local residents, the Area Planning Officer reported that the roof to the rear extension would be completely pitched. The garage shown on the drawings was not mentioned in the description of the report as it self-evidently would not be of sufficient size to accommodate a vehicle and as two parking spaces were proposed.

In response to a query from a Member the applicant confirmed that his builder would not need to access the site from no. 12 Appleford Drive.

A Member was disappointed about some of the negative comments aimed at the planning officer. He stated that the officer was employed by the Council to give his professional opinion and that is what he had done. A Member noted that some of the issues raised were civil matters not planning considerations. He stated that no decision had been made on the applications this would be made by the Planning Committee not the planning officers.

Officers then toured the site with Members, viewing the site from the back gardens of nos. 10 and 12 Appleford Drive.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel