

A01

FH/TH/23/0773

PROPOSAL: Erection of dormer to rear together with second floor rear extension and hip to gable extension to facilitate loft conversion

LOCATION: 221 Beacon Road BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 3DY

WARD: Beacon Road

AGENT: Mr James Duncan

APPLICANT: Ms Sara Taylor

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 amended drawing numbered 05/23/02, received 17 October 2023.

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 roof tiles to match existing, tile hanging on gable end to match main roof, as confirmed by the Applicant's Agent in correspondence received 17 October 2023, and Brick Red C72 Cedral composite horizontal cladding on the external surfaces of the dormer extension and white render on the first floor extension, as confirmed by the Applicant's Agent in correspondence received 3 November 2023, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND:

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES

Information on how to appeal this planning decision or condition is available online at <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-decision>

Please be aware that your project may also require a separate application for Building Control. Information can be found at:
<https://www.thanet.gov.uk/services/building-control/> or contact the Building Control team on 01843 577522 for advice.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The property is a two storey dwelling in Beacon Road which comprises a mix of semi-detached and small groups of terraced properties set back from the highway. The property forms a semi-detached pair with No 223 having hipped roofs and a small front garden to the front.

PLANNING HISTORY

PN01/TH/16/0223 - Erection of single storey rear extension to extend 5.4m in depth, 2.3m to eaves and overall height of 3.1m. Prior Approval Granted 21.03.2016

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application as originally submitted sought planning permission for the erection of a front dormer and rear dormer together with second floor rear extension and hip to gable extension to facilitate loft conversion. The dormer within the front roof slope has since been removed and replaced with 2 rooflights. The extension to the rear is located above the existing rear projection forming a three storey rear projection.

PLANNING POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2020

SP35 - Quality Developments
QD02 - General Design Principles
QD03 - Living Conditions

Broadstairs & St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2031

BSP9: Design in Broadstairs & St Peter's

NOTIFICATIONS

Neighbours have been notified and a site notice posted and one representation has been received raising the following concerns:

- Out of keeping with character of similar Victorian properties
- Lack of detail of material finish
- Additional floor out of keeping with character of every other loft extension in the road
- These rear extensions were never designed to have an extra story built on top

- Obtrusive and incongruous when set upon half of a semi pair and would set a precedent in the neighbourhood for this type of Victorian property
- Extension attached to the party wall along the raised roof dividing ridgeline - concerns regarding structural integrity of my property being affected
- Overshadowing from wall facing my property
- How will the wall be repaired or maintained - it can only be reached across my property
- Dormer to front of property is an inappropriate design and completely out of character with the neighbouring street scene
- Reduced privacy in garden from rear facing windows including juliet balcony
- Significant reduction in light reaching both rear habitable rooms; dining room on the ground floor and study/office on 1st floor
- The rearward facing extra storey will eliminate sunlight from reaching the roof of my rear facing part of the house which will mean a build up of moss and moisture on my roof tiling creating a potential opportunity for water ingress to my house.
- Extension infringes on the use and enjoyment of my patio and garden - the first 20m of my garden will become unusable as no sunlight will reach it through Autumn, winter and spring and only usable for a small portion of the mid sommer.
- The proposal should be limited to a conventional loft conversion like others in neighbourhood

The Broadstairs Society has no adverse comment to make on this application.

Broadstairs & St Peter's Town Council - The Committee unanimously recommends REFUSAL on the grounds of overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light to neighbouring property. The Committee believes the application constitutes overdevelopment of the site and will be out of character with the streetscene.

COMMENTS

This application is reported to the Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Jenny Matterface to enable Members to consider the impact of the development on the neighbour due to overlooking and potential loss of privacy.

The main considerations in assessing the proposal are the impact on the character and appearance of the area and impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Character and Appearance

Thanet Local Plan Policy QD02 requires new development to 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 development itself must be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces. This policy is further supported by paragraph 130 of the NPPF which states that decisions should ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment. Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan requires

development proposals to conserve and enhance the local character and sense of identity and reflect the design characteristics of the area.

The property is a semi-detached property with No 223 in Beacon Road. The semi-detached pair are architecturally similar in appearance having hipped roofs finished with red cement tile and bay windows within the front elevation at ground floor level. The front elevation of the application site has off-white painted brickwork whereas the adjoining property has retained its original yellow stock brickwork with red brick detailing.

It was proposed to alter the roof from hipped to gable and install dormers to the front and rear roofslopes. The dormer originally proposed within the front facing roofslope was considered to be overly dominant on the building and out of keeping with the streetscene where there are no other examples in this part of Beacon Road. The application has been amended and the front facing dormer has been removed and replaced with two rooflights.

Altering the roof from hip to gable would appear to unbalance the semi-detached pair as No 223 currently has a matching hip. However, this type of alteration can be carried out without the need for planning permission subject to meeting the requirements of Class B of the General Permitted Development Order, and this constitutes a relevant fallback position when considering this change. Therefore, it is not unusual for this type of alteration to be carried out to facilitate loft conversions and in this instance the neighbouring group of terraced properties would partially screen the gable end of the property when viewed from Beacon Road. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the gable end is to be finished with tile hanging to match existing and this would minimise the visual impact of this change to the roof form. Therefore the change is considered acceptable when assessed against Policy QD02.

To the rear it is proposed to install a dormer extension into the rear roofslope and erect an extension above the existing rear projection. The resulting extensions would form an 'L' shaped extension. Within the dormer extension it is proposed to install a set of french doors with a Juliette balcony to serve the master bedroom whilst the extension above the rear projection would provide an en-suite with a window within the rear elevation facing into the rear garden. The dormer would be set down from the main ridge and in from the edge of the gable end. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the external surfaces of the dormer would be finished with Brick Red C72 Cedral composite horizontal cladding. This would be similar in appearance to the red/brown roof tiles and would help the dormer to blend into the roof. The external walls of the extension would be finished with white render. The front, side and rear elevations of the dwelling have been finished with white painted brickwork and therefore the use of white render on the extension would provide a similar finish and is considered acceptable.

Concerns have been raised that the development is not in keeping with development on similar aged properties and that a more traditional dormer would be more appropriate. Whilst extending above the rear projection of Victorian properties is unusual it is noted that there are limited opportunities to view the rear of this property from the public realm. Furthermore, whilst the extension may disrupt the original architectural design of the property, and appear fairly dominant at the rear in relation to the main dwelling, the building is not heritage listed. Views of the extension would be possible from surrounding properties

and from the car parking area for Nos 1-3 Fir Tree Cottages to the rear, where it is possible to view a number of fairly large dormer extensions. Any views of the extensions from surrounding roads would be at a significant distance and therefore the development is unlikely to appear intrusive or out of keeping with the character and appearance of the wider area or the streetscene in this instance.

Given the location of the extensions and minimal impact on the streetscene it is considered the proposed development would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the area and therefore the proposal accords with Policies SP35 and QD02 of the 2020 Thanet District Council Local Plan, and Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St. Peter's Neighbourhood Plan.

Living Conditions

The proposed development would provide a master bedroom with French doors and Juliette balcony within the enlarged roof space and an en-suite at second floor level above the rear projection. Concern has been raised that the windows would cause overlooking and loss of privacy towards the neighbouring garden.

The full length windows within the bedroom would face into the rear garden and beyond towards the rear boundaries of properties fronting Afghan Road at a distance of nearly 49 metres. The red outline defining the application site accords with the boundaries shown on the Council's GIS Mapping and shows the property has a shorter rear garden than its neighbours with a distance of approximately 18 metres from the location of the windows within the dormer extension to the rear boundary. There is no information provided as to the ownership of the land beyond the rear boundary however from Google Map images the land appears to form part of the rear garden of the adjoining semi-detached property (No 223). Within the immediately surrounding gardens there appear to be a number of fairly large outbuildings however there is no planning history to show that these outbuildings have planning permission for use as independent forms of accommodation and therefore these are likely to be outbuilding ancillary to the use of residential properties.

With regards to potential loss of privacy the private amenity space of residential rear gardens is generally acknowledged as being within the first 5 metres from the rear elevation of a dwelling, with the remainder of the garden likely to have a degree of mutual overlooking that is often possible between rear gardens, and from windows within surrounding properties. Views from the Juliette balcony would primarily look down the garden of No 221, with indirect views across the gardens of Nos 215 to 217 with only oblique views towards the rear elevation of No 219. Views towards the private amenity space of the adjoining property (No 223) would be restricted by the extension above the rear projection. Views from this window would otherwise be similar to the views gained from existing windows within the rear of this property and would not therefore give rise to unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy directly into neighbouring windows or private amenity space.

Concern has been raised that the extension above the rear projection would result in loss of light to windows within the adjoining property no.223. Photographs have been provided that show views from the first floor window and rooflight, and look out onto the roof of the rear projection and towards the neighbouring roof where the extension is proposed to be built.

The photos show shadowing falling across the roofs consistent with the orientation of the property; the application site is located south-west of the adjoining semi-detached property. Further photographs taken during a site visit, from the car parking area looking back towards the rear elevation of these properties, show shadowing across the majority of the first floor window created by the depth of the existing rear projection, with the natural sunlight moving towards the rear of the site during August (photos taken 18:20 on 15 August 2023).

The concerns raised state there would be a significant reduction in light reaching both rear habitable rooms serving a dining room on the ground floor and study/office on the first floor. The flank wall of the extension, facing No 223, would have a depth of approximately 4.3 metres from the existing eaves (finishing in alignment with the end of the rear projection) and a height of approximately 2.3 metres above the height of raised brickwork along the ridge of the roof. A study/office is not considered to be a main habitable room and therefore light to this room would carry less weight compared to a main habitable room such as a lounge or dining room. However, whilst there would be some loss of light and outlook from the first floor window from the proposed second floor extension, there would be a separation distance from the extension to the window of approximately 3 metres and the light levels and outlook to and from this window are already somewhat compromised by the presence of the existing rear projection. The proposed development is therefore not considered to significantly impact on the light or outlook from the first floor window to compromise the living conditions of occupiers.

The windows within the ground floor are likely to be in shadow for most of the day due to the orientation of the property and its relationship with properties to the north-east. The proposed development is not considered to have a greater impact on light levels or outlook to and from the ground floor windows.

With regards to the light and outlook from the neighbour's rooflight, it is unclear whether this room is also used as a study, nevertheless it is likely to provide additional accommodation or storage space for the property but is unlikely to be a main habitable room, unlike a sitting room or lounge. The rooflight is located fairly high within the roof slope and has a high cill level and it is unlikely therefore that there would be views from the window that would be compromised by the location of the proposed extensions. It should be noted that a dormer extension, built through permitted development, is likely to have the same impact on light levels to the rooflight to the development now proposed. The dormer projects approximately 3.5 metres from the rear roof slope, whilst the roof of the extension is set down approximately 0.8 metres from the ridge of the main roof, with internal stairs installed for the change in floor levels thereby keeping the finished height of the roof to a minimum. The photograph, previously mentioned, with the shadowing across the rear of these properties shows the rear dormer of Fir Tree Cottages casting a shadow diagonally across the rear roof slope and therefore some shadowing would likewise occur from the proposed dormer. However, the dormer would be set down approximately 0.4 metres from the main ridge and, given the height and distance of the rooflight, whilst there would be some loss of natural light to the rooflight later in the day, it is unlikely there would be an unacceptable loss of light resulting from the proposed development would significantly harm living conditions to warrant refusal in this instance, particularly given the room does not appear to be a main habitable room.

Concerns are raised by the neighbour that the first 20 metres of the garden will become unusable having no sunlight reaching it through Autumn, winter and spring with only a small portion in mid summer. The photo taken from the car parking area shows shadowing across the car parking area created by the boundary treatment to the space. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the existing rear projection creates a similar overshadowing impact on part of the neighbouring rear garden. However, given the additional height and depth of the wall created by the extension, together with the orientation of the property, it is unlikely that the development would significantly impact on light levels within the rear garden to the detriment of residential amenity.

Given the above it is considered that the impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers would not be significantly affected and therefore the proposal meets the requirements of Thanet Local Plan QD03 and the NPPF.

Other Matters

The Party Wall Act and the construction of the extension and any issues arising are not material planning considerations. These issues would be covered through Building Control Regulations.

Concerns regarding future maintenance and build up of moss and moisture on the neighbouring roof are not material planning considerations in assessing this application.

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 SP35, QD02 and QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan, Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is therefore recommended that Members approve the application subject to safeguarding conditions relating to the external materials to be used.

Case Officer

Rosemary Bullivant

TITLE:

FH/TH/23/0773

Project

221 Beacon Road BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 3DY

