

**A11**

**FH/TH/21/0199**

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey rear extension, first floor front extension, front porch extension and external render

LOCATION: 21 Seacroft Road BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 1TL

WARD: Viking

AGENT: Mr Tony Michael

APPLICANT: Lucy Keel

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 drawings numbered SR 07 C, SR 03 C and SR 05 C, received 28 April 2021.

GROUND;

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 The external materials and external finishes to be used in the development hereby approved shall be natural slate roof tiles, white painted render with vertical detailing to first floor, white timber/composite cladding to ground floor, black composite/aluminium windows and doors, stone cladding to middle porch area, garage surround and porch columns, as shown on amended drawing numbered SR05C, received 28 April 2021, and as confirmed by the Applicant's Agent in correspondence received 28 April 2021.

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 Seacroft Road adjacent to a public footpath and is located within the urban confines of Broadstairs in a wholly residential area. Properties in Seacroft Road are substantial sized dwellings with a variety of architectural styles, and on the southern side are mostly set back from the highway in a staggered formation, with low level boundary walls or landscaped to the front boundary.

## PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/91/0625 - Erection of a first floor side extension with balcony area GTD 23 August 1991

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a part single and part two storey rear extension following removal of the existing single storey extension, erection of a first floor extension to the front following removal of the existing balcony and erection of a pitched roof open porch extension. It is also proposed to add stone cladding detail to the front elevation, with white timber effect horizontal cladding to the lower elevations of the main property and extension and white painted render and vertical boarding detail to the first floor.

## PLANNING POLICIES

### **Thanet Local Plan 2020**

QD02 - General Design Principles

QD03 - Living Conditions

CC04 - Renewable Energy

### **Draft Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Policy BSP9: Design in Broadstairs & St Peters

## NOTIFICATIONS

Neighbours have been notified and a site notice posted.

Original Proposal

Objections (5 representations):

- Nos 15,17,19 & 21 are all staggered to allow each resident privacy close to the rear of their
- respective property. Whilst an extension to number 15 was approved a few years ago our privacy has not been compromised due to a garage in between.

- The proposed extension will affect our privacy and also lead to some overlooking in the rear garden.
- Loss of light to conservatory
- The second hatched line drawn across from No 21 is to our flat roofed single storey garage and not the house itself.
- Over developed in proportion to the adjacent properties.
- Will not enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding area particularly in terms of its scale.
- Will alter the aspect of openness by overdevelopment on the site.
- No 21 is already more than adequate in size
- It would put 19 Seacroft Rd into something resembling a dark tunnel, from a southern view, and considerably reduce 23 Seacroft Rd's ability to receive sunlight for its energy capturing roof panels - something all responsible governments have encouraged us to have.
- The plans do not show our garage and sun lounge.
- Significant overbearing impact by a large brick wall and the loss of outlook from our sun lounge.
- Impact on solar panels - loss of sunlight from shading from the two storey extension
- The extension will increase the footprint by at least another 30% to 50%. The buildings lines to the rear of all the properties are staggered to keep privacy. This will destroy the original designs.
- Contrary to Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs & St Peters Neighbourhood Plan, which states that extensions and alterations should take into account neighbouring properties privacy, outlook and right to a continuing level of good light.
- No plans for additional parking for this even larger house, as there are problems with parking through the year with visitors and holiday makers.
- Contravenes the Broadstairs & St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan Policy BS)9 - privacy, outlooks and rights to levels of natural light.
- Will decrease the savings made to us from our green technology solar panels and lower the feed into the National Grid.
- 21 Seacroft Road has already had a large extension built which doubled the size of the original building.
- Drawing shows large dressing rooms - we would say they would be bedrooms - avoiding increasing the rateable value
- Seven bedroomed house - leading to possible business or air bnb lettings
- Concerned this could become a business adventure as it's occupied by one adult and one child
- One car drive - where are the other size cars going to park
- Visitor and holiday makers parking is bad now
- One single storey rear extension would greatly decrease any objections to the proposal.
- Loss of natural light to my kitchen
- There is a window facing south into my rear garden
- Loss of light to window on west and glass panelled side door
- My bathroom window will be deprived of natural light
- Overly dominant

- Strong sense of enclosure
- Overlooking and loss of privacy in my back garden where I have a swimming pool
- In 1991 a large double bedroom and balcony over an existing garage was allowed.

Support (2 representations):

- We consider the improvement proposed to the front of the old property will enhance the area and local scene for the benefit of all.
- The proposed rear extension will have no impact on our property (No 15).
- The development looks really good to me and I can only see it enhancing the property and area.

Amended Proposal

Objections (4 representations):

- Still feel it would have overbearing impact on my property.
- The 'staggering' of Nos 15,17,19 and 21 allows the safe extraction of gas fumes into the open space but the extension will create a 'passageway' which could allow fumes to accumulate outside my backdoor.
- The reduction of only approximately half a metre to the proposed extension will have little beneficial affect on the natural light to my bathroom and toilet.
- The ground floor remains large, intrusive and overbearing approximately 2 metres from my side kitchen window.
- Concerns regarding the 2 flat roofs which could be used as balcony overlooking my garden.
- The amended proposal remains contrary to Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs & St Peters Neighbourhood Plan and strongly believe that permission should be refused.
- The alterations have not addressed concerns raised in our earlier objection
- Number 21 occupies a plot at the highest point of Seacroft Road (which rises from the junction with South Cliff Parade). As such, despite the proposed alterations to the original plan, the very large first floor extension will still be obtrusive due to its size and will still dominate the neighbouring properties. It should also be borne in mind the substantial increase to the property approved in 1991.
- Our earlier comments still stand and we feel this application should be declined.
- The height of the first floor will shadow our solar panels also explained in our first objection.
- We have no concerns with a ground floor extension which will still make it an over developed property.
- Parking concerns have not been addressed.
- Loss of sea views.

## CONSULTEES

**Broadstairs & St Peter's Town Council** - The Planning Committee of the Town Council has considered this application and resolved unanimously to recommend REFUSAL with the following concerns: Overdevelopment, out of keeping with the street scene, loss of light to neighbours, overshadowing and overbearing.

## COMMENTS

This application is brought before members at the request of Councillor Bailey to allow members to consider the impact of the proposal on:

- Over development
- Close to adjoining properties.
- Out of character with the area (proposed building materials / finish)
- Loss of light or overshadowing.
- Overlooking / loss of privacy.
- Loss of Visual amenity

The main consideration for Members to assess is 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 Seacroft Road. To the front elevation, at first floor level, it is proposed to erect a pitched roof extension to enlarge Bedroom 1 and this would replace a 3 metre deep balcony. At ground floor level it is proposed to erect a pitched roof open porch. The upright supports and roof overhang would project approximately 0.8 metres forward of the front elevation of the dwelling. It is proposed to finish the front elevation with horizontal timber effect cladding at ground floor level and this detailing would be continued to the side and rear. The front entrance elevation would have a section of white stone cladding that would be extended around the garage surround. The first floor gable ends would be finished with white painted render with vertical boarding detailing. This detailing would be continued to part of the side elevation facing the public footpath.

The application, as originally submitted, showed a 5 metre deep two storey extension running across the entire width of the property. Following concerns the proposal has been amended and the rear extension reduced in scale. It is now proposed to erect a 4.5 metre deep extension across the rear that has been set in approximately 1.5 metres on both sides at first floor level. The roof of the amended extension is shown with a double pitched roof with valley which allows the overall height of the roof to be kept to a minimum.

With regards to the character and appearance of the area the alterations to the front elevation would remove the somewhat severe high level red brick side wall of the balcony and replace this with a gabled ended extension that would respect the gable end design feature of the main dwelling. The addition of cladding and render detailing and white stone cladding would add visual interest to the property in a street where there are a variety of finishes used. The proposed alterations to the front elevation are not considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

Concern was raised over the original scheme as it would have resulted in a dwelling of substantial depth and bulk, with an approximately 13 metre length of wall, at two storey height, alongside the public footpath. This elevation is visible from the public realm above the roof of the neighbouring bungalow to the north-west. Following these concerns, and

related concerns regarding the impact on neighbouring residential amenity, the proposal has been amended to set the first floor element approximately 1.5 metres away from the boundary with the public footpath. The ground floor extension would be single storey in height alongside the boundary and would be partially visible above the high level fence. It is considered that the extension, in its amended form, would break up this expanse of flank wall to the boundary and the inset would reduce the overall bulk of the extension and provide visual relief to the boundary. Whilst the extension would still be visible from the public realm it would be seen in relation to the main dwelling and it would not appear unduly prominent from views within Seacroft Road.

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.

The proposal would result in a fairly large extension to the rear elevation however the property itself is a substantial property where large extensions such as this would be seen in relation to the existing building and can be seen on other properties in the vicinity. It is considered that the proposal, in its amended form, would respect the main dwelling and would not appear unduly out of keeping within the streetscene, meeting the requirements of Thanet Local Plan Policy QD02, Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan and the NPPF.

### **Living Conditions**

Concerns have been raised that the extension is too large and will have an overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers. In particular there is concern that the extension would result in loss of light and outlook and the windows would result in overlooking and loss of privacy.

The alterations to the front elevation would front the public highway and there are no windows proposed within the side elevation, facing the public footpath and No 23, and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy.

The windows within the first floor would serve a bedroom, dressing room and en-suite and would not create additional overlooking above that which already exists. The windows at ground floor level would replace similar full length glazing across the rear of the property. The proposed extension would bring the windows further into the rear garden however the

new windows would have a similar relationship to neighbouring residential occupiers to existing windows within the property where there is potential for mutual overlooking between rear gardens.

The originally submitted plans included a two storey extension close to the boundary with the public footpath and the neighbouring property. No 23 is a bungalow and its footprint orientates the rear elevation towards the side boundary. It was considered that the two storey extension would be in close proximity to this property and would result in a loss of outlook to this neighbour. Following these concerns the proposal has been amended and the first floor element has been set in approximately 1.5 metres away from the boundary. The ground floor extension would extend to the side boundary with the public footpath but it would not rise significantly above the height of the high level boundary fence and would have limited impact on No 23 in terms of outlook or unacceptable loss of light. The amended proposal shows the first floor extension set approximately 6 metres away at its nearest point and is not considered to result in unacceptable loss of amenity to occupiers of this dwelling.

The ground floor extension would project from the rear of the dwelling and retain the same distance from the common boundary with No 19 as the existing dwelling. The extension would be single storey with a height of approximately 3 metres and the first floor extension would have a finished height to eaves of approximately 5 metres with the roofslope pitching away from the boundary. Whilst there may be some loss of light and outlook from the neighbouring property it is considered given the separation distance together with the design of the extension, which steps the first floor element further away from the boundary, there would not be unacceptable loss of light or sense of enclosure resulting to occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling at no.19.

Given the above it is 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 the proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan and the NPPF.

### **Solar Panels**

Concern has been raised that the extension would adversely impact upon the efficiency of the solar panels on the adjoining property (No 23). The solar panels are located on the rear roofslope and the roofslope facing towards the side boundary with the public footpath and the application site. The presence of the solar panels on the neighbouring property are a material consideration in assessing the proposed development. Thanet Local Plan policy CC04 relates to renewable energy in which the Council seeks to encourage renewable energy installations and the aims of this policy are supported through chapter 14 of the NPPF. The first floor extension, as originally proposed, resulted in a substantial length of wall alongside the side boundary, however, the amended drawing now shows the first floor extension set approximately 1.5 metres away from the western boundary. Whilst the proposed extensions may result in some reduction in natural light reaching these solar panels it is considered given the presence of the existing dwelling, the separation distance of the proposed extension and the solar panels of between 10 and 15 metres together with the design of the extension, which includes a double pitched roof that pitches away from the

boundary, the proposed development would be unlikely to adversely impact upon the operation of the solar panels to substantive reduce its contribution to renewable energy generation or significantly impact on the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

### **Highway Safety**

The proposal maintains the current level of off-street parking and access from the highway remains unchanged. The impact upon highway safety is therefore considered to be acceptable.

### **Other Matters**

Gas fumes - Concerns have been raised regarding the safe dispersal of gas fumes. The proposed extensions would be located within the curtilage of the application site and set away from the side boundary. Landscaping such as trees and hedges could be planted within the site along the side boundary having a similar screening impact on the open space. I am satisfied that the proposed extensions would be set away from the neighbouring property sufficiently to avoid an impact from any domestic extraction flues.

### **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 Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan and the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that Members approve the application.

### **Case Officer**

Rosemary Bullivant



TITLE:

FH/TH/21/0199

Project

21 Seacroft Road BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 1TL

