

a) DOV/16/00838 – Conversion of existing building from two flats to two dwelling-houses with a two-storey extension to 24 (existing extensions to be demolished) and erection of a first-floor conservatory to no. 22 - 22, 24 and 24A, Mill Hill, Deal

Update on Reasons for withdrawing this item from the Planning Committee meeting agenda of 20 October 2016

1.1 This application was due to be considered at the October 2016 Planning Committee. In the days leading up to the Committee meeting, the applicant submitted a letter and accompanying information to some Members. These were not circulated to Officers and therefore there was no opportunity to review the documentation in advance. This new information only came to light on the afternoon of the Committee meeting and a decision was taken to withdraw the report from that meeting's agenda.

1.2 The documentation consisted of two undated letters, a synopsis of the proposed works with brief comments, photographs/drawings, an email from the Planning Delivery Manager to the applicant, an email from the applicant to his agent and some handwritten comments on the Case Officer's Committee report.

For information the documentation is attached.

It is not considered that any new information has been provided, but taking the points made, Officer comments are:-

1.3 Overshadowing (and the overbearing effects/loss of outlook)

The Officer report at 4.2 covers this point and the email between the Planning Delivery Manager and the Applicant advises that the overshadowing would not be a strong enough reason on which to base a refusal on its own. The point being, as the committee report sets out at para 4.3, that the cumulative effect of the proximity of the development to the properties to the rear (which causes the overshadowing) would also result in a sense of enclosure and loss of outlook – the effects of which (including the overshadowing) would be harmful to their residential amenity. Essentially, if the two storey extension was reduced in depth at first floor (to a suitable design) then this could overcome the combined harm

1.4 Garden Area

The proposed garden area is small and if left without any means of enclosure would mean there would be no private amenity space to serve the needs of occupants. Even if enclosed, the amount of amenity space available would be considered insufficient to meet the needs of the occupants of two houses. The loss of land to garden land, whether enclosed or otherwise would clearly erode an element of amenity provided by this albeit small area of grass verge in a built up street scene. Such areas of grassed verge do contribute to the street scene quality of an area – and it is only too easy to lose such spaces.

The applicant argues that amenity space to properties opposite is less than that proposed for this development. The private rear gardens referred to are approximately 12 square metres per dwelling.

1.5 The improvements that will be made by the development

The conclusion to the Officer report at 6.2 accepts that the development proposed would result in an improvement to the appearance of the building and provide two new dwelling-houses.

Conclusion

The development remains unacceptable for the reasons set out in the original committee report and the original recommendation remains unchanged

Dave Robinson

Planning Delivery Manager