

R09

F/TH/23/1600

PROPOSAL: Erection of 2 bed single-storey detached dwelling with associated landscaping and parking.

LOCATION: Land Rear Of 67 Stone Road BROADSTAIRS Kent

WARD: Bradstowe

AGENT: Urban Surveying & Design LTD

APPLICANT: Mr D Molloy

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Permission

For the following reasons:

1 The proposal, by virtue of its design, relationship with adjoining properties and restricted size of the plot, would result in the loss of spaciousness between dwellings which is a characteristic of the area, resulting in a cramped and congested form of development that would appear out of character with the pattern of residential development in the locality and incongruous within the street scene, to the severe detriment of the visual amenities of the area and not outweighed by any public benefits, contrary to Thanet Local Plan Policies SP35 and QD02 of the Local Plan, Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peters Neighbourhood Plan and paragraph 132 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed development will result in increased recreational 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 paragraph 182 and 183 of the NPPF and the Habitats Directive

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is located on the eastern side of Castle Avenue, Broadstairs to the rear of 67 Stone Road. At present the site has a single storey garage situated on it, that fronts Castle Avenue. There is a physical delineation of the proposed curtilage by a fence, entry only being provided through a gate to the right of the garage. No 67 Stone Road is a detached dwelling set above the road level with rooms within the second floor mansard roof. It occupies a narrow plot, this extends back to the rear boundary fronting Castle Avenue. The existing garage on site is one of the few exceptions of not having a dwelling fronting castle Avenue.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/20/0997 Erection of 1No 2 bed single storey detached dwelling with associated car parking, and private amenity space following the removal of existing garage. Refused 13 October 2020 Appeal dismissed 21/05/2021

The reasons for refusal were:

By virtue of the restricted size of the plot and the proposed dwelling's design and relationship with adjoining properties, the proposal would result in the loss of open and spaciousness between dwellings which is a characteristic of the area, and therefore, result in a cramped and congested form of development, that would appear out of character with the pattern of development in the locality and incongruous within the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Thanet Local Plan Policies SP35 and QD01 and QD02 of the Local Plan and paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 Local Plan and paragraphs 176 and 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

F/TH/20/0447 Erection of 1No two storey 2-bed detached dwelling with associated car parking, and private amenity space following demolition of existing garage Refused 22 June 2020

F/TH/08/0442 Erection of a detached dwelling with access from Castle Avenue. Refused- Appeal dismissed.

F/TH/07/1169 Outline application for the erection of a new dwelling to land rear of no 67. Refused

OL/TH/02/0307 Outline application for the erection of a detached chalet bungalow with integral garage Refused

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Full planning consent is sought for the erection of a detached single storey dwelling which will provide a two bedroom residential unit. The dwelling has a gable presenting to Castle Avenue with a bedroom window and front entrance door (the latter being off-set) on its front facade. The overall height of the dwelling would be 3.5m and eaves height of 2.8m. The dwelling would have a width of 5.9m and depth of 14.5m.

The site would be enclosed to the highway, in part by a timber fence approximately 1.25m in height.

The proposed dwelling would be constructed in cedar cladding (sand yellow & grey) with dark grey slates.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan

SP01 - Spatial Strategy - Housing
SP14 - General Housing Policy
SP22 - Type and Size of Dwellings
SP29 - Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan (SAMM)
SP30 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets
SP35 - Quality Development
SP37 - Climate Change
SP43 - Safe and Sustainable Travel
H01 - Housing Development
QD01 - Sustainable Design
QD02 - General design Principles
QD03 - Living Conditions
QD04 - Technical Standards
TP02 - Walking
TP03 - Cycling
TP06 - Car Parking

Broadstairs & St. Peters Neighbourhood Plan

CC1 Clean Air for Residents
CC2 Biodiversity
BSP 9 Design in Broadstairs & St. Peter's
BSP12 Full Fibre Broadband Connections

NOTIFICATIONS

Letters were sent to adjoining occupiers, and a site notice posted close to the site.

23 representations were received, this includes 14 letters of support.

The concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Privacy
- Narrowness of plot
- Noise
- Overlooking
- Out of keeping with area
- Precedent for other development
- Overdevelopment
- Access
- Fire risk
- Vegetation/Vermin may result from development in narrow gap created
- Structural implications to neighbouring properties

- Sewage concerns
- Crime
- Cramped property
- Asbestos
- Planning history
- Neglect of site

The letters of support make the following comments:

- Fits in well with the area/carefully design
- Driveway will alleviate parking situation
- No impedance of light
- No environmental issues
- Benefit to the wider area
- Removes an eyesore

Broadstairs Town Council: The Committee unanimously recommends REFUSAL on the grounds of overdevelopment and cramming. The proposed development is not compatible with neighbouring developments as per Broadstairs & St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy BSP9.

CONSULTATIONS

Southern Water: Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link: southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

The Council's Building Control officers or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.

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.

Environment Agency: No comment

KCC Highways: The site is located to the rear of 67 Stone Road, accessed via Castle Avenue. The proposal seeks to provide 2 parking spaces to the front of the site. A KCC Street Light column and a telegraph poles are located either side of the site access, although it is noted that a dropped kerb would not be required due to a historic crossing being in place.

The parking space is illustrated as measuring 2.9 metres x 5 metres, which is sufficient and enables car doors to open on either side.

I suggest that pedestrian visibility splays are conditioned by way of a suitable condition.

I confirm that provided the following requirements are secured by condition, then I would raise no objection on behalf of the local highway authority:

Provision of measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway.

Provision and permanent retention of the vehicle parking spaces and/or garages shown on the submitted plans prior to the use of the site commencing.

Provision and maintenance of 2 metres x 2 metres pedestrian visibility splays behind the footway on both sides of the access with no obstructions over 0.6m above footway level, prior to the use of the site commencing.

Submission of a Construction Management Plan before the commencement of any development on site to include the following:

- (a) Routing of construction and delivery vehicles to / from site
- (b) Parking and turning areas for construction and delivery vehicles and site personnel
- (c) Timing of deliveries
- (d) Provision of wheel washing facilities
- (e) Temporary traffic management / signage

Informatives:

It is important to note that planning permission does not convey any approval to carry out works on or affecting the public highway.

Any changes to or affecting the public highway in Kent require the formal agreement of the Highway Authority, Kent County Council (KCC), and it should not be assumed that this will be a given because planning permission has been granted. For this reason, anyone considering works which may affect the public highway, including any highway-owned street furniture, is advised to engage with KCC Highways and Transportation at an early stage in the design process.

Across the county there are pieces of land next to private homes and gardens that do not look like roads or pavements but are actually part of the public highway. Some of this highway land is owned by Kent County Council whilst some is owned by third party owners. Irrespective of the ownership, this land may have highway rights over the topsoil.

Works on private land may also affect the public highway. These include works to cellars, to retaining walls which support the highway or land above the highway, and to balconies, signs or other structures which project over the highway. Such works also require the approval of the Highway Authority.

Kent County Council has now introduced a formal technical approval process for new or altered highway assets, with the aim of improving future maintainability. This process applies to all development works affecting the public highway other than applications for vehicle crossings, which are covered by a separate approval process.

Should the development be approved by the Planning Authority, it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure, before the development is commenced, that all necessary highway

approvals and consents have been obtained and that the limits of the highway boundary have been clearly established, since failure to do so may result in enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority. The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under the relevant legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant to contact KCC Highways and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.

Guidance for applicants, including information about how to clarify the highway boundary and links to application forms for vehicular crossings and other highway matters, may be found on Kent County Council's website:

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/highway-permits-and-licences/highways-permissionsand-technical-guidance>. Alternatively, KCC Highways and Transportation may be contacted by telephone: 03000 418181

COMMENTS

This application is referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Bayford, to discuss concerns that the development would represent an over-development and to consider any benefits of the development.

Principle

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption of sustainable development. In determining whether housing on the site would be acceptable, the need for housing in the district will therefore need to be balanced against other issues such as the impact upon the countryside, sustainability of the site, character and appearance of the proposed development and highway safety.

The site lies within the urban confines of Broadstairs in a sustainable location. Within the site there is a detached garage which fronts Castle Avenue.

The principle of residential development on the site accords with Policy H01 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and is acceptable subject to the detailed consideration of all other material issues including the impact upon the character and appearance of the area, living conditions of neighbouring and future property occupiers and highways matters.

Character and Appearance

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, sympathetic to local character and history, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, and optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of

development and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible. Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan outlines that the primary aim of new development is to promote or reinforce local character and provide high quality and inclusive design that is sustainable in all other respects. Proposals should therefore relate to surrounding development, form and layout, be well designed, pay particular attention to context and identity of location, scale, massing, rhythm, density, layout and materials, and be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces. Any external spaces and landscape features should be designed as an integral part of the scheme.

Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peters Neighbourhood Plan states that development proposals should enhance and conserve local distinctiveness by demonstrating high quality design which both respects and responds to the distinctive character of Broadstairs & St Peter's.

Castle Avenue is a residential road within the urban area. The street has a variety of properties in it, mainly detached bungalows with a few chalet bungalows and houses in the street. This side of the road has a clear building line, with properties set back from the road, with parking spaces to the frontages and low front boundary treatments. The plot sizes in this street are all of a reasonable size and the spacing between the properties is quite significant giving a spacious feel to the area.

The site appears to be formerly part of the garden of 67 Stone Road (boundary treatment in place separating the two sites) and there is a dilapidated garage in situ. The application site slopes quite steeply down on this side of Castle Avenue. Many dwellings on the eastern side are single storey and have gable ends facing the road, allowing long views over and between the buildings.

The Inspector in dismissing the latest appeal (planning reference number F/TH/20/0997) detailed the following in terms of character and appearance:

'9. Whilst the plot here is the same width as at Stone Road, the surrounding built form is different, to the left is a wide bungalow with a low roof slope from side to- side, and having a side elevation close to the boundary with the site with windows giving onto a pathway. The plot width equates to that of both semi detached dwellings on Stone road. A similar arrangement is in place to the right where there is a chalet-bungalow with rooms in the roof, with a low garage abutting the boundary with the site, in total occupying a width greater than the individual frontage plots on the lower road. That rhythm of low dwellings and intervening garages forms a distinctive feature of the streetscene and sets the character and appearance of this road apart from that of Stone Road."

The Inspector further stated:

"However, the proposed new dwelling would appear out-of-place and uncharacteristically cramped on its site when seen in relation to its neighbours and the wider street-scene. Although the garage presently on the site is described as dilapidated by the Officer and that appears still an accurate description, and the overgrown nature of the site detracts, it is one of a number of flat roofed structures on this frontage and notwithstanding its condition, does

not cause real detriment or a perception of permanent harm. The appeal proposal would not be of the standard of design sought in the local policies and the Framework previously cited.

Whilst within the urban area where development would be acceptable in principle, the provision of a windfall development such as this does carry weight and that weight has to be increased in view of the Council's housing land supply situation. Nevertheless, that is not a reason to allow harmful development and Framework paragraph 11.d)ii states that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole."

In addition a Planning Statement has been submitted with the application (submitted during the application process). The supporting statement details that the presence of parked cars in front of the dwelling will be little different to the appearance of the site at present and no different to the character of the vast majority of other properties. The general activity associated with a dwelling would be no different to other properties within the road. Reference is made that the current appearance of the garage detracts from the area presently. Reference is made to the fact that the boundary treatment proposed for the dwelling would conceal domestic items on the front facade- doorbell, letter box for example. It is also put forward that as this land was effectively background some sort of outbuilding or boundary treatment would be expected.

The application site is significantly narrower than other plots in Castle Avenue; barely half the width of most of the nearby plots. Whilst this plot width accommodates a house fronting Stone Road, these properties are a lot more tightly packed. The proposed plot has a width of 7.1m where neighbouring plots vary between 13-18m. The difference between these plot widths are considered significant and would be clearly at odds with the established pattern and character.

With regard to Castle Avenue, both the adjoining dwellings are built close to the common boundary. The proposal is for a single storey building that has a greater depth (14.5m) than width (5.8m) owing to the constraints of the site. This is not comparable to other residential dwelling plots within the street. Whilst it could look superficially like an outbuilding as is the current situation a new dwelling would attract parked vehicles, general comings and goings, domestic paraphernalia like house number/name plaque, letterboxes, a doorbell that an outbuilding would not. As such I consider that the subdivision of the plot for a dwelling house would be inherently against the established character of the area.

The design of the proposal is for a single storey dwelling with a gable to the front, having a front entrance door off set and a window under the gable. Due to the drop in levels of the site these features would not be visible from the road and would therefore appear blank. The materials for the construction are shown to be cedar cladding (sand yellow & grey) with dark grey slates.

The building in general terms is felt to have taken design cues from the existing detached garage on site or other outbuilding as such and not from other dwellings in the surrounding areas. As detailed above only a blank facade would be visible from the road. It is appreciated that this is to give the appearance of an outbuilding and to arguably be no worse

than the current situation, if not a positive, as that is in a poor state of repair, although this is not permanent as the Inspector noted. However, that is no reason to permit this proposal, if it does not meet a sufficiently high quality of design for the area. In terms of materials within the area these are mainly red brick, render, tile hanging, and where there is cladding this is for a relatively minor part of a dwelling in a corner below a gable and above a window. I consider that the design solution used would not be of sufficient quality to reinforce local character or distinctiveness both in terms of design and use of materials.

Whilst the proposed building would be able to sit within the parameters of the site. It is not considered that this is of a sufficiently high standard of design that is sought from the NPPF, policies within the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan and therefore contrary to these aims.

Living Conditions

Paragraph 123 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.

Local Plan policies QD03 and QD04 are also relevant to this application. Policy QD03 (Living Conditions) 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.

The proposed development will have no significant impact upon No 10. due to the location of its garage on this boundary, angle to the habitable accommodation and single storey nature of the proposed development.

With regard to the impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 12 Castle Avenue, this is a detached bungalow and there are a number of windows facing the proposed dwelling.

There is currently a close boarded fence marking the boundary with some shrub planting within the application site. The proposed dwelling is located to the south of number 12; with a roof which pitches away from number 12. The proposed dwelling would have an eaves height of approximately 2.4m and ridge height of 3.5m. There is a distance of approximately 2m between built forms- proposed dwelling and number 12. Whilst a new dwelling will have some impact in terms of loss of light to these windows, which serve a kitchen, bathroom and toilet, I do not consider it to be so significant as to result in unacceptable harm.

The proposed development is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in terms of the living conditions of adjacent neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 135 National Planning Policy Framework.

In terms of the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling/s, 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. The internal space standards referred to in Policy QD04 are the National Described Space Standards (March 2015). Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. All windows serving primary habitable rooms are required to provide an acceptable level of outlook, natural light and ventilation for all primary habitable rooms. The floor space required for a two bedroom 4 person dwelling over one floor is 70 sqm. The proposal meets requirements.

In addition if the proposed units are two or more bedrooms an area of doorstep play space will be required in order to comply with the requirements of policy GI04 - Amenity Green Space and Equipped Play Areas. Doorstep play space is defined as a playspace for young children which is immediately adjacent to, closely visible and safely accessible from the dwellings served. The dwelling proposed has two double bedrooms and has an enclosed doorstep playspace to the rear which is considered to be acceptable.

Transportation

Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that amongst other aims: a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location and b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual impacts on the road network would be severe. Paragraph 116 goes on to highlight that Within this context, applications for development should: a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second - so far as possible - to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use; b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive - which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards; d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

Under Policy QD01, all developments are required to: 1) Achieve a high standard of energy efficiency to the equivalent of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (subject to HE05

where applicable), 2) Make the best use of solar energy passive heating and cooling, natural light, natural ventilation and landscaping, 3) Provide safe and attractive cycling and walking opportunities to reduce the need to travel by car. Policy QD02 relates to general design principles and states amongst other principles that developments must incorporate a high degree of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists, provide safe and satisfactory access for pedestrians, public transport and other vehicles, ensuring provision for disabled access and Improve people's quality of life by creating safe and accessible environments, and promoting public safety and security by designing out crime. Policy TP01 states that new development will be expected to be designed so as to facilitate safe and convenient movement by pedestrians including people with limited mobility, elderly people and people with young children, whilst Policy TP03 states new development will be expected to consider the need for the safety of cyclists and incorporate facilities for cyclists into the design of new and improved roads, junction improvements and traffic management proposals.

The site is located in a sustainable location and two off street parking spaces are proposed. The number of parking spaces is considered acceptable for a two bedroom house. Furthermore they are located side by side and do not impede access to the front entrance of the property, this is considered to accord with KCC requirements. In addition the parking spaces are in accordance with KCC requirements.

Cycle storage for the dwelling is shown to be accommodated within the rear garden, together with bin storage.

In terms of drainage of the hard standing the application details that the surfacing will be interlocked permeable paving, to ensure that excess water would not go onto the highway.

Given the location of the site and the proposed off street parking and cycle storage, this development is not considered to result in any significant increase in demand for on street parking or harm to highway safety is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Ecology and biodiversity

Paragraph 185 a) of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan).

Thanet Local Plan Policy SP30 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets) states development proposals will, where appropriate, be required to make a positive contribution to the conservation, enhancement and management of biodiversity and geodiversity assets resulting in a net gain for biodiversity assets. Sites should be assessed for the potential presence of biodiversity assets and protected species. For sites where important biodiversity assets, including protected species and habitats including SPA functional land, or other notable species, may be affected, an ecological assessment will be required to assess the impact of the proposed development on the relevant species or habitats. Planning permission will not be granted for development if it results in significant harm to biodiversity and geodiversity assets, which cannot be adequately mitigated or as a last resort compensated for, to the satisfaction of the appropriate authority.

The site comprises existing garages and a residential garden that is surrounded by residential properties. Given this location the site is considered to represent limited potential for biodiversity. Full details of the proposed landscaping, including ecological enhancements could be secured by condition.

Other Matters

The development could be conditioned to achieve a high standard of energy efficiency to the equivalent of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and a water efficiency standard of 110litres/person/day in accordance with policies QD01 and QD04 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

Given the existing building on the site and the size of the dwelling proposed this development is not considered to result in any significant harm to drainage or increase in surface water in the area.

The construction of a dwelling and the use of the site for residential purposes is not considered to result in any significant increase in pollution or result in any significant impacts upon air quality in the area.

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 has been submitted with a draft Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to provide the required financial contribution for the single residential unit to mitigate the additional recreational pressure on the SPA area. The undertaking is for £320 and contains the monitoring fee (£150), however, the official copy entry and title plan/s to establish land ownership have not been submitted and therefore the draft is not sufficient at present to check or verify. This therefore needs to form a reason for refusal as no signed valid UU is in place.

Other matters

The agent has submitted additional information - planning statement and various plans detailing street scenes, plot dimensions etc, including information relating to a plot that was recently granted planning consent for a detached dwelling on another site; land adjoining 9 Queens Avenue in Broadstairs. This application; reference number: F/TH/23/1106. This was for a 1no two storey 3-bed dwelling with parking following demolition of existing 2no garages. The proposed dwelling was two storeys in height with gable ends to the front and rear. An inset balcony is proposed on the first floor front elevation and the ground floor front elevation would be set in from the side elevations. The proposed dwelling would have a narrow frontage and the ridge would be set below that of number 9, but above that of number 11.

In this case the officer considered that whilst the proposed dwelling would have a narrow frontage and be located close to the neighbouring properties, there is no consistent pattern to plot widths or spacing between the dwellings. Furthermore the height of the proposed dwelling is considered to provide a transition between the substantial height of number 9 and the single storey height of number 11. Matters relating to residential amenity, highway safety were not considered to create harm.

Officers considered that the two applications are not directly comparable and each application should be treated on its own merits. It is however stated that 9 Queens Avenue, whilst being on what is known as the 'chessboard' as this current application is, the character of Queens Avenue is somewhat different (no consistent pattern to plot widths or spacing between dwellings) and the application plot width was not so significantly different that would create perceivable visual harm.

Conclusion

The Council has achieved a measurement of 73% for housing delivery against the identified housing targets in the 2022 Housing Delivery test results, which falls below the requirements set by the government under paragraph 79 and footnote 8 of paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). On this basis the Council are in presumption under paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which means when considering the planning application, planning permission should be granted "unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be refused.

The proposed development of one dwelling with the urban confines of Broadstairs is considered acceptable in principle. It is however considered that the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm resulting. A completed unilateral undertaking has not been provided to secure the required mitigation towards the Special Protection Area and this therefore forms a further reason for refusal. Aspects relating to highway safety are considered acceptable.

It is therefore recommended that Members refuse this application.

Case Officer
Gillian Daws

TITLE:

F/TH/23/1600

Project

Land Rear Of 67 Stone Road BROADSTAIRS Kent

