

R09

FH/TH/22/0271

PROPOSAL: Erection of first floor extension to rear elevation with new walkway and roof terrace, together with railings to front

LOCATION: elevation and alterations to existing outbuilding

53 Addington Street RAMSGATE Kent CT11 9JJ

WARD: Central Harbour

AGENT: Mrs Janet Tilley

APPLICANT: Ms R Wing

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Permission

For the following reasons:

1 The proposed high level walkway and first floor roof terrace, by virtue of their prominent location, height and design, would create an alien feature that is architecturally unrelated to the size and scale of the existing building, and detracts from the visual amenities of the locality, resulting in harm to the significance of the conservation area, and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies SP35, HE02 and QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan and the NPPF.

2 The proposed rear extension and balcony by virtue of their excessive depth, height and bulk, and orientation to/relationship with the adjoining buildings, would result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing, subsequent loss of daylight and the creation of a sense of enclosure; detrimental to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers thereof, contrary to Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

3 The proposed high level walkway and roof terrace, by virtue of its height, location, proximity to and relationship with adjacent neighbouring properties, would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy to those properties, as well as an increased levels of noise and disturbance to nearby habitable bedroom windows, severely detrimental to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers thereof, contrary to Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The application site lies within the urban confines of Ramsgate, in a residential area.

No. 53 Addington Street is a mid-terrace, two storey dwelling, converted from a former shop, located within the Ramsgate Conservation Area, and a short distance from the harbour.

The surrounding street scene is characterised by a mixture of commercial and residential properties of varying scale and design.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/05/1138 Granted 21/10/2005

Change of use and conversion of barbers to provide additional residential accommodation in conjunction with the existing dwelling

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Planning consent is sought for a first floor rear extension with inset balcony, together with high level walkway, alterations to an existing outbuilding to allow for the creation of a roof terrace and railings to the front elevation. The first floor extension will extend outward from the main hipped roof at the same ridge height of approximately 5.60m, with an eaves height of 4.14m, for a distance of approximately 5.58m beyond the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling. The extension will replace the existing low level butterfly roof to the rear of the property above the existing single storey rear extension.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

THANET LOCAL PLAN 2020

SP35 - Quality Development
HE02 - Development in Conservation Areas
QD02 - General Design Principles
QD03 - Living Conditions
TP06 - Car Parking

NOTIFICATIONS

Letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers and a site notice was posted near the site. No representations have been received.

Ramsgate Town Council: make no comment.

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer -

53 Addington Street is located in the Ramsgate Conservation Area on the main thoroughfare of the commercial frontage, a short distance from the harbour.

Thanet's Local Plan, policy HE02, states within Section 7 'The character, scale and plan form of the original building are respected and the development is subordinate to it and does not dominate principal elevations.' As well as Section 8 which states 'Appropriate materials and detailing are proposed and the development would not result in the loss of features that contribute to the character or appearance of the conservation area. New development which

would detract from the immediate or wider landscape setting of any part of a conservation area will not be permitted.'

NPPF Section 16, Paragraph 197 states, In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of (c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The proposal is largely focused to the rear of the building, looking to extend the space to create a first floor extension in a somewhat contrasting manner. The design itself infills quite a lot of the existing form of the site, meaning that the core of the property, before it was extended and the outbuilding added, is encapsulated by this proposal. Although no information has been provided on the age of this section of the building, given its form and what appears to be flint covered walls it is considered be of a historic nature. The loss of this flint in its original form would be considered a detriment to the property and that of the character of the surrounding environment given its historic nature.

The form itself protrudes quite substantially past the existing form of the rear building whilst appearing quite cumbersome in comparison to the existing street development. Although not a direct heritage consideration this could cause an issue with the principle of overlooking the protuberant nature of the form. A balcony has also been included in the design, which I believe would appear quite out of place in this location as well as for the age of the building. I know examples of terraces were discussed on site but none of the references have been included in the application as additional information nor in the same circumstances as that proposed here. This is quite a common approach within the conservation area due to the uncomfortable cohesion that they create.

Although this scheme is focused to the rear, I do still believe it to have an implication somewhat to the setting and appearance of the surrounding conservation area as it is very much perceivable from the public realm.

I do not have an issue with the railings proposed to the front of the property given that they mention that of the neighbouring buildings.

Overall I do not consider that the implication to the setting and appearance of the surrounding conservation area has been fully considered part of this application as is the requirement in the aforementioned legislation and as such I object to the proposed scheme.

COMMENTS

The application is reported to the Planning Committee as the application has been submitted by an elected member of the Council.

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.

The site comprises an existing dwelling located within the urban confines of Ramsgate. The principle of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable, subject to the consideration of all other material planning considerations, including the impact upon the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring living conditions.

Character and Appearance

The application proposes a first floor rear extension with inset balcony, together with high level walkway, alterations to existing outbuilding to allow for the creation of a roof terrace and railings to the front elevation.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that development should be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment, establish and maintain a strong sense of place, and that permission should be refused for development of poor design which fails to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area.

Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan outlines that the design of all new proposals must respect or enhance the character or appearance of the area particularly in scale, massing, rhythm and use of materials.

Policy HE02 of the Thanet Local Plan states that development will be permitted provided that the character, scale and plan form of the original building are respected and the development is subordinate to it and does not dominate principal elevations, and that appropriate materials and detailing are used. It also states that any development resulting in the loss of features that contribute to the character or appearance of the conservation area, or which detract from the immediate or wider landscape setting of any part of a conservation area will not be permitted.

The proposed introduction of railings to the modest area of hardstanding to the front elevation, will match the design and height of the existing railings to the neighbouring properties on either side of the host dwelling, and submitted drawings show this appearing to sit well on the property, be of an appropriate scale and material and blend in well with the wider street scene. The Conservation Officer also has no objections to this introduction.

Whilst the remainder of the proposed works are located entirely to the rear of the property, they will be seen from public view along Spencer Place, which is accessed via Spencer Street to the west of the application site and which runs parallel between Addington Street and Spencer Square serving as a rear access to both sets of properties. Directly adjacent to the site includes no.51A Addington Street, which is accessed from Spencer Place, with a number of properties' primary entrance from this access. Given the arrangement of the neighbouring properties and their amenity spaces, the increased height and bulk of the proposed extension at first floor level, including the introduction of alien features such as the high level walkway and terrace over the outbuilding is a contrast to the existing low level arrangement and could appear quite dominant on the plot.

The proposed first floor rear extension seeks to rationalise the rear space, replacing the current butterfly roof of the ground floor extension and extending upwards to create more internal space. Whilst the increased height and bulk is a contrast to the existing low level arrangement, when considering the considerable height of the neighbouring properties on either side and the proposed use of materials to blend in with the existing dwelling, this increase would be unlikely to appear overly dominant on the rear street scene.

Nevertheless, the introduction of alien features such as the high level walkway from an inset balcony, leading to a new high level terraced area above the existing outbuilding would be entirely out of character for the plot.

Although there is evidence of another roof terrace to the rear of No. 49 Addington Street, approved ref: F/TH/00/0536, it is not initially obvious when walking along Spencer Place, being at a high level position, setback from the rear boundary, and partially screened by both a rear extension and neighbouring property, therefore it is not a comparable example.

The presence of the railings and the associated amenity use of the space at first floor level is likely to result in the presence of residential paraphilia that changes the character of the space, and appears out of keeping with the modest form of development located to the rear of properties in this street. There are no other roof terraces and associated paraphernalia at this low level within this part of Addington Street and Spencer Place, and given the presence of Spencer Place to the rear of the site the roof terrace will be highly visible within the setting of the Conservation Area. As such the proposed roof terrace and associated walkway, are considered to appear as alien features within this prominent rear location that severely detract from the significance of the conservation area.

The proposed roof terrace and high level walkway are therefore considered to result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, whilst also impacting upon the significance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies SP35, HE02 and QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan and the NPPF.

Living Conditions

In terms of living conditions, paragraph 119 of the NPPF outlines 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. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Thanet Local Plan Policy QD03 states that new development must not lead to unacceptable living conditions through overlooking, noise or vibration, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light or sense of enclosure.

Given the arrangement of the neighbouring properties and their small amenity spaces, there is a concern regarding loss of light and outlook, as well as a sense of enclosure from the proposed first floor rear extension.

The first floor extension will extend outward from the main hipped roof at the same ridge height of approximately 5.60m, with an eaves height of 4.14m, for a distance of approximately 5.58m beyond the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling. This will replace the existing low level butterfly roof to the rear of the property above the existing single storey rear extension.

There is not considered to be any impact upon adjoining property No. 55, to the south of the site, given its significant height and depth, and that there are no windows within the section of the side elevation projecting beyond No. 53 that could be blocked by the extension.

There is a greater impact upon Nos.51 and 51a to the north-west of the site. No. 53 projects one metre beyond the existing rear elevation of no.51 at 2-storey level. Beyond this a single storey extension extends the full depth of the plot, with a variety of low level roof forms. Within the existing rear elevation of no.51 there is a basement window serving a playroom, a ground floor window and glazed door serving a lounge, and a first floor window serving a bedroom. The proposed first floor extension will extend the entire length of the common boundary with No. 51, adjoining the small amenity yard serving the property, and will extend 6.58m beyond the existing rear elevation of no.51.

To the rear of No.51 lies No.51a, whose amenity space also adjoins the common boundary with no.53. Within the side elevation of no. 51a is one first floor window, which appears to serve a bathroom, and two ground floor windows, which appear to serve a dining room and lounge area. The proposed first floor rear extension will extend beyond the windows serving with the bathroom and dining room within no.51a.

Given the height, depth and overall bulk of the proposed extension, along with the lack of augmented separation distance between the proposed extension and the common boundaries with Nos. 51 and 51a, there is concern that there would be an increase in harmful overshadowing and a sense of enclosure to the neighbouring occupiers, in particular given the existing lack of amenity space and light.

The applicant declined to supply any supporting Light Report to address this, which would have enabled a full determination of the harm, and whether or not the plans could have been amended to allow for a more sympathetic and less harmful development.

Nevertheless, when following the path of the sun from east to west, although the amenity space belonging to No. 51 is shaded by an existing large projection of No. 55 Addington Street to the south, for part of the day, there is still some natural daylight over the top of the butterfly roof in the afternoon given its modest height. Therefore, should the roof height and bulk be increased as proposed, with no increased gap to the common boundary, this element of afternoon light would be reduced significantly. As such, it is considered that the proposed first floor extension will result in an unacceptable impact upon light to and outlook from the occupiers of no.51, including their rear amenity space.

For No.51a the existing butterfly roof only affects the light going to the ground floor window on the side elevation of No. 51a, and therefore any increased roof height here would appear to increase shadowing and loss of light to their first floor window. However, the first floor window appears to serve a bathroom, which is a non-habitable room. Furthermore, at

ground floor level the dining room window is a secondary window. The impact to these two particular windows is therefore not considered to be significant.

The proposed inset balcony would be set back within the rear elevation of the first floor extension, and be screened from both sides by the proposed walls of the extension. Nevertheless the arrangement would not prevent any overlooking towards the side elevation of No. 51a and their first floor window.

This is compounded by the introduction of a high level walkway leading from the balcony, to the proposed roof terrace atop the existing rear outbuilding.

Both the walkway and roof terrace are proposed to be set at a high level of between 2.18m and 2.4m above ground level, with see-through metal railings. Whilst this allows for the host building to still be seen, it increases the potential for harmful overlooking as the applicants could look back towards windows within the rear elevation and into the private amenity space of No. 51, and directly into the amenity space and side windows of No. 51A.

Furthermore, the level and type of noise nuisance created from a roof terrace, which could be accessed at all times of the day, is not something that is expected to be heard within neighbouring bedroom windows at this height. Given that the proposed roof terrace will be larger in size than the existing courtyard serving no.53, there is likely to be a greater use of the roof terrace, which will form the main amenity space serving the property.

To the rear of the site is Spencer Place. Backing onto this are properties that front Spencer Square. There would be a distance of 4.36m beyond the rear edge of the proposed first floor roof terrace and the rear boundary of no.24 Spencer Square, which encloses their private amenity space. The proposed roof terrace will result in direct overlooking of this amenity space, resulting in a loss of privacy for existing occupiers.

The proposed first floor extension and associated roof terrace and walkway is considered to create significant harm to the light to and outlook from no.51 Addington Street, along with a sense of enclosure, loss of privacy, and noise and disturbance; a loss of privacy and noise and disturbance to the occupiers of no.51a Addington Street; and a loss of privacy to no.24 Spencer Square, contrary to Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

Transportation

The proposed pergola is located away from the boundary with the highway and makes no significant change to the amount of habitable accommodation or off street parking at the property.

For these reasons, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in harm to highway safety or amenity.

Conclusion

The proposed rear roof terrace will create an alien feature that detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area, and the proposed first floor extension, roof terrace and walkway will cause significant harm to neighbouring amenity, contrary to Policies, HE02, QD02 and QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

It is therefore recommended that Members refuse the application.

Case Officer

Tanya Carr

TITLE: FH/TH/22/0271

Project 53 Addington Street RAMSGATE Kent CT11 9JJ

Scale:

