A05	F/TH/15/0338
PROPOSAL:	Erection of side and rear single storey extension
LOCATION:	52 Yew Tree Gardens, Birchington, CT7 9AL
WARD:	Birchington South
AGENT:	Mr R Clark
APPLICANT:	Ms J Lesaux
RECOMMENDATION:	Approve

Subject to the following conditions:

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

## GROUND:

In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Purchase Act 2004).

2 The external materials and external finishes to be used in the extension hereby approved shall be of the same colour, finish and texture as those on the existing property.

# GROUND:

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan.

3 The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted application as amended by the revised drawing numbered 602/2B and dated 26 June 2015.

GROUND:

To secure the proper development of the area.

# RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history

## SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site lies within the urban confines of Birchington-on-sea. Yew Tree Gardens is a large cul-del-sac comprising of rows of two and three-storey pitched terraced properties, with onstreet areas of car parking. No.52 is situated on the end of a row of 5 properties, with a long paved front garden providing off-street tandem parking for two cars.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to provide additional bedrooms and living accommodation for the property. The extension has a hipped

and flat roof design, with facing brickwork to match the existing yellow stock brickwork on the property.

The proposal has been amended subsequent to submission following discussion with the Planning Officer, so that the roof height of the rear extension has been reduced adjacent to the neighbouring no.53, and the rear extension is now set off the side boundary with no.53 by 600mm.

## **DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

### Thanet Local Plan (2006)

D1 – Design TR16 – Car Parking

#### **NOTIFICATIONS**

Letters have been sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice has been posted. Two objections have been received from the neighbouring property raising the following concerns:

\* Loss of light.

\* Loss of outlook.

- \* Position of extension will impact on drainage inspection chamber.
- \* Inaccuracies on application form.

#### COMMENTS

The application has been called to Planning Committee by Cllr Suzanna Brimm, for members to consider the impact of the extension on the neighbouring property and parking availability in Yew Tree Gardens.

The main considerations in determining this application are the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers and the impact on the local highway network.

#### Character and Appearance

The extension would use materials to match the external appearance of the existing property, with yellow stock brick, concrete tiles for the hipped roof sections and UPVc windows. The side section of the rear extension would be partially visible from Yew Tree Gardens, however as the extension is set back approximately 6.5metres from the front elevation of the property this will not appear obtrusive, nor will the hipped roof design appear out of keeping with other properties in the road. Therefore the proposal will not have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area.

## Living Conditions

The amended location of the rear extension would be 600mm away from the side boundary with no.53, with an eaves height of approximately 2.6metres, pitching away from the boundary to an ridge height of approx. 3.15m. The proposal would extend 4metres beyond the rear wall of the property. A 1.8m high fence is in place between the two properties for the first few metres of the garden, increasing to 2metres in height. The rear gardens of both properties are about 8.5m long.

The nearest rear facing window at ground floor in the neighbour's property is a kitchen window. Concern has been raised by the neighbour in terms of the impact on the light and outlook from this window and the impact on the garden. As the room serves a kitchen without any seating, this is not considered to be a 'habitable room' for the purposes of planning considerations. This means that the room is not a room in which a resident would spend a considerable amount of time, such as a living room.

It is also relevant to consider the permitted development rights which no.52 benefits from. Permitted development rights allow for development without requiring planning permission, and this derives from general planning permission granted not by the Local Authority but by Parliament. Using these rights, a single storey rear extension of the same height and design could be built on no.52 extending out by 3metres without needing planning permission.

Taking account of the above matters and the height of the single storey extension and its design, the amended extension would not have any significantly harmful effects on the living conditions of no.53 in terms of loss of light or creation of a sense of enclosure to the main living and dining areas of the property. Given the location of the extension, set 600mm off the side boundary, at a height of 2.5metre to eaves, this will not result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring occupier. The impact on the kitchen window from the extension is not considered significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.

## Transportation

The proposed extension will increase the living accommodation within the property, adding 2 bedrooms at ground floor. There would be an increased parking demand for the property. 2 off-street parking spaces are available for the property in the front garden area, which is unusual in this area, meaning that the property can support the increase in demand without resulting in a significant adverse impact upon highway safety or convenience as a result of the proposed development.

## **Other Matters**

Concern has been raised about the impact of the extension on a drainage inspection chamber, located on the boundary between no.53 and no.52 about 4metres from the rear of the property. The impact of foundations on the Inspection chamber is not a material planning consideration, as it is the responsibility of the landowner to ensure access to the chamber and suitable foundations are built for the extension.

## Conclusion

In view of the above it is consider that this application should be approved as it would not have a significantly adverse impact on its surroundings and residential amenity and accords with Local Plan Policy D1 and the National Planning Policy Framework

Case Officer lain Livingstone