

R04

F/TH/20/0692

PROPOSAL: Erection of three and two storey building containing 2No. two bed and 2No. 1bed residential flats with roof terrace

LOCATION: Land Adjacent To 2 Shah Place RAMSGATE Kent CT11 7QD

WARD: Central Harbour

AGENT: Ms Debbie Marriage

APPLICANT: Mr Tim Woolcott

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Permission

For the following reasons:

1 The proposed 2 and 3 storey building, by virtue of its design, width, and mass would represent a visually dominant, obtrusive and incongruous form of development which would fail to respond to or respect the traditional pattern and appearance of development of the surrounding residential area, resulting in significant harm to the appearance and local distinctiveness of the area, contrary to saved Thanet Local Plan Policy SP35, QD01, QD02 and paragraphs 122, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed building, by virtue of its location and relationship with the adjacent residential units, would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook from the adjacent property (no.1 Shah Place and 76 Chatham Street), and poor standard of accommodation for future occupants by the use of obscure glazing to rear windows at first and second floor level, significantly detrimental to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers thereof and future living conditions of new occupants, contrary to Thanet Local Plan Policies QD03, QD04 and paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 The proposed two bedroom units with the scheme would not be provided with a safe doorstep play area for young children, to the detriment of the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the proposed two bedroom residential unit, contrary to Thanet Local Plan Policy GI04 and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 The proposed development will result in additional pressure on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), and Sandwich Bay and Hacklinge Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and in the absence of an acceptable form of mitigation to relieve the pressure, the proposed development would be contrary to policy SP29 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on the base of a larger triangular parcel of land. The triangular parcel of land fronts Shah Place, Park Road and Chatham Street. The application site has frontages to these three roads, and has a rectangular shape, the largest road frontage is to Park Road, on its northern side. The existing site consists of hardstanding and some self-seeded vegetation.

To the south of the site are two and a half storey terrace properties fronting Park Road, to the east there are two storey with semi basement properties fronting Boundary Road and along Chatham Street there are three storey properties. Along Shah Place properties from the road appear two storey, but due to changes in levels have a semi basement level to the rear.

The application site is located just outside of the Ramsgate Conservation Area, and no. 31 Chatham Street is a listed building. The site is not subject to any other site specific designations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application is for full planning permission for the erection of a three and two storey building containing 2No. two bed and 2No. 1bed residential flats with roof terrace. The building would have flat roofs with parapets. The three storey element would front part of Park Road (at the west end of the site). The building would wrap around the perimeter of the site to provide a continuous frontage, although an access passageway is provided midway along the Park Road frontage at ground level.

In terms of accommodation to the west of the access passageway there is a secure access leading to an internal stair to serve the three residential units at the upper floors. At lower ground level (east) a 2 bed unit is provided which would be designed to provide wheelchair accessibility. To the west of the passageway access is storage for refuse and cycle etc.

At the upper level the building extends across the access passageway providing 1no 1 bed unit and 1no. 2 bed unit at first floor and 1no. one bed unit on the second floor. The second floor would also have a shared roof terrace accessible by the communal stairs.

In terms of materials the submitted Design and Access Statement details that the block to the east would be faced with Staffordshire blue brick and the block to the east faced with a multi buff stock. A blue brick plinth would tie the western block to the east block. At roof level the plant room, clad with timber, forms a transition element between the top floor accommodation and the roof terrace, timber would also be used in the design of the undercroft entrance gates.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

SP01 - Spatial Strategy - Housing
SP11 - Ramsgate
SP14 - General Housing Policy
SP29 - Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan (SAMM)
SP35 - Quality Development
SP36 - Conservation and Enhancement of Thanet's Historic Environment
SP43 - Safe and Sustainable Travel
SP44 - Accessible locations
H01 - Housing Development
GI04 - Amenity Green Space and Equipped Play Areas
QD01 - Sustainable Design
QD02 - General Design Principles
QD03 - Living Conditions
QD04 - Technical Standards
QD05 - Accessible and Adaptable Accommodation
HE01 - Archaeology
HE02 - Development in Conservation Areas
HE03 - Heritage Assets
TP02 - Walking
TP03 - Cycling
TP06 - Car Parking

NOTIFICATIONS

Letters were sent to adjoining occupiers, a site notice posted close to the site.
No third party representations were received.

Ramsgate Heritage and Design Forum: : We support the contemporary design and use of materials and an excellent way to deal with this awkward and prominent site. Parapet treatment is awkward, and we suggest that it be raised and stepped to the south elevation.

CONSULTATIONS

Environment Agency: We have assessed this application as having a low environmental risk. We therefore have no comments to make.

Southern Water: We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on our website via the following link:

southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

Our initial investigations indicate that there are no dedicated public surface water sewers in the area to serve this development. Alternative means of draining surface water from this

development are required. Discharge of surface water runoff to the public combined network can be allowed only once full assessment of other alternative methods have been carried out and discounted and at the discharge rates agreed with Southern Water as not introducing detriment to the downstream network. Foul and surface water onsite network shall remain separate until the boundary of the site or final connection to public sewer.

The disposal of surface water from this development shall follow the hierarchy within Part H3 of Building Regulations:

- a) An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system.
- b) A water course.
- c) Where neither of the above is practicable: a sewer.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

KCC Archaeology: The site lies very close to the discovery of an Anglo-Saxon burial on the Station Approach Road in 1932. This may have been part of a wider cemetery that may have extended into the area of the site. The site itself has been previously developed from at least the mid-19th century which would have affected, at least in part, the potential for burials to survive.

None-the-less it is possible that significant archaeological remains may be present at the development site which could be damaged or destroyed by proposed groundworks. I would therefore suggest that as part of any planning consent granted provision is made for a programme of archaeological works secured by a planning condition.

Natural England: On the basis of the appropriate financial contributions being secured to the relevant scheme. NE concurs with your authority's conclusion that this is suitable mitigation, as such the proposed developments will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of Thanet Coast and sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar site.

Environmental Health: I note the D&A statement states (pg2): 'Environmental - The concern regarding air quality and proximity to the road junction has been addressed through the inclusion of a managed air handling, drawing air from high above street level, this will allow windows to be closed when environmental pollution is high. Likewise the inclusion of ducted air will allow internal temperatures to be kept comfortable without the need for occupants to open windows, mitigating environmental noise in the new flats.'

Although I could not see details provided; can this be conditioned? Windows will need to be specialist road noise acoustic glazing, detail also to be provided.

Conservation Officer: Land Adjacent to 2 Shah Place is situated neighbouring Ramsgate Conservation Area and opposing a nearby Grade II listed property at 31 Chatham Street.

Within The NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) Section 16, paragraph 192 it is highlighted that local authorities should take into account (paragraph c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Additionally under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, Section 66 Paragraph 1 which states when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The existing condition of the site proposed for development is currently vacant and largely considered an eyesore, contributing negatively to the surrounding environment as well as that of the nearby historic conservation area. It is overgrown in places and attracts abandoned rubbish, cars and general fly tipped items.

Some form of development, which would be considered to improve the appearance of the site, would therefore be acceptable alongside the capabilities of ensuring the continued maintenance of the area.

The design of the proposed is largely unique in its form, albeit substantial in height. I do believe there to be a risk of it being slightly overbearing to the site, however, this is somewhat limited due to its overall height being less than that of the ridge line of the existing built form present. Alongside the design the proposed materials are considered to be less harmful than some to the surrounding environment, UPVC has not been used instead aluminium has been incorporated into the scheme lending contribution to the somewhat industrial aesthetic created within the site. This would be preferable within the historic environment instead of 'functionality over form' design and therefore it is also acceptable adjacent to the conservation area.

A further risk accumulating from this site is the possible impact to that of the nearby Grade II listed property. Its most obvious perceivable view, of which has the most character contributing to the buildings aesthetic, is that of its principle facade and its positioning attaching it to a row of Victorian Terraces. Due to the positioning and orientation of the proposed scheme at Shah Place, it is not considered that the scheme impedes on these views which therefore reduces the impact to the heritage asset.

Separately from heritage matters I do believe there to be a risk of overlooking within the sites given the tight constraints of the existing built form of the area. Parallel to this becomes a risk of development encompassing the site entirely. However from a heritage perspective I believe this proposal to largely improve the appearance of the site from its current condition whilst having reduced impacts onto the setting of the nearby listed property. Materials more sympathetic than some are being proposed alongside the building's unique appearance and therefore I believe this application to meet national and local guidance. Due to the aforementioned reasoning as detailed above I do not object to this application.

COMMENTS

This application is referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Ara who supports the application due to the brownfield nature of the site and its need to be redeveloped with new homes as the current site detracts from the wider area.

The main consideration with regard to this application is the consideration of the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the residential amenity of neighbouring property occupiers, and highway safety.

Principle

In line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2014, planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the 'development plan' unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are a significant material consideration in this regard.

Policy HO1 of the Thanet Local Plan states that residential development on non-allocated sites within the confines of the urban area can be granted where it meets other relevant Local Plan policies.

The application proposes the erection of a three and two storey building to provide four residential units. The site is located within the urban confines and therefore accords with this policy.

The principle of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable, subject to the consideration of all other material planning considerations.

Character and Appearance

The impact the proposed scheme may have upon the character and appearance of the area and in particular the impact upon the setting of the Ramsgate Conservation Area as designated heritage assets falls to be assessed.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset; great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The NPPF goes on to state in states that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Policy SP36 of the Council's Local Plan is a strategic policy which states that the council will support, value and have regard to the historic or archaeological significance of Heritage Assets. Policy HE02 relates specifically to new developments in conservation areas. It states that within conservation areas, development proposals which preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area will be permitted and when relating to proposals to extend existing buildings within the conservation area that the character, scale and plan form of the original building are respected and the extension is subordinate to it and does not dominate principal elevations and appropriate materials and detailing are proposed and the extension would not result in the loss of features that contribute to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 122 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account: a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it; b) local market conditions and viability; c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services - both existing and proposed - as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use; d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Policy SP35 relates to the quality of development and states that new development will be required to be of high quality and inclusive design. Policy QD01 relates to sustainable design and sets out that all new buildings and conversions of existing buildings must be designed to reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and have resilience to function in a changing climate. Policy QD02 is a general design policy and sets out that the primary planning aim in all new development is to promote or reinforce the local character of the area and provide high quality and inclusive design and be sustainable in all other respects.

In terms of the Conservation Area, the site falls outside of its boundary. The boundary is located to the south east of the site enclosing those properties fronting Chatham Place (western boundary) and properties along the southern side of Boundary Road (northern boundary of the Conservation Area). The site can, however, be viewed from the Conservation Area, and therefore any development on this site would have an impact on it. It is appreciated by officers that this site is currently vacant and at the time of a site visit contained an abandoned car and rubbish. It is therefore accepted that the current appearance of the site detracts from the general character and appearance of the area as well as the setting of the Conservation Area. It is, however, recognised that developing untidy sites is the only way to secure amenity/visual improvements.

The character of the surrounding area is mixed, but contains predominantly two and three storey properties of a traditional design reflective of their ages. Properties within the area have detailing, particularly to the fenestration, with bay or recessed windows with traditional placement in terms of their positions. Materials consist of brick work or render, whilst some properties have pitched roofs and others have flat roofs with parapets.

This site whilst being acceptable in principle for development, has a number of constraints that make it difficult to develop. The site is quite prominent due to its position in the road, the long and relatively narrow dimension of the site and the topography of the site and relationship with adjoining properties.

Within the Planning Statement submitted with this application the agent states that:

"The site lends itself to a standalone piece of architecture that can utilise a palette of materials reflecting contemporary trends whilst still ensuring that the overall mass and scaling are proportionate to surrounding houses. We believe that this has been achieved by

the highest part of the building coming no higher than the eaves on the adjoining dwelling on Shah Place."

The design submitted does not seek to directly replicate the design of adjoining dwellings that it would be viewed in relation to, but instead an individually designed building that has a more modern form, design and proportions when compared to adjacent buildings within this triangular site.

In terms of the height, the building proposed would be three and two storey, in keeping with the height of the adjoining buildings. However, due to the natural topography of the wider site (the triangular parcel) the application site is lower than the other two sides of the triangle. The proposed building would not be higher than any of the roof forms on this wider parcel of land; however, due to the building being located on the back edge of the footpath and its wide facade with limited articulation, it is considered that the proposed building mass would appear substantial and dominating. In addition given the long views from adjacent roads, any development on this site would be prominent within the street scene.

As stated above the building does not seek to replicate or be a pastiche but rather a standalone building, however, I do consider that any building here, given its close visual affinity to the existing buildings would need to respect their proportions particular in terms of fenestration detailing, which in my view the current scheme does not. The character and appearance of the immediate area is defined by streets of terraced 2 to 3 storey houses of varying design, often with prominent bay windows, giving the buildings a strong vertical emphasis. In contrast the proposed building has much more of a horizontal emphasis exacerbated and elongated by the flat roof design. There is little detailing, for example no header treatment, and the fenestration does not reflect the normal hierarchy or have a vertical emphasis across the elevations, which would be typically found in this location. Whilst it is not necessary to copy building design within the area it is considered that development on this site would need to be of a high standard it is considered that more projections to articulate the frontage would produce facades that would be out of keeping with the bay windows that feature so prominently in the area. Whilst it's noted that the building would provide a strong frontage to the site and the wider area (by enclosing the site), I have concerns that it creates a large building mass and width with little articulation which would fail to respect the character of the area. It is considered that the overall design of the building subject to this application is at odds with the character of the area described above, whilst the LPA has no objection on principle to a more modern form of building it is considered it should acknowledge the established character in its design approach.

I would also raise concerns about the use of a roof terrace which would appear as an alien feature within the street scene and Conservation Area in this visually prominent location. Often it is not just the presence of having the roof terrace but also the paraphernalia associated with their use which is often visible. Implementing a roof terrace busies a space that would typically be empty or unoccupied if it were a flat roof area. The installation of the proposed roof terraces would be inherently visible and distracting amongst the surrounding historic environment, further exacerbated by the use of lighting which could be added and would also not be expected at this height.

The materials proposed are generally considered acceptable, however, it is considered that samples of these materials should be secured by condition, if planning permission is granted.

In terms of the Grade II listed property; 31 Chatham Place. This site is located to the south east of the application site and is separated by roads. No 31 also faces west rather and is at an angle to the application site. Given this I concur with the Conservation Officers comments in this respect and consider that due to the positioning and orientation of the proposed scheme, it is not considered that the scheme impedes on these views which therefore reduces the impact to this heritage asset.

Given the above, it is considered that the development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. This is due to the horizontal emphasis of the proposed building exacerbated and elongated by the flat roof and provision and use of the roof terrace. The development would therefore be contrary to the aims of Policies SP35 and QD02 of the Local Plan which requires development to relate to surrounding development, form and layout, be well designed, respect and enhance 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 proposal also fails to accord with the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not maintain the area's prevailing character and setting or be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Living Conditions

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Policy QD03 of the Local Plan deals specifically with living conditions. This policy states that all new development should:

- 1) Be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and not lead to the unacceptable living conditions through overlooking, noise or vibration, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light or sense of enclosure.
- 2) Be of appropriate size and layout with sufficient usable space to facilitate comfortable living conditions and meet the standards set out in QD04.
- 3) Residential development should include the provision of private or shared external amenity space/play space, where possible.
- 4) Provide for clothes drying facilities and waste disposal or bin storage, with a collection point for storage containers no further than 15 metres from where the collection vehicle will pass.

Due to the constraints of the site, as well as the close neighbour relationship, difficulties are presented when trying to create a building that would not harm neighbour amenity to an unacceptable degree.

In support of the application, daylight studies in the form of plans were submitted with the application. This covers the existing and proposed situation at certain times of the year;

Winter Solstice, March Equinox, September equinox and the summer Solstice and at 9.30am, 12.00pm and 3.30pm. A full appraisal of the drawings and findings of the study has not been provided. In terms of what the drawings show:

Winter Solstice - This shows the inner courtyard created and rear of buildings would be in shadow for a majority of the day with the proposed building in situ.

March Equinox - This shows the inner courtyard created in shadow for a majority of the day. The lower proportion of the buildings to the west, north and east is in shadow most of the day with the upper sections having daylight at certain times of day.

September Equinox - This shows the inner courtyard created in shadow for the majority of the day. The lower proportion of the buildings to the west, north and east is in shadow most of the day, the upper sections have daylight at certain times of day - but not all day.

Summer Solstice - This shows the inner courtyard created is in shadow for a large part of the day, the greatest amount of daylight received at midday. However it is noted that for significant periods of time throughout the year the existing buildings will be cast in shadow.

No 2 Shah Place has what appears to be a rear kitchen window in the projection and window to a habitable room. There are no windows on the upper floors. The proposed building would abut no. 2's side wall; this elevation contains no windows and would therefore not create any material harm. The proposed building would project beyond the rear boundary of this property and its rear yard area. Given the orientation of the proposed three storey building (at this point) it would create overshadowing to the rear yard area and a loss of daylight to the rooms in the rear of the property. Whilst daylight studies have been submitted with the application these prove, as suspected, that there will be significant reductions in direct sunshine and additional overshadowing. I consider that the harm would be unacceptable to the living conditions of no. 2 Shah Place. Whilst I appreciate that there were buildings in this position historically, (although no details of their height are known) the fact that there is currently a gap within the street scene (and has been for some time) allows light to existing space and windows which would be lost for most of the day and during the year. This is not a good standard for residents of the proposed building or for occupiers of the existing building.

With regard to the windows within the rear elevation of the proposed building, the plans annotate that these will be fitted with obscure glazing at first and second floors to the habitable rooms, but not to the shared communal stairway and circulation area. The kitchen windows would have openings for ventilation, the plans do not clearly show if these are through top openers. Whilst these would be obscure I consider this to be a poor standard for the residents therein, but additionally I consider that the existing occupiers will still have a sense of overlooking from these openings.

No. 1 Shah Place is enclosed to some degree by the configuration of the existing properties and has a very modest rear yard. The proposal would have a more modest effect on this occupier, given the separation, however there would still be an impact in terms of loss of sun/daylight to the rear. Given the angles and separation distance I consider that in terms of overlooking this property would not be unreasonably affected.

No. 76 Chatham Street is in an L shape - therefore having two road frontages. It would abut the east end of the proposed building. The end that would abut the building would be single storey, stepping down from the two storey part at the top of the site. There are no windows

within this flank, however there are windows facing into its rear courtyard and also on the rear face of the upper northern rear face, including the two upper floors and openings within the ground floor (when viewing from the south). There is planning history on this site- the last approval being in 1987 to change the use to one shop, one office and three self contained flats. It is, however, clear from a site visit that there is no shop or office and the building looks to be used solely for residential. The proposed building at this point would be two storey with a roof terrace for the occupiers. Windows are located to the middle section of the building serving the communal areas. Furthermore to reduce the impact upon the occupiers of no.765 a flat roof element above the ground floor is shown with the two storey element set in, further from the common boundary. There is concern that there would be an impact to the rear facing windows- in the west and south elevation of no.76, and also its rear yard area, due to the height and limited separation distance (8.4m), which would reduce day/sunlight to an unacceptable degree.

Taking the above into account I consider the impact to no. 1 Shah Place and 76 Chatham Street to be unacceptable in terms of loss of light, overshadowing, sense of enclosure and overlooking and contrary to policy QD03 of the Local Plan and paragraph 117 of the NPPF. Furthermore due to the close physical positioning of the buildings windows within the rear elevation of the proposed building, will be fitted with obscure glazing at first and second floors to the habitable rooms I consider this to be a poor standard for the residents within the proposed units.

Doorstep playspace is required for all 2-bed units or more under Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan, along with refuse storage, clothes drying and cycle storage space. It is confirmed that two of the units are two bedrooms and two are one bedroom. Given the constraints of the site a open yard is not proposed; an undercroft is shown at ground floor, but this provides access to the different parts of the building, rather than being a safe playspace for young children or for drying clothes etc. However a shared roof terrace is shown , which all the flats would have access to via the shared stairway. The plans annotate that this would have seating and landscape planters with a parapet wall. The plans indicate that this area would be enclosed by railings approximately 1.4m. I consider that this would not offer a safe area of playspace for young children given the means of enclosure I therefore consider that this is contrary to GI04 and as such forms a reason for refusal.

In terms of the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed dwellings, Policy QD03 requires new development to be of an appropriate size and layout with sufficient usable space to facilitate comfortable living conditions and meet the standards set out in Policy QD04, which are the National Described Space Standards (March 2015). Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, with all windows serving primary habitable rooms required to provide an acceptable level of outlook, natural light and ventilation for the rooms. For a one bedroom, two person unit on one floor the requirement is 50sqm and for a two bedroom three person unit on one floor the requirement is 61sqm. The proposed dwellings meet all of these criteria in terms of the overall floor space to habitable rooms and is therefore considered policy compliant.

Transportation

Kent Highways normally require one vehicle parking space per unit. Off-street parking is not included in the scheme and the restricted size of the site and need to maintain access for properties to the rear does not easily allow for off-street parking.

The ground floor storage area would provide the development with safe storage space for bicycles. In addition the site is located in a sustainable location, close to local facilities and within easy walking distance of the main Ramsgate town centre and close to public transport connections.

Given the accessibility of the site I consider that it would not be necessary to provide off street parking in this instance.

Given the constrained location of the site, it is likely that details on the construction management of the proposed development will be required, if permitted. To include the details relating to for example the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors, construction vehicle loading/unloading, turning facilities and access routes/arrangements, loading and unloading of plant and materials, storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development and wheel washing facilities.

The impact upon highway safety is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Other matters

The application site adjoins heavily used highways to all sides, and therefore there is concern regarding noise and air quality, particularly from vehicles waiting at the traffic lighted junction. In this regard Environmental Health has requested details of the managed air handling system and air temperature control be fully detailed and controlled via condition, if permission is approved. Furthermore to mitigate against noise from the traffic windows will need to be specialist road noise acoustic glazing details of which would need to be controlled by condition.

Given the archaeology within the area it is considered reasonable to add a condition as suggested by KCC for a programme of archaeological works.

Contributions

Natural England has previously advised that the level of population increase predicted in Thanet should be considered likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR have been identified.

Thanet District Council produced the 'The Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan (SAMM)' to deal with these matters, which focuses on the impacts of recreational activities on the Thanet section of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA). The studies indicate that recreational disturbance is a potential cause of the decline in bird numbers in the SPA. To enable the Council to be satisfied that proposed residential development will avoid a likely significant effect on the designated sites (due to an increase in recreation) a financial contribution is required for all housing developments to

contribute to the district wide mitigation strategy. This mitigation has meant that the Council accords with the Habitat Regulations.

This application does not include a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the required financial contribution for the 2no 1bed and 2no 2bed residential units to mitigate the additional recreational pressure on the SPA area. On this basis this also forms a reason for refusal.

Conclusion

The principle of developing this site for residential accommodation is acceptable. The site presents a number of difficulties due to its constrained nature and close physical relationships with other adjoining properties. There are also benefits with developing this site as at present it does not add to the attractiveness of the area, in fact it is considered that it detracts from the area. However, there are severe concerns regarding the impact the proposed building could have on neighbouring amenity for the occupiers of no.2 Shah Place and no.76 Chatham Street; together with the impact upon the character and appearance of the area, specifically the building design (including detailing), building mass, height, and presence of a roof terrace. The proposal also provides a poor standard of doorstep playspace, which would be unsuitable for young children, and fails to provide the required SAMM contribution.

It is therefore recommended that Members refuse the application.

Case Officer

Gill Richardson

TITLE: F/TH/20/0692

Project Land Adjacent To 2 Shah Place RAMSGATE Kent CT11 7QD

