

A01

F/TH/17/1781

PROPOSAL: Erection of 2No. 4-bed semi-detached dwellings

LOCATION: Land Adjacent 1 Albert Road BROADSTAIRS Kent

WARD: Beacon Road

AGENT: Mr Andrew Evans

APPLICANT: Mr John Leech

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 shown on drawing numbered 17.1116.AE.PL03, 17.1116.AE.PL04, 17.1116.AE.PL05 and 17.1116.AE.PL06.

GROUND:

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 No development shall take place on any external surface of the development hereby permitted until details of the type, colour and texture of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the dwellings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

GROUND:

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

4 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of location, type and height the boundary treatments, which shall be erected delineating the private gardens of the approved dwellings, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of either approved dwelling.

GROUND:

To ensure that the development is compatible with the amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.

5 No further roof alterations whether approved by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 Class B or C of Part 1 Schedule 2 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out without the prior permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND:

To ensure a satisfactory external treatment and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan.

6 The development hereby approved shall incorporate a bound surface material for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway.

GROUND:

In the interests of highway safety.

7 No development shall commence on site until full details of the surface water drainage arrangements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage details shall be constructed as approved before any part of the development hereby permitted is brought into use.

GROUND:

To ensure that there is a satisfactory means of drainage in accordance with the NPPF.

8 The first floor windows in the rear elevation of the dwellings hereby approved (as shown on drawing numbered 17.1116.AE.PL05) shall be provided and maintained with level 5 obscure glass or equivalent.

GROUND:

To safeguard the privacy and amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan.

9 The windows to be provided at first floor level in rear elevation of the dwellings hereby approved shall be provided and maintained with a cill height of not less than 1.73 metres above the finished internal floor level.

GROUND:

To safeguard the privacy and amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES

Please be aware that obtaining planning permission and complying with building regulations are separate matters - please contact building control on 01843 577522 for advice on building regulations

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to a regular shaped parcel of land between numbers 1 and 3 Albert Road and 52 Whitfield Avenue, Broadstairs. The site is enclosed by a wall approximately 1m high to the Albert Road frontage. It is noted that there is a street light in situ on the public footpath in front of the site. The front portion of the site is overgrown in nature and there is a flat garage to the eastern end of the site. The rear portion of the site is associated with number 52, as part of its curtilage.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/17/0986 Erection of 2no. two storey 4 bed dwellings. Refused 21/09/17 Planning Committee

This application was recommended by officers for approval but following full consideration of the proposal Members resolved to refuse the planning application on the following grounds:

1) The proposed two dwellings, by virtue of their design, prominent siting and proximity to and relationship with the adjoining properties in Albert Road, would result in the loss of openness between dwellings, comprising a cramped and congested form of development, that would appear out of character with the pattern of development in the locality and incongruous within the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Thanet Local Plan Policies D1 and SR11 and paragraphs 57 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2) The proposed development by virtue of its height, siting and proximity to numbers 52, 54 and 56 Whitfield Avenue would result in a dominant form of development that would have an unacceptable overbearing sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties, significantly harmful to the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of those properties, contrary to policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

F/TH/17/0689 Erection of 4No. two storey dwellings. Withdrawn prior to determination 26/06/17, due to officer concerns

F/TH/08/0443 Erection of a single storey dwelling. Refused 28/05/08 Appeal dismissed.

The reason for refusal was:

1. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its prominent siting and its proximity to and relationship with the adjoining properties in Albert Road, would result in the loss of openness between dwellings, therefore comprising a cramped and congested form of development, that would appear out of character with the pattern of development in the locality and

incongruous within the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Thanet Local Plan Policies D1 and SR11.

The Inspector considered that the proposed single storey bungalow would infill what is now the only significant gap in the development in the immediate area, and would give a congested appearance to its frontage. In terms of the layout he noted that 'the front wall of the bungalow would be in line with the existing bungalow at 1 Albert Road, and would be forward from the building line of the semi-detached houses to the east. Together with the loss of openness from the site, the proposed bungalow would be out of keeping with the overall character of the surrounding area.' He concluded that the proposal would appear unreasonably congested on its site, and it would be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the surrounding area.

This appeal decision is still considered to be a material consideration in the determination of residential development on the site.

F/TH/04/0804 Erection of a detached, hipped-roofed bungalow, on land to be severed from the existing garden of No. 1 Albert Road. Refused 18/02/05

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Planning consent is sought for the erection of 2 no. 4 bed semi-detached dwellings and associated car-ports. The dwellings would be two and a half storey with rooms within the roof space. The two dwellings are a mirror image of each other, having a centrally positioned front entrance door and window openings aligning with one another. A car port is proposed for each dwelling located to the side of each dwelling.

The submitted plans indicate that the materials will be facing brickwork, fibre cement cladding, natural slate with timber doors and windows.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan (2006) Saved Policies

- Policy D1 - Design
- Policy D2 - Landscaping
- Policy H1 - Residential development sites
- Policy H4 - Windfall Sites
- Policy TR12 - Cycling
- Policy TR16 - Car parking provision
- Policy SR5 - Doorstep and local play space
- Policy SR11 - Private Open Space

NOTIFICATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers were notified of the application and a site notice was erected at the front of the site. As a result five representations have been received (some objectors have written in more than once). The concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Fire escape and safety issues of new dwellings;
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Plans do not match the surrounding closest properties 54 & 56
- The houses are not in keeping with the rest of the road – car ports and use of timber doors and windows rather than Upvc
- Rear very visible bedroom windows look more industrial
- Adverse impact upon residential amenity by way of loss of sunlight (particularly in the winter, outlook and being overbearing
- No. 54 will become boxed in; suffering a complete sense of enclosure
- No. 56 has a bedroom balcony that can be overlooked by both properties
- Submitted drawings have a number of inaccuracies – extensions on other dwellings not included
- Highway safety concerns
- Loss of mature trees and shrubs
- Increase in noise from the proposed residential properties

CONSULTATIONS

Broadstairs Town Council: The Planning Committee of the Town Council has considered this application and has resolved unanimously that the planning application should be refused.

Concerns: Too high, overdevelopment, overshadowing, neighbours' loss of light, neighbours' loss of privacy, overlooking, detrimental impact on the residential amenities of nos. 52, 54 and 56 Whitfield avenue, creates an unacceptable overbearing sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties, cramming and loss of trees and shrubs.

Broadstairs Society: Object to the development. The previous application was for 2 4-bed semi-detached houses and there seems little difference between the applications. The Society still feels it is an overdevelopment of the site and should not be approved.

COMMENTS

This application is referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Cllr. Matterface on the basis of the impact on neighbours at number 54 and 56 Whitfield Avenue.

Principle

The 2008 appeal decision and the recent 2017 application determined by Members of the Planning Committee, referred to above are considered to be a material consideration in the determination of residential development on the site.

However, the Council does not currently have a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, housing applications such as this, should be considered in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework's (NPPF's) presumption in favour of sustainable development.

This is because local policies relating to the supply of housing are no longer considered up-to-date (para 49). Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that where relevant local policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

In this case the application site lies within a residential area of Broadstairs, however, the proposal needs to be assessed with regard to the impact of the character and appearance of the area, impact on living conditions of neighbours and all other relevant material considerations.

Character and Appearance

One of the reasons for refusal for the previous application related to form and character issues; it was considered that the proposal would result in the loss of openness between dwellings, comprising a cramped and congested form of development, that would appear out of character with the pattern of development in the locality and incongruous within the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenities. In order to address this reason, changes to the scheme have been made.

The key changes made are:

- * The car-ports have been moved to the site boundaries rather than between the two dwellings proposed
- * Barn hips have been incorporated into the design of the dwellings
- * Alterations to the fenestration including:
- * Additional roof lights incorporated into the front elevation
- * Windows at first floor/lower roof level rather than roof lights

Referring back to the design of the proposed dwellings, these reflect the traditional form of a pair of semi-detached properties, with the dwellings next to one another and garages to either side of their respective dwellings which they serve, which replicates the existing pattern of development within the street scene. In addition the roof over the dwellings incorporates a half hip rather than a gable; again there are a mix of hip and half hip roofs within Albert Road, which these two dwellings would be seen in conjunction with. The northern side of Albert Road has a pattern to the roof types alternating between full hips and half hips; nos. 3 & 5 have a full hip, nos. 7 & 9 have a half hip, nos. 11 & 13 have a full hip. This roof type will therefore reinforce this pattern.

The dwellings would have fibre cement cladding to half the front elevation and brickwork to the middle option. It is considered that this is reflection of the tile hanging on existing dwellings that is the material between the upper floor window and front entrance door. The dwellings also both have roof lights within the front roof slope, whilst this is not a common feature within the street scene it is noted that no. 29 Albert Road has a roof light. One of the main differences is that the front entrance point for both proposed dwellings is located in a central position within the main elevation, those within existing dwellings are to the outer edge of the dwellings. Whilst the proposed dwellings do not directly replicate those within the

street exactly, it is considered that the key characteristics of housing in the area have been included and the development would not appear out of keeping in the streetscene following the alterations.

The reason for refusal also refers to the prominent siting of the development; the plot has limited depth and therefore the dwellings and associated car-port cannot be moved back further into the plot without reducing the depth of the amenity space. Notwithstanding this no. 3 Albert Road (two storey) would be marginally further back than the proposed dwellings. No.1 (bungalow) however would still be set further forward of the proposed dwellings. The scheme now re-locates the carports to either side of the dwellings rather than having them between the two proposed dwellings. This gives a visual break between the two storey elements and reduces the prominence within the street scene.

In terms of the site, the plot has a width of 20m, which is greater than other semi-detached dwellings fronting Albert Road (varying between 15m-18m). The proposed layout with single storey carports located to the flank of each property replicates others within the street. Their siting also creates more space at first floor level between the neighbouring properties, appearing visually similar to others within the streetscene. It is appreciated that the depth of the plots are limited in comparison to other dwellings amenity spaces, however this would not be highly visible from the road to cause visual harm to the wider area.

It is therefore considered that the previous reason for refusal has been overcome, and that the development will not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Living Conditions

The proposed dwelling would be two storeys with a room in the roof and therefore has the potential to impact upon the amenities of those residents living nearby.

To the north of the site is no.56 Whitfield Avenue and its associated curtilage. As the proposed dwelling is located to the south, there would be some loss of light received by no. 56 Whitfield Avenue, however given the separation distance and orientation of the property, perpendicular to the application site with main windows facing to the west and east, I do not consider that it would be significantly harmful. In terms of outlook, no.56 has a rear garden from which the development would be visible. The proposed dwelling would not affect the outlook from the main habitable room windows to the rear of no.56 due to the position of the site to the south of the site.

In terms of outlook, no.54 has a rear garden from which the development would be clearly visible. However, the proposed dwellings gardens would separate the built form from the boundary, and the spacing between the rear conservatory of no.54 and the development has increased from the previously refused scheme from 6m to 7.5m. This increase in space is considered on balance to be acceptable without resulting in a development that would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to the garden of no.54.

The proposed first floor rear bedrooms of the development would be served by fixed obscure glazed windows, with opening rooflights (clear glazed) of cill height of 1.7m above finished floor level. This arrangement will mean that no actual overlooking would result to either the

rear garden of no.s 54 or 56 Whitfield Avenue. The obscurity of these windows, and the proposed side windows at first floor level, would be controlled by condition.

No. 52 is within the ownership of the applicant (blue land), however, concern was raised by Members about this relationship. The built form of the proposed dwellings would extend approximately a third of the way across the bottom of their site, the degree of separation between the dwellinghouse has increased in comparison with the previously refused scheme by approximately 2.7m. I considered that this relationship is acceptable.

In terms of overlooking, the front windows face south over the frontage of properties on the opposite side of the road. Therefore views would be limited to public areas only.

Transportation

In-front of the dwellings is one off-street parking space for each unit, together with the space provided by the carport.

In terms of parking provision, the carport provides space for 1 vehicle per dwelling and there is an additional space to the front of each dwelling. This is sufficient for a four bedroom property and accords with the current parking standards.

In terms of the street light it is recommended that an informative is attached to advise that if street furniture will need to be repositioned at the applicant's own expense.

Conclusion

Given the current housing need within Thanet and the location of the site could support a housing development, and therefore the principle of housing on this site is considered acceptable. The previous application for two dwellings was refused due to the impact on the character of the area and on the living conditions of neighbours. The revisions to the design of the properties replicate the key appearance of existing dwellings within Albert Road and increase the spacing between the new buildings and existing in the streetscene, replicating plot widths in the area. Therefore the development will appear in keeping with the character and appearance of the wider streetscene.

Previously Members were also specifically concerned with the impact upon neighbouring occupiers that would result from the introduction of two, two storey dwellings on this parcel of land. Amendments have been made to the design and siting of the dwellings, with increased spacing provided between neighbouring properties and the development. It is considered on balance that the revisions made to the scheme are sufficient to overcome the previous Member concerns. Therefore in conclusion, the proposal is considered to accord with Thanet Local Plan policies and the NPPF, and is recommended for approval.

Case Officer

Gill Richardson

TITLE: F/TH/17/1781

Project Land Adjacent 1 Albert Road BROADSTAIRS Kent

Scale:

