

**A02**

**FH/TH/16/0555**

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of two storey side extension together with erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing

**LOCATION:** garage

18 Hildersham Close BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 2XD

**WARD:** St Peters

**AGENT:** John Lowden

**APPLICANT:** Mrs J Taylor

**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 proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted application as amended by the revised drawing numbered 141-1A and received 07 July 2016.

**GROUND:**

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 The external materials and external finishes to be used in the erection of 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.

#### SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is located within the urban confines of Broadstairs. Hildersham Close is characterised by predominantly two storey development consisting of a mix of 1970's

detached and semi-detached dwellings set in modest sized plots. Architecturally properties are of a typical 1970's design, brick built, a number with tile hanging and most with neo-Georgian details around the doors and windows. The dwelling the subject of this application is a two storey detached property with a pitched tiled roof, brick and tile hanging to the front elevation. It (and its neighbour, no 19) presents a gable frontage to the road with a linked garage set under an asymmetrical pitched roof to the side. There is a narrow gap between the garage and the neighbouring property.

The dwelling is set back from the road by some 5.2m with the garage set back a further 5m. It sits on a common building line with its neighbours. The adjoining property to the east (number 19) is located approximately 4.6m from the side elevation of no 18. On the opposite side number 17 is a two storey semi-detached house which is set a similar distance away from no 18.

### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

A previous planning application for a development, similar in description to the current application was refused under TH/16/0040. The ground for the refusal was;

"If permitted the extension by virtue of its width and massing will create a terracing effect between number 18 and 19 Hildersham Close which will be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene and the overall character of the area contrary to policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and section 7 of the NPPF"

This application differs from the earlier scheme by setting back the side extension further to the rear of the property and offsetting the extension from the boundary.

### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension set under a hipped roof which runs at right angles to the main roof with the ridge set approximately 0.9m lower than that of the main house. The extension is shown to be set back from the main front elevation of the house by 3.6m at ground floor level and 4.9m at first floor level. It will extend beyond the rear of the existing house by some 3m and is set off the boundary by 0.5m. A single storey rear extension is also proposed to run off the new two storey extension towards the centre of the rear elevation. This measures some 3m in depth by 2.7m in width and is set under flat roof.

There are no windows in the side elevation with fenestration shown only on the front and rear elevations.

### DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

#### **Thanet Local Plan 2006 (Saved Policies)**

D1 - Design principles

### NOTIFICATIONS

Letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers and a site notice was posted near the site. One letter of objection has been received raising the following points of concern. [However in doing so the letter does acknowledge the positive changes that have been made to the design of the revised proposal]:

- o The proposal will still result in a terracing effect which would be detrimental to the street scene
- o The proposal will have an adverse impact on light to a side window in the property
- o The scale and massing of the side wall of the extension will be overbearing
- o Over development of the plot

Broadstairs and St Peters Town Council objects to the proposal on the grounds that it would:

- Create a terracing effect
- Result in loss of light to no 19
- Be overbearing
- Be detrimental to the street scene

## ANALYSIS

Councillor Gregory requested the application be called in on the grounds of loss of light, terracing effect and overbearing impact to the neighbouring property, 19 Hildersham Close.

The main considerations with regard to this planning application are the impact of the proposal upon character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

### **Character and Appearance**

The property is located within an established residential area comprising two storey properties set in reasonable plots. To the west of the application site the properties are regularly spaced although they vary from detached to semi-detached houses. The application as submitted sought to infill the whole of the gap to the side of no 18 as far as the boundary with the adjoining property. However this has been the subject of further discussion with the applicant who has provided revised plans showing the building offset from the boundary by 0.5m.

At first floor level the extension is now shown to be set back by almost 5m. It is therefore appropriate to consider whether these changes address the adverse impact on the street scene caused by the original application.

Development in Hildersham Close, on its north side, has a regularity of rhythm with spacing between the buildings being largely uniform. This is heightened by the uniformity of the building widths fronting the road. However it must be acknowledged that oblique views along the street from either direction will not be affected by the proposed side extension. The degree of setback, especially at first floor level, will ensure that it is only in close views of the property that the extension will be seen. The degree of set back now ensures that the proposed development will not have a major impact on the street scene.

Moreover the modest offset of the building from the boundary, when combined with the faceting of the building will ensure that the development will not be read as a terrace wherever the site is viewed from. I therefore consider that the revised proposal will not make a significant impact on the street scene.

In terms of the pattern of the development the extension will not significantly alter the overall pattern and rhythm of the street frontage for the reasons set out above. It must also be acknowledged that the uniformity of the building widths on this immediate part of the road has already been affected by the extension constructed at no 19.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development will not result in an unduly dominant or intrusive development within the street scene and the proposal is therefore in line with policy D1 of the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and overcomes the previous reasons for refusal.

### **Living Conditions**

In relation to the living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers there are two considerations, whether the extension has an overbearing impact on the adjoining property and whether it involves the loss of amenities that could be reasonably expected in this suburban area.

The earlier refused scheme identified that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining residents. This matter has been reviewed with the benefit of a further site visit and additional information from respondents to the application.

The side extension will project 3m beyond the rear elevation of the existing house and border the side of a single storey extension at the back of no 19. As the location of this rear projection is on the north side of the house its impact on the potential loss of light will not be significant in view of its limited length beyond the rear of the house. Nor do I consider that it will have an overbearing effect when viewed from the rear windows of the house.

There are side windows to no 19 at ground floor level. One large window towards the front of the property gives secondary light to a habitable room. However the extension at ground floor level will only marginally encroach on the edge of the opening and light from the south will be unaltered. A second window is set adjacent to the existing garage of no 19 which blocks that opening to a great degree. The proposed extension will reduce any light able to enter that window but again it appears to be a secondary window. This window has been confirmed by the owner of the property to be a second window to a large lounge diner with that window providing outlook and light to the rear part of that room.

The proposed development will cut any remaining sky view from that window and inevitably reduce the amount of light entering that window. The offsetting of the extension by 0.5m from the boundary does go some way towards alleviating the impact.

As a result I am of the opinion that whilst there will be some impact it does not carry sufficient weight to support a refusal of the application. In reaching this conclusion I have

taken into consideration the fact that it is a secondary window and that rebuilding of the existing garage under permitted development would allow for some increase in height of the structure relative to that window.

In light of this it is not considered that there would be a significant increase in the overbearing impact of the proposed extension or significant loss of light which would unreasonably affect the amenity of the occupiers.

The proposed rear extension is of a modest scale and in a location that would prevent any significant detrimental impact on neighbouring property occupiers. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above it is considered that this application does not have an adverse impact on its surroundings or living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers and accords with Local Plan Policy D1 and the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that members approve the application subject to safeguarding conditions.

### **Case Officer**

David Stewart

TITLE: FH/TH/16/0555

Project 18 Hildersham Close BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 2XD

Scale:

