

Officer Report

Application No.	25/2072/FH
Site Address	6 CHURCH FIELD, STANFORD, ASHFORD, TN25 6UA
Officer Name	Katy Claw
Proposal	Garage conversion, first floor side extension and new dormer to front elevation

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-439127
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Refused
Recommendation Date	09 January 2026

Report

SITE

The application site forms a single detached property situated on the corner of the cul-de-sac with Stone Street. All six dwellings forming the cul-de-sac are uniform in their design and siting. Whilst they are not of any special architectural merit, they are unique, formed of two-storey gable-ended dwellings with forward projecting integral garage with catslide roof form. To the front of the garages is space for 2 independently accessible parking spaces. The surrounding front amenity areas are laid to grass, and the cul-de-sac is open plan with no dividing fences or walls.

The wider streetscene of Stone Street consists of two-storey detached properties of varying sizes and designs. Materials here are generally traditional red brick with tile hanging and concrete roof tiles.

A PROW (HE347) runs from the West and passes directly in front of the properties of Church Field, through the cul-de-sac where it then branches off to the South and East.

The following constraints apply:
 Within the settlement of Stanford
 Flood Zone 2 (fluvial flooding)
 PROW HE347
 Area of Archaeological Potential
 Special Landscape Area

RELEVANT HISTORY

99/0555/SH – erection of a conservatory to the south elevation.

Approved with conditions

SH/80/1220 – Outline application erection of dwellings.

Approved with conditions

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for a first-floor side (east) extension with connecting pitched roof front facing dormer over the catslide roof. The application also proposes conversion of the integral garage to form a bedroom with shower room, incorporating removal of the garage door to be infilled with a window and matching brickwork. The extensions would also be finished in matching materials.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file. The main points raised are summarised below.

Stanford Parish Council – no comment or objection to the application.

REPRESENTATIONS

3 representations received and are available in full on the planning file. The main points raised are summarised below.

- Not in keeping with the rest of the cul-de-sac
- Parking issues
- Impact upon neighbouring privacy

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 15.12.2025

RELEVANT POLICIES

Places and Policies Local Plan 2020: HB1, HB8, T2, NE3

Core Strategy Review 2022: SS1

NPPF

NPPG

APPRAISAL

Design and visual appearance

Dormer extension

Policy HB8 PPLP refers to extensions to dwellings, and it says that alterations and extensions should seek to reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building and not have a detrimental impact on the street scene, either by themselves or cumulatively. Point 4 of HB8 says that loft conversions requiring dormer extensions will be in proportion to the existing roof, thus maintaining overall building proportions. They should avoid presenting a top-heavy and flat-roofed appearance. Planning applications for extensions in roof spaces which front a highway will ensure that the proposed structure avoids damage to the architectural and aesthetic character of the existing building, and maintains the integrity of the street scene.

The proposed dormer would span the entire width of the catslide roof above the garage and set back from the eaves by around 0.4m and it would be highly visible on approach along Stone Street due to the corner plot location and significant depth. Its design, bulk and massing would result in an incongruous form of development, failing to read as an adjunct to the host property and would amount to poor design.

The design and bulk of the proposed dormer window would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the appearance and character of the host building and upon the appearance and character of the wider streetscene, in conflict with local planning policies HB1 and HB8 PPLP and the NPPF. It would also fail to be of sufficient design quality to protect or enhance the natural beauty of the Special Landscape Area, leading to unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of this designated area, in conflict with local planning policy NE3 PPLP.

It is noted that the remainder of the properties within the cul-de-sac remain largely unaltered, but this in itself is not a reason to refuse planning permission for alterations to a single property.

First-floor side extension

The extension here is connected to the proposed dormer but notwithstanding, the side extension would follow the roof line of the main house and would appear as a subservient addition in its own right due to the reduced ridge height which would sit approximately 0.2m below the main ridge. The use of matching materials is supported.

Garage conversion and associated works

The removal of the garage door and replacement with matching window and matching infill brickwork is acceptable. The loss of the garage space for parking purposes is acceptable, and this is covered in further detail below.

Residential amenity

It is considered that there would be no additional impact upon No.5 Church Field as a result of the side extension and dormer by way of loss of light, overbearing impact or overlooking. The existing space separation (around 0.8m) between the properties would be retained and the neighbours own garage sits between the proposed development and their main residence, resulting in a neutral impact overall.

The dormer would introduce an additional window at first floor, but any views from the dormer window would look over the open front amenity areas of the neighbouring properties opposite. These are not private areas and the space separation (18.2m) to the front facades of the neighbours is sufficient to ensure that inter-overlooking of windows would not occur to any such degree to warrant a reason for refusal.

Parking and highways

Policy T2 PPLP in with KCC IGN3 guidance sets out that garages can be variously used either for parking or for storage, or a combination of both, their use for vehicle parking is unreliable. As such they are not considered to count towards parking provision and as such, the conversion of the integral garage to living accommodation is not objectionable.

Policy T2 requires two independently accessible parking spaces for 3+ bed properties in rural areas. The property meets current parking standards and so the increase in the number of bedrooms from 4 beds to 6 beds is not objectionable on parking grounds.

It is noted that concern has been raised regarding the current parking provision within the cul-de-sac in general but this alone does not amount to a reason for refusal.

Archaeological Potential

Given the minor nature of the application it is not considered likely to result in harm to any buried items of archaeological interest. As such it is considered that no further information or mitigation is required in this regard.

Environmental Impact Assessment

In accordance with the EIA Regulations 2017, this development has been considered in light of Schedules 1& 2 of the Regulations and it is not considered to fall within either category and as such does not require screening for likely significant environmental effects.

Local finance considerations

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. Section 70(4) of the Act defines a local finance consideration as a grant or other financial assistance that has been, that will, or that could be provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown (such as New Homes Bonus payments), or sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

In accordance with policy SS5 of the Core Strategy Local Plan the Council has introduced a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) scheme, which in part replaces planning obligations for infrastructure improvements in the area. This application is not liable for the CIL charge.

HUMAN RIGHTS

I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view, the Assessment section above and the Recommendation represents an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) [and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties)] and the wider public interest.

PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

In determining this application, regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set down in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular with regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. It is considered that the application proposals would not undermine objectives of the Duty.

It is considered that the application proposals would not conflict with objectives of the Duty.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the above, it is considered that planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out in the body of the report.

Recommended Refusal Reasons (1)

1

The proposed front facing dormer, by virtue of its scale, bulk, massing, siting and design would amount to an incongruous and obtrusive form of development which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene and would fail to protect or enhance the natural beauty of the Special Landscape Area. The proposed development would be contrary to policies HB1, HB8 and NE3 of the adopted Places and Policies Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Suggested Informatives (1)

1

Your attention is drawn to the fact that this refusal of planning permission is on the basis of submitted documents:

Site Location Plan – 11.11.2025

Proposed Block Plan – 7838-P-03 Rev A – 11.11.2025

Proposed Roof Plan – 7838-P-04 Rev A – 11.11.2025

Proposed Plans & Elevations – 7838-P-02 Rev A – 19.11.2025

