

A05

FH/TH/16/0756

PROPOSAL: Erection of a single storey side extension and two storey rear and side extension and erection of porch to front elevation following demolition of existing garage.

LOCATION: 26 Old Hall Drive RAMSGATE Kent CT12 5LE

WARD: Cliffsend And Pegwell

AGENT: Miss Aileen Waddell

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Larkins

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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings.

numbered 22699A_04 Revision P3, and 22699A_05 Revision P4 received 5 August 2016., ,
****, ****, ****, ****, ****

GROUND:

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 The external materials and external finishes to be used in the extensions 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 Cliffsend. Old Hall Drive is characterised by two storey development with predominantly detached properties and groups of terraced properties. Architecturally properties are of a neo-Georgian appearance with a very uniform

external appearance and open plan front gardens laid to lawn. The detached properties in this part of Old Hall Drive most notably have virtually identical front entrances with arch and columns in the neo-Georgian style with bow windows at ground floor. The properties are set back from the highway and have distinct separation from each other with single storey garages to one side, maintaining an openness between properties which is characteristic of the appearance of this part of Old Hall Drive.

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no previous planning history for this property.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The original proposal was for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension with balcony to rear, erection of porch to front elevation following demolition of existing garage. Following a number of objections from neighbouring residential occupiers and concerns regarding 'terracing' the proposal has been amended to omit the balcony to the rear and revise the extensions.

The proposal now under consideration is for the erection of a single storey side extension and two storey rear and side extension and erection of a porch to the front elevation following demolition of the existing garage.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2006 (Saved Policies)

D1 - Design principles

NOTIFICATIONS

Letters of objection have been received from 12 nearby residential properties raising the following concerns:

- Overbearing impact on neighbouring properties
- Loss of spacing between properties
- Loss of light
- Loss of outlook
- Loss of view through existing gap between properties
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Negative impact on surrounding area
- Porch is too large and not in keeping with other houses
- Loss of parking as a result of larger porch
- Additional parking in front garden out of keeping
- Balcony - overlooking and loss of privacy
- Frontage should remain a Georgian style with open plan appearance
- Loss of open soft landscaping to the front of the property to car parking
- Impact on the whole look and economic benefits of living in a village environment
- Addition of flue
- Covenant for the estate - nothing shall be built in advance of the front of the house.

The Cliffsend Residents Association confirm the objections already listed.

Two letters of support have been received, one from the immediate neighbour at No.24, raising no objection.

CONSULTATIONS

Cliffsend Parish Council - Initially raised concerns over the potential loss of privacy resulting from the balcony but this has since been removed from the proposal. Concerns are raised over the side extension together with the porch making the property out of character with existing properties.

ANALYSIS

The application is brought before members by Cllr John Townend for members to consider the impact of the size and severity of the planned alterations/extensions on the character and appearance on Old Hall Drive which has retained its original open plan design.

Character and Appearance

The area comprises two storey detached properties with a very uniform external appearance and open plan gardens to the front laid to lawn. The detached properties in this part of Old Hall Drive most notably have virtually identical front entrances with arch and columns in the neo-Georgian style with bow windows at ground floor.

Many of the objection received raised concerns over the loss of the originally designed entrance door and the erection of a porch that would change the character and appearance of properties within Old Hall Drive. The proposed porch has external measurements of 1.8 metres by 3.2 metres and a height of 2.7 metres. A modest porch could be built under permitted development allowances as the property is set back more than 2 metres from the highway however this proposal is larger in floor area than that permitted within the permitted development allowance. The proposed porch would alter the uniform appearance of this property compared to its neighbours in Old Hall Drive, however, porches can be added without the need for planning permission where they meet the permitted development criteria. I therefore consider the argument to keep the external appearance of the entrance to the property unchanged is not one that can be considered on its own as a reason for refusal. The proposed porch would extend across the front of the property, extending 0.5 metres beyond the existing front elevation. The facing brickwork is to match that of the main property with the addition of a timber door and glazing. I consider the porch to be residential in design and not inappropriate in scale to the main dwelling and is therefore acceptable.

The single storey side extension has been set back slightly from the front elevation and would be set back 2.1 metres from the proposed front porch. This single storey element runs almost 6 metres from the front elevation of the main dwelling to the rear and together with its mono pitched roof maintains the visual gap between properties as viewed from the highway. The proposed two storey extension runs across the rear of the property to a similar depth of the extension of the neighbouring property at No.28. The two storey extension to the rear of

the property would not be immediately visible from Old Hall Drive, however, the portion of extension to the side of the property, towards the rear adjoining the boundary with No.24, would only be visible from glances between properties. I consider the siting and design of the two storey rear and side extension, together with the windows fronting the highway and materials to match, would not appear unduly dominant within the streetscene.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development, by virtue of its siting and design, would 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.

Living Conditions

The proposal under consideration no longer includes the balcony roof terrace to the rear which raised concerns of overlooking and loss of privacy.

There are no windows proposed in the side elevations facing either adjoining properties (Nos 28 and 24). The two storey extension would project 3.5 metres into the rear garden with the single storey rear extension extending a further 3 metres, in the location of the garage, alongside the existing garage of No.24. This extension would be approximately 0.6 metres wider than the garage footprint it replaces. A window is proposed in the side elevation of the single storey rear extension facing the rear garden of No.28 and is approximately 7.5 metres from the side boundary which is screened by a high level wooden fence.

The single storey rear extension would be approximately 9.5 metres from the rear garden boundary with properties in Moyes Close and Greystones Road, with the two storey element being approximately 12.5 metres from the boundary. From the rear garden of the application site it was noticeable that properties to the rear overlook directly into the application site resulting in mutual overlooking between properties. The existing windows at first floor serve a bedroom and bathroom. The windows proposed at first floor in the extended rear elevation would serve bedrooms which is similar to the existing situation, albeit 3.5 metres further into the site. This is not considered to be significantly harmful to the neighbours at the rear, given the presence of existing first floor windows.

The rear extension would project the same distance into the rear garden as the existing glazed conservatory which is to be removed. I consider there to be no material change in the impact of window arrangements at ground floor.

The proposed extensions would be built on the boundary with No.24, however, due to the separation distance of approximately 2.5 metres and the location of the existing garage it is considered there would not be an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers of No.24.

The occupants of No.28 have objected to the impact of the rear extension on a bedroom facing the application site, with concerns that the side wall would be very close and have a significant overbearing impact on the bedroom and loss of natural light. The distance between the application site and No.28 remains the same (2.5 metres) however the extension would add an additional 3.5 metres of depth to the property. At the time of my visit

the first floor side window of No.28, serving a bedroom, was clearly in shadow from the existing proximity of No.26. The natural light reaching the window is mainly from above, over the roof of No.26. Given the orientation of the room some morning light will be reduced to this bedroom, however, I do not believe this would significantly change as a result of the proposed extension given the existing relationship between the two properties.

The view out of this bedroom window is currently directly onto the brickwork of the side elevation of No.26 with views into the rear garden possible if leaning into the window. Due to the current lack of outlook due to the positioning of the bedroom window I do not consider the proposed extension would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to this bedroom.

The proposed development would not result in any significant detrimental impact on neighbouring property occupiers. It is therefore considered that in terms of the living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers, the proposal is in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highway Safety

The property currently benefits from a large driveway and a garage. The garage is to be removed and a porch and side extension built over existing off street parking. The proposed porch to the front will result in a distance of approximately 8 metres for the parking of vehicles. It is considered that the proposal would not materially increase the dwellings requirement for car parking provision and off street parking is available within the site and there is ample on-street parking available within Old Hall Drive.

For these reasons I consider there will be no change in highway safety.

Other Matters

Concerns raised over the loss of view from Moyes Close through the gap to the green in Old Hall Drive are not concerns that can be considered through the planning process.

The flue shown in the original drawing, removed in the amended drawing, would not require the benefit of planning permission.

Concerns regarding Covenants are civil matters and are not considered by this application.

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

Rosemary Bullivant

TITLE: FH/TH/16/0756

Project 26 Old Hall Drive RAMSGATE Kent CT12 5LE

Scale:

