

A01

FH/TH/20/0939

PROPOSAL: Erection of two storey rear extension following the demolition of existing single storey rear extension

LOCATION: 75 Royal Esplanade MARGATE Kent CT9 5ET

WARD: Westbrook

AGENT: No agent

APPLICANT: Mr Chris Hatcher

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 drawing entitled 'detailed Plans of a Proposed Rear Face 2 x storey extension' and Block Plan received 31 July 2020.

GROUND:

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 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 QD02 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 is a detached dwelling fronting Royal Esplanade and is located within the urban confines of Margate in a wholly residential area. Properties along this section of Royal Esplanade are substantial sized dwellings with a variety of architectural styles, set back from the highway, with low level boundary walls to the front boundary. The dwelling to the north occupies a double width plot which provides a significant open space between properties, over which the side elevation of the application site can be seen from the public highway.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension. The first floor extension would have a pitched roof with tiles to match the main roof and the wider ground floor extension would be finished with a mono pitched roof with rooflights. The external brickwork finish would match those used on the main dwelling. On the first floor the extension would enlarge the existing bedroom and include a window within the eastern and southern elevations. At ground floor level bi-folding windows and doors would be installed on the eastern and southern elevations, including the rear wall following the removal of the existing single storey extension.

PLANNING POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2020

QD02 - General Design Principles

QD03 - Living Conditions

NOTIFICATIONS

Neighbours have been notified and a site notice posted and one representation has been received mainly concerned that the extension would compromise future development proposals within the neighbouring garden.

Concerns raised include:

- The bulk and massing of the proposed extension will have an overbearing and harmful effect when viewed from the proposed house and garden of No.74, particularly taking account of the higher ground level of No. 75.
- Whilst two storey side extensions are not uncommon in the locality, two storey rear extensions have not been permitted in this part of Royal Esplanade.
- The extension is detrimental to and out of character with the surrounding area.
- Overshadowing and loss of light - Due to the bulk and height of the proposed extension, there is a detrimental effect in terms of blocking daylight from the rear windows of proposed No.74, particularly the nearest ground floor window.

COMMENTS

The application is brought to Planning Committee, as the applicant is related to an employee of Thanet District Council. The main consideration for Members to assess are the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area and impact on neighbouring amenity.

Character and Appearance

The area is predominantly characterised by two storey dwellings fronting Royal Esplanade. The proposed development would be located to the rear of the property which, due to the double width neighbouring plot, the flank facing elevation of the extension would be visible from the public highway, across the garden.

Thanet Local Plan policy QD02 relates to general design principles and supports development that relates to surrounding development, is well designed, respects and enhances the character of the area paying particular attention to context and identity of its location, scale, massing, rhythm, density, layout and use of materials appropriate to the locality. The development itself must be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and be inclusive in its design for all users. This policy is supported by paragraph 127 of the NPPF which states that decisions should ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, and paragraph 130 which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Consideration therefore needs to be given as to whether the scale and design of the extension would fail to respect the main dwelling, or be out of keeping or harmful to the character and appearance of the area in terms of its relationship with neighbouring buildings and spaces in line with the aims of the above policies.

With regards to the siting of the extension it is not proposed to build the extension close to the side boundary and therefore the existing space to the boundary would be maintained. The extension would project approximately 4.8 metres from the rear elevation of the property, with the eaves height matching the existing dwelling, with the ridge set down approximately 1 metre from the ridge of the main dwelling. The extension, at ground floor, would have a width of approximately 6 metres, reducing to a width of approximately 3.3 metres at first floor level. The external surfaces of the extension would be finished with red facing brick to match the bricks used in the main dwelling and the pitched roof would be finished with brown coloured roof tiles to match those of the main roof. Extensions located to the rear of dwellings would not normally be easily visible from the public realm due to the screening afforded by neighbouring properties. However, in this instance the neighbouring property, No.73, has a double width plot which allows the side elevation of the application site to be visible from the street. The existing side elevation of the property is mostly screened by trees within the garden of the neighbouring site and vegetation on the common boundary above the timber fencing. The proposed extension would add a further 4.8 metres of wall to the depth of the property which would continue flush along the side elevation. Whilst the extension would make the dwelling appear deeper the extension would be set back approximately 21 metres from the front boundary with Royal Esplanade and together with the curve of the highway, any views of the extension would be relatively fleeting.

It is not unusual for two storey extensions to be located to the rear of residential properties and in this instance whilst the extension is fairly deep the ridge would be set down from the ridge of the main roof, giving it a subservient appearance to the main dwelling. The addition of a pitched roof and matching materials would enable the extension to respect the design of the main dwelling, and given its setback location it would not appear overly prominent within the streetscene.

There is currently a planning application submitted for the erection of a two storey dwelling within the neighbouring garden of No.73. Whilst this planning application has not yet been decided the presence of a two storey dwelling would further screen views of the proposed extension from the public highway.

The single storey element would not be immediately visible from the public realm and the removal of the existing single storey extension would have little visible impact on the wider character and appearance of the area.

The scale, design and location of the proposed extension is considered to respect the main dwelling and would not appear unduly out of keeping within the streetscene, meeting the aims of Thanet Local Plan Policy QD02 and the NPPF.

Living Conditions

The existing 5.3 metre deep single storey extension, close to the boundary with No.76, is to be removed and bi-folding doors inserted within the rear elevation. The proposed extension would be part single storey and part two storey. The ground floor part of the extension would extend approximately 4.8 metres from the rear elevation, with a width of approximately 6 metres, with the first floor extension having a width of approximately 3.3 metres. The single storey extension would be finished with a mono pitched roof, with three rooflights and include bi-folding doors and windows on the southern elevation, approximately 5 metres from the side boundary with No.76. The windows at ground floor within the rear (eastern) elevation, would be approximately 8.5 metres from the rear common boundary with properties fronting Tyson Avenue. The extension at first floor level would extend the bedroom and include a window within the eastern and southern elevations. There are no windows proposed within the northern elevation, facing No.73. With regards to the potential for overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers the ground floor windows would face onto the boundary surrounding the rear garden and would not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy above the mutual overlooking that is often found between adjoining gardens.

At first floor level the rear facing window would look towards the rear gardens of properties fronting Tyson Avenue. This window would be closer to the common boundary than the existing bedroom window, reducing the distance to the rear boundary to approximately 8.5 metres. The overall distance from the window to the rear elevation of No.15 Tyson Avenue (the nearest property to the rear) is approximately 22.5 metres). Views towards properties to the rear are currently screened by mature trees and other vegetation and from the first floor windows it is fairly difficult to gain views of the rear elevations of these properties, or to gain views into neighbouring gardens. If the vegetation were to die back or be removed in the future, due to the separation distance, it is unlikely that views from the proposed first floor

window would result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers of properties to the rear over and above the mutual overlooking that is often found between adjoining gardens.

The first floor window facing towards the boundary with No.76 (southern elevation) would look towards the flat roof of the 5 metre wide extension on the boundary. The first 5 metres beyond the rear elevation of a dwellinghouse is normally viewed as the private amenity space within residential gardens. Looking towards the neighbouring property from the first floor bedroom window it is possible to look onto the flat roof but not into the private amenity space beyond due to the width and depth of the extension which provides screening to this area. Beyond the neighbouring extension there is more than 20 metres to the common boundary between No.76 and No.77 and over this distance it is unlikely that unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy into private amenity space would occur.

The application site is at a slightly higher land level to the neighbouring site of No.73 to the north. Concern has been raised that the two storey height and depth of the extension would adversely impact upon the amenities of future occupiers of a dwelling which the neighbour is looking to build within their garden. The neighbour has described in detail how the proposed extension would result in overshadowing and loss of outlook from the rear windows of the proposed dwelling and in particular the loss of natural daylight during particular parts of the year. Material considerations can, amongst other things, include overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light or overshadowing but this would only be relevant where there is extant planning permission that has a realistic expectation of being constructed in a timely manner. In this regard the neighbour has referred to a 1972 planning application (Reference ES/1/63/144A) that was refused for a bungalow to be built within the garden. No further planning applications have been received to build on this site until the Outline planning application, submitted on 28 August 2020, for the erection of a two storey dwelling. This application is currently being considered through the outline planning application reference OL/TH/20/1142.

Given that the neighbouring planning application has been submitted in outline form only, with the layout and design reserved for future consideration, it would not be reasonable to consider the impact upon this pending application at this time, as if permitted the future reserved matters application could be designed to take into account the positioning of the proposed rear extension. The proposed extension must be considered on its own merits and the existing relationship.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts to the living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers in terms of sense of enclosure, loss of outlook or loss of privacy, and will therefore be in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and the NPPF.

Highway Safety

The off street parking to the front of the property would not be affected by this proposal. There are no adverse highway implications as a result of this development.

Conclusion

The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of surrounding neighbouring residential occupiers. The proposed development therefore accords with Policies QD02 and QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that Members approve the application.

Case Officer

Rosemary Bullivant

TITLE:

FH/TH/20/0939

Project

75 Royal Esplanade MARGATE Kent CT9 5ET

