

A01

FH/TH/23/1534

PROPOSAL: Erection of 1no. two storey side extension, 1no. single storey rear extension with balcony, following demolition of existing conservatory, 1no. side extension replacing existing garage, alterations to roof to include increase in ridge height, insertion of roof lights and formation of roof terrace, alterations to fenestration and materials, together with erection of pergola to rear garden, formation of swimming pool, alterations to landscaping and erection of 2m high boundary treatments.

LOCATION: 74 Stone Road BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 1EB

WARD: Bradstowe

AGENT: Thomas Mullally

APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs Lucken

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 GSL1.P.1.01 Rev 3H, GSL1.P.1.02 Rev 3I, GSL1.P.1.03 Rev 3I, GSL1.p.1.04 Rev 3I, GSL1.P.2.01 Rev 3H and GSL1. P.2.02 Rev 3G.

GROUND;

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Environmental Management Plan shall include amongst other matters details of: hours of construction working; measures to control noise affecting nearby residents; wheel cleaning/chassis cleaning facilities; dust control measures; lighting control measures; pollution incident control and site contact details in case of complaints. The construction works shall thereafter be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan, unless any variations are otherwise first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND:

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 To assess and mitigate the impacts of development on significant archaeological remains:

A) Prior to any development works the applicant (or their agents or successors in title) shall secure and have reported a programme of archaeological field evaluation works, in accordance with a specification and written timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

B) Following completion of archaeological evaluation works, no development shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of any safeguarding measures to ensure preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording in accordance with a specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

C) The archaeological safeguarding measures, investigation and recording shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed specification and timetable.

D) Within 6 months of the completion of archaeological works a Post-Excavation Assessment Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Post-Excavation Assessment Report shall be in accordance with Kent County Council's requirements and include:

a. a description and assessment of the results of all archaeological investigations that have been undertaken in that part (or parts) of the development;

b. an Updated Project Design outlining measures to analyse and publish the findings of the archaeological investigations, together with an implementation strategy and timetable for the same;

c. a scheme detailing the arrangements for providing and maintaining an archaeological site archive and its deposition following completion.

E) The measures outlined in the Post-Excavation Assessment Report shall be implemented in full and in accordance with the agreed timings.

GROUND:

To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded in accordance with Local Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 The rating level of noise emitted from the proposed Air Source Heat Pump shall not exceed the background noise level 35dB at the nearest residential facade. All measurements shall be defined and derived in accordance with BS4142: 2014 + A1:2019.

GROUND:

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 The privacy screening to the upper terrace of the garden hereby approved shall be provided and shall be installed prior to first use of that terrace permanently retained thereafter.

GROUND: To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

No. 74 Stone Road is a two storey dwelling in a predominantly residential area of Broadstairs. There is front landscaping to the front of the property, with a driveway to the north and south, with a path from each to the front porch. An area of soft landscaping sits between the driveways, with a low brick wall to the front facing Stone Road. A large terrace area sits to the back of the property, which leads onto a soft landscaped garden area. A tall brick wall runs along the north boundary and historically, the side garage wall has been built onto this boundary wall. The footpath adjacent leads to Stone Bay, though of a level topography adjacent to the property, when it reaches a gap in the cliff, it slopes downwards to the sands. The topography of the site is largely flat, with an incline from the existing access drive to the south towards the front of the existing building.

To the north of the site beyond a pedestrian route (Stone Gap) to the beach lies an area of Trees covered by a TPO (1 of 1956).

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is for number of extensions and alterations to the existing building and wider site, including the erection of a single storey side extension, a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension with balcony, the demolition of the existing conservatory, alterations to the roof and the insertion of rooflights, the formation of a roof terrace, alterations to materials, fenestration, landscaping, and boundary treatments, the erection of a pergola and the formation of a swimming pool.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to neighbouring property occupiers and a site notice posted close to the site.

- * One letter of objection has been received surrounding:
- * Overbearing impact
- * Overlooking
- * The potential for the pool to leak/overspill and the impact given changing land levels
- *

Broadstairs and St Peters Town Council: The Committee unanimously recommends REFUSAL on the grounds of the rooftop terrace being overbearing with a lack of privacy due to the proposed terrace overlooking into the neighbouring property's living space, and the close proximity of the terrace and windows to the neighbouring property's boundary.

The Committee have concerns regarding the swimming pool as 74 Stone Road is geographically higher than neighbouring properties and the swimming pool's location could cause significant damage should it leak.

CONSULTATIONS

TDC Environmental Health: Final Comment - Thank you for the plan showing the proposed ASHP has been relocated to away from the adjoining residential boundary. The distance to any nearby window is such that noise is unlikely to be audible and therefore EH do not object save for the following standard condition for plant:

Condition - ASHP

The rating level of noise emitted from the proposed ASHP and shall not exceed the background noise level 35dBA at the nearest residential facade. All measurements shall be defined and derived in accordance with BS4142: 2014 + A1:2019.

Initial comment - The proposed development is in close proximity to other residential buildings. There are intended to be significant earthworks in altering the ground levels for the property and excavation of a swimming pool at the rear of the property. In order to mitigate effects from dust and noise a Construction Environmental Management Plan should be submitted. The plan should specifically address measures that are to be taken to address potential dust and noise issues. It is therefore recommended that the following condition is applied.

Condition – Construction Environmental Management Plan

Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Environmental Management Plan shall include amongst other matters details of: hours of construction working; measures to control noise affecting nearby residents; wheel cleaning/chassis cleaning facilities; dust control measures; lighting control measures; pollution incident control and site contact details in case of complaints. The construction works shall thereafter be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan, unless any variations are otherwise first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thank you for further consulting Environmental Health on this application which also includes the installation of two ASHPs. ASHPs can cause annoyance / nuisance to neighbours particularly where there are low background noise levels and where site in close proximity to neighbouring boundaries. No details have been provided for the specification proposed. The applicant should provide these upfront given the proximity to 72 Stone Rd of one of the units as may require relocation if unable to achieve the following limits:

Noise from the running/operation of any plant, as measured within neighbouring residential premises, shall not exceed a sound level in excess of noise rating curve NR20 in the frequency range 31.5Hz to 8KHz.

The noise rating level (LA,T) associated with the development site shall not exceed the background noise level (LA90,T) at the nearest residential facade. All measurements shall be defined and derived in accordance with BS4142: 2014 + A1:2019.

I would be happy to give further advice once the spec has been submitted or the ASHP adjacent to 72 has been relocated to the opposite boundary to increase separate distance to 72.

KCC Highways: Final Comment - There is no justification provided as to the need for two accesses to this site, and I would maintain my request for one access to be closed by way of reinstating full height kerbing. Although the two dropped kerbs are existing the proposals seek to join these creating a tandem parking arrangement which will increase associated movements. Having a singular access will create a larger area for manoeuvre and parking so all cars may egress in a forward gear, reducing associated movements with the site. The gates have not been setback the minimum of 5.5m required to prevent obstruction on the highway. The gates situated on the highway boundary would also impact both vehicular and pedestrian visibility. I wish to place a holding objection until such a time that the applicant may be able to satisfy the outstanding queries outlined.

Initial comment - Although this development proposal does not meet the criteria to typically warrant involvement from the Highway Authority in accordance with the current consultation protocol arrangements, concerns have been brought to our consideration for our further assessment. I would advise the access closest to Thanet Place Gardens be reinstated to full height kerbing, with the other existing crossover retained. This would allow for parking bays in line with Kent Design Guide and Dropped Kerb Guidance as well as area for manoeuvre to ensure all vehicles egress in a forward gear. Any gates are to open away from the highway and to be set back a minimum of 5.5 metres from the edge of the carriageway to prevent obstruction on the public highway. Furthermore it should be shown that the gradient of the access is to be no steeper than 1 in 10 for the first 1.5 metres from the highway boundary and no steeper than 1 in 8 thereafter. There should be use of a bound surface for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway.

KCC Archaeology: Thank you for consulting on the above planning application. The application site lies in an area with considerable archaeological potential relating to a focus of Iron Age and Roman settlement and other activities. A number of discoveries have been made on nearby properties including the finding of roman buildings and infant burials at 103

Stone Road, Iron Age ditches and granary structures at Hamilton Close and a Roman-British burial ground in Castle Avenue. Roman remains were also found in 1891 on land to the east of the site. The development proposals include substantial ground works for the excavation of a swimming pool as well as recontouring the site. Although there may be some previous impact from the current profiling of the site there is potential for significant archaeological remains to be encountered during development works. I would therefore recommend that should consent be granted then provision is made for archaeological evaluation and mitigation through the following condition.

To assess and mitigate the impacts of development on significant archaeological remains:

A) Prior to any development works the applicant (or their agents or successors in title) shall secure and have reported a programme of archaeological field evaluation works, in accordance with a specification and written timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

B) Following completion of archaeological evaluation works, no development shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of any safeguarding measures to ensure preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording in accordance with a specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

C) The archaeological safeguarding measures, investigation and recording shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed specification and timetable.

D) Within 6 months of the completion of archaeological works a Post-Excavation Assessment Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Post-Excavation Assessment Report shall be in accordance with Kent County Council's requirements and include:

a. a description and assessment of the results of all archaeological investigations that have been undertaken in that part (or parts) of the development;

b. an Updated Project Design outlining measures to analyse and publish the findings of the archaeological investigations, together with an implementation strategy and timetable for the same;

c. a scheme detailing the arrangements for providing and maintaining an archaeological site archive and its deposition following completion.

E) The measures outlined in the Post-Excavation Assessment Report shall be implemented in full and in accordance with the agreed timings.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded in accordance with Local Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2020

SP12 - Broadstairs

SP35 - Quality Development

SP36 - Conservation and Enhancement of Thanet's Historic Environment

HE01 - Archaeology

HE03 - Heritage Assets

QD01 - Sustainable Development
QD02 - General Design Principles
QD03 - Living Conditions
CC04 - Renewable Energy
TP06 - Car Parking

Broadstairs and St Peters Neighbourhood Plan 2023

BSP3: Protecting and providing Important Trees
BSP9: Design in Broadstairs and St Peter's

ANALYSIS

The application is reported to the Planning Committee following a call-in by Cllr Bayford, for members to consider whether the development would be overbearing and the impact on neighboring privacy.

Principle of Development

The proposal relates to an existing residential dwelling and there is no in principle objection to its extension or alteration.

The main considerations are the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and highway safety.

Character and Appearance

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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 attractive, welcoming and distinctive, as well as 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 Neighborhood Development Plan 2023 sets out that development 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. It should have regard to and respond positively to the design principles set out in the AECOM Design Guidance and Codes for Broadstairs and St Peter's area. Design Code 04 of the Design Guide sets out that architectural design should reflect

high-quality local design references in both the natural and built environment. It should reflect and reinforce local distinctiveness. Design Code 08 states that the character of the existing building, along with its scale, form materials and details should be respected and taken into consideration when preparing proposals for alterations and/or extensions. Extensions should safeguard the privacy and daylight amenity of neighbouring properties.

To the front there would be no increase to the overall front building line or footprint of this part of the dwelling. The works would see the alteration of an existing side extension to the north to increase the roof height and provide a monopitch finish, along with alterations to materials and openings, the erection of a first floor extension over the existing southern projection. The existing ridge would be increased by around 0.3m in height and the central front focus with the balcony over the existing entrance porch would remain. The two storey side element would draw some attention away from the more balanced views of the current arrangement given the forward position, however two storey front projections are not uncommon within the wider streetscape and there is a diverse architectural character here. The raised ridge would not appear overly dominant in the streetscape, being marginally larger than the existing, and it already appears larger than the nearest neighbouring property to the south given the difference in eaves height between the two sites.

The overall appearance of no. 74 would be more contemporary, with aluminium frames and large openings, white brickwork and horizontal tiling, with a slate roof and charred timber cladding to the extension and black screening across the front porch and first floor balcony. This is a semi-coastal location with a mixed material palette and more contemporary materials and appearances can be expected here.

Some views across the sides and rear would also be possible given the gradient changes and nearby public paths. Again the appearance would be contemporary, with balcony elements and modern material finishes.

In terms of the rear extension views of this would be likely to be limited from Stone Gap and the surrounding streetscape. The flat roof finish would help prevent any sense of bulk and mass here, along with the angled appearance. Although set on a higher land level, extensions and later additions can be expected within residential sites and the works are not likely to be harmful here.

In terms of the rear garden features such as the pergola and swimming pool, these would be features of a domestic property. The swimming pool would be set into the ground and not visible from public vantage points. The pergola would be around 2.1m in height from the proposed finished land levels. The other landscaping alterations would also not be visible from any public vantage points.

A gate is proposed in the north perimeter wall leading on to Stone Gap. There appear to be other examples of this along the boundary with dwellings leading to the seafront and therefore this would not be an uncommon feature.

To the front of the site the two existing dropped kerbs would be retained and two parking spaces served by these dropped kerbs proposed one either side of a central landscaped area.

An air source heat pump would be fitted at the front of the site. Paragraph 163 of the NPPF states that LPAs should not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy and should approve applications if the impacts are or can be made acceptable. Policy QD01 of the Thanet Local Plan sets out that all new buildings and conversions of existing buildings must be designed to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and have resilience to function in a changing climate and will be required to make the best use of solar energy, passive heating and cooling, natural light, natural ventilation and landscaping. Policy CC04 supports the use of renewable energy or micro-generation equipment where there are no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area, visual and landscape impacts have been minimised in the design and layout of the scheme, and there is no adverse impact on heritage assets or their setting. The pump would be set down and back from the highway. On balance this is not likely to result in any visual harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Given the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the surrounding area and is therefore considered to comply with the aims of policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan and the guidance of the NPPF.

Trees

Policy QD02 sets out that all new development should promote or reinforce local character and be sustainable. For external spaces this means features such as trees, natural habitats and surfaces that contribute positively to the quality and character of an area should be retained, enhanced, and protected where appropriate. Trees and other planting should be incorporated appropriate to both the scale of buildings and the space available, to provide opportunities for increasing biodiversity interest and improving connectivity between nature conservation sites where appropriate. Policy BSP3 of the Broadstairs and St Peters Neighbourhood Plan sets out that proposals for new development which would have an adverse impact on protected trees and other significant trees in the Plan area will not be supported.

Paragraph 136 of the NPPF sets out that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Within the curtilage of the application site there appear to be a number of trees. The trees are not currently protected, however S197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) imposes a requirement on Local Planning Authorities to consider the appropriate provision and preservation of trees in the determination of planning applications.

The trees to the front of the site that are proposed to be removed appear immature and unlikely to meet the standards required for protection.

There is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to the north of the site in Thanet Place Gardens. Trees here are separated by Stone Gap, a public right of way, and although there is some

overhang towards the site, none of the proposed works are likely to impact the crowns or roots here.

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. Paragraph 135 states that decisions should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for future users. Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan outlines that new development should be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces, and should be inclusive in its design for all users. It should improve people's quality of life by creating safe and accessible environments and promote public safety and security. Policy QD03 outlines that new development must not lead to unacceptable living conditions through overlooking, noise, vibrations, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light or a sense of enclosure.

Policy CC04 supports the use of renewable energy or micro-generation equipment where there are no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area such as noise and amenity, and there are no significant impacts on the residential amenity of local residents.

The increase in ridge height would see development at around 0.3m taller. This is considered to be a marginal difference, and the overall roof profile and shape would remain. This increased height would not sit any closer to neighbouring property occupiers and is, therefore, not considered likely to result in any new harm.

To the rear a balcony is proposed to be inset in the rear roof slope, with rooflights either side. Number 3 Park Road bounds the site to the east and is a large building with an attached annexe which appears to be currently used by the occupiers of no. 3 as their main day to day living space rather than the main dwelling. There are no windows or roof lights in the annexe roof space that face the site, however there are a row of rooflights facing east in the rear roofslope of part of the annexe building. These rooflights are not likely to be impacted in any harmful way given their location, orientation, and the distance from the proposed works.

No. 3 has two garden areas, a large area of garden for the main dwelling as would be expected and a smaller garden area which serves the annexe. It is this smaller area serving the annexe which is closest to no. 74 adjoining the shed boundary. Whilst none of these appear immediately visible from the first floor, a terrace or balcony in the roof could provide some views into the neighbouring garden and patio. The change in land levels in this location means that No. 3 to the rear is set down lower and development at the site could be experienced in a more prominent way. The existing terrace in the northeast corner is set down with some natural screening, and a pergola exists here. On balance, it is considered that the views from the balcony would be out and angled, and are unlikely to be directed to the neighbouring patio area. Some views of the balcony may be possible from No. 3, but it is not uncommon to have views of balconies and other features of such development in a residential development such as this.

The main garden associated with No. 3 is set behind the annexe building. Views over the existing rear roofslope of the application property are possible from here however the dwelling is angled. Some views might be possible long distance over the roof line of the annexe and towards the far eastern parts of the neighbouring garden, however on balance it is considered that any views would be angled and long distance and that most of the main garden space could be retained as private garden space without being overlooked.

The main building itself is set around 29.5m from the rear of the application dwelling. There appears to be a certain amount of mutual overlooking between sites from upper floor windows. On balance, it is not expected that a balcony in the roof at the application site would harmfully alter this relationship given the existing arrangement.

In terms of the impact of the balcony and rooflights on neighbours occupiers to the south, Number 72 Stone Road sits roughly in line with the rear of the application property. The balcony and rooflights would face out and not be likely to lead to any direct overlooking of habitable spaces. There is a small garden associated with the site and the roof additions may cause some sense of overlooking or surveillance. At present there is established high hedging on the boundary between sites which limits views between the two, however it is recognised that this could be removed or become damaged and it not necessarily a permanent feature.

The two storey side extension, or first floor addition above the existing ground floor bedroom on the southern side elevation would not increase the forward projection of built form or move any closer to the neighbouring boundary. It would however add new bulk and mass within 0.6m of the border with No. 72 Stone Road. There is a narrow gap between dwellings here and the works would protrude around 2.4m forward of the neighbouring front building line. Whilst the site is west facing and development is unlikely to have any unacceptable light impacts, it could result in a sense of overbearing so close to neighbouring habitable spaces. At ground floor a lounge/diner runs the length of the side and is served by two high level side windows, a front bay window and rear double doors. Outlook and light would be retained here. At first floor a bedroom sits to the front and to the back. There are no flank windows here. The rear bedroom is not likely to be negatively impacted given the rear building line proposed. The front bedroom only has one opening. Given this and the distance between the properties it is not considered that there would be the impact on the occupiers of no. 72 Stone Road would be significant enough to warrant a recommendation of refusal.

To the rear with No. 3 Park Road development would be set back but floor length windows are proposed in the rear elevation. Given the first floor height these are not likely to result in any significant change to the current arrangement and would not be likely to cause harm in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy. There would be more than 21m from the extension to the windows on the host building at No.3 and, therefore, the works are considered to be acceptable here.

To the rear, a single storey side extension with terrace is proposed. This would be an irregularly shaped extension with rooflights, sitting at ground level with a terrace over the lower land levels of the garden beyond. The extension would sit across a large part of the rear, but mainly towards the southern boundary. It would be around 2.8m in height, with a flat roof finish, and extend up to 3m from the original rear wall of the host building, but built

onto a higher land level, with an overall increase of around 0.7m in ground level changes. This would allow a matching finished floor level with the current interior of the host building. Given the current boundary arrangement, along with the set-in, and orientation of sunlight in this location, the works are not likely to result in any significant harm to neighbouring amenity.

To the east with No. 3 Park Road development would be set around 9.5m from the boundary and is not likely to result in any harm in this location. The set down and wall between sites means that views from the annexe and patio area here across the ground floor area of the application site are limited and unlikely, and therefore the works are considered to be acceptable.

To the north the single storey side extension would be located away from any neighbouring habitable spaces, and sit adjacent to Stone Gap, a public path used to access the beach.

The alterations to fenestration would largely see replacement window materials and size of openings, keeping most windows in the current or similar location as the existing arrangement. To the front all windows would appear in a similar location and be set back into the site and across a highway, including the proposed first floor extension window, and would therefore not be likely to cause any harm to the west. They would sit forward of the property to the south and avoid any impact here. A new door in the side extension to the north would open away from neighbouring habitable spaces.

Across the rear the arrangement would be similar, except where highlighted and discussed above, and unlikely to result in any new harm. No windows are proposed in the side elevations.

The proposed alterations to materials, given the type of change sought, is not considered likely to result in harm to neighbouring amenity.

The proposed pergola would be around 2.1m in height and sit in the southeastern corner of the site, on the boundary with No. 72 Stone Road and No. 3 Park Road. Given the limited height of the proposed pergola, when considered against the height of garden boundary treatments, it is not considered that it would have any noticeable impact. It is further recognised that pergolas are usually open structures that allow light to pass through, generally preventing a sense of bulk mass, loss of outlook or enclosure.

The proposed swimming pool would be set into the ground. Although there is the possibility of a more active use creating noise, given its domestic scale and form this is not automatically presumed and therefore the provision of such is not considered likely to result in any unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

The proposed landscaping changes are not likely to result in harm to neighbouring amenity. Whilst land level changes to the rear would result in the formation of three "terraces", and some increase in height of the gradient, this would be for a short length. The increase would amount to around 0.7m for 4.5m from the original rear wall of the host building. A terrace or balcony would be erected on this higher land level beyond the proposed rear extension. Given the changes in level, it is not considered that there would be any adverse impact to

no. 3 Park Road to the rear with views from the terraces being out to the rear and over the garden of no. 3 towards the sea. Concerns were raised about possible overlooking to the rear garden of no. 72 Stone Road from the upper terrace and 1.7m privacy screen is now proposed to avoid this issue.

The proposed access gate along the northern perimeter would be set away from neighbouring occupiers and therefore any comings and goings associated with this would not be likely to be sensed by neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed air source heat pump is located away from the boundary and the council's Environmental Health Team confirm that the distance to any nearby window is such that noise is unlikely to be audible and therefore do not object. They do, however, request a condition limiting the noise of the air source heat pump. This condition is considered reasonable.

In terms of the living conditions of future occupiers, all habitable spaces would benefit from light, outlook and ventilation.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers and would provide a good standard of accommodation for occupiers. It is therefore considered to comply with the aims of policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and the guidance of the NPPF.

Archaeology

Thanet is an area rich in archeology, with a long history of trade, settlers and invasion and defence given its former island status and proximity to Europe.

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF sets out that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. Paragraph 205 goes on to state "when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)." Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (paragraph 208).

Policy SP36 of the Thanet Local Plan sets out that the Council will support, value and have regard to the archaeological significance of heritage assets by protecting the historic environment from inappropriate development. Policy HE01 sets out that the Council will promote the identification, recording, protection and enhancement of archaeological sites, monuments and historic landscape features and that development proposals adversely affecting the integrity or setting of Scheduled Monuments or other heritage assets will normally be refused. Where development would be likely to affect a site of archaeological importance, preservation in situ will be sought. If this is not possible or justified appropriate investigation and recording will be required.

There are land level changes throughout the application site and it is proposed to add structured tiers to the garden to make it more usable as well as install a swimming pool, outside bar and pergola.

KCC Archaeology Team have reviewed the application and advise that “the application site lies in an area with considerable archaeological potential relating to a focus of Iron Age and Roman settlements and other activities. A number of discoveries have been made on nearby properties including the finding of roman buildings and infant burials at 103 Stone Road, Iron Age ditches and granary structures at Hamilton Close and a Roman-British burial ground in Castle Avenue. Roman remains were also found in 1891 on land to the east of the site. The development proposals include substantial ground works for the excavation of a swimming pool as well as recontouring the site. Although there may be some previous impact from the current profiling of the site there is potential for significant archaeological remains to be countered during development works.” They advise that a provision is made for archaeological evaluation and mitigation through a condition.

It is noted that the works to add tiers to the garden and install the swimming pool would involve some excavation and levelling of the garden, but this is considered to be relatively minor given the contouring works that have already been carried out in the garden.

Given the above, it is considered that with the safeguarding condition proposed that there would be no adverse impact on the archaeology from the proposed development.

Highways

Paragraph 108 of the NPPF requires that transport issues be considered at the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Policy QD02 outlines that new development proposals should incorporate a high degree of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists and provide safe and satisfactory access for pedestrians, public transport and other vehicles. Policy TP06 outlines that proposals for development will be expected to make satisfactory provision for the parking of vehicles. Suitable levels of provision are considered in relation to individual proposals, taking into account the type of development proposed, the location, accessibility, availability of opportunities for public transport, likely accumulation of parking and design considerations.

The application as originally submitted included the provision of 2m high gates to the front of the site and sought to utilise the two existing dropped kerbs to create an in and out parking arrangement.

Concerns were raised by highways regarding the two accesses to the site and the gates impacting visibility and causing vehicles to have to wait on the highway for them to open as they would not be set back into the site to allow a vehicle to wait off the highway. Therefore, the gates have been removed from the scheme and a central area of landscaping created to

the front of the application site. This allows each of the dropped kerbs to serve a single parking space.

This arrangement is considered acceptable and on the basis that the proposed development would not increase the number of bedrooms within the property, it is not considered that there would be any adverse impact on highway safety or parking from it.

Other Matters

Broadstairs Town Council have raised concerns about potential damage to surrounding properties given the change in levels between no. 74 and some neighbouring properties should the proposed swimming pool leak.

The acceptability of a swimming pool can only be assessed through the planning system, not the technicalities of its construction, in the same way that planning does not normally consider how an extension would be constructed. It would, however, be expected that a suitably qualified professional would design and install the swimming pool and any leaks/faults with the swimming pool would be a private matter between the applicants and any neighbours and not for consideration as part of this planning application.

Conclusion

This application seeks consent for the erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension with balcony, following demolition of existing conservatory, a side extension replacing existing garage, alterations to roof to include increase in ridge height, insertion of roof lights and formation of roof terrace, alterations to fenestration and materials, together with erection of pergola to rear garden, formation of swimming pool, alterations to landscaping and erection of 2m high boundary treatments.

It is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable appearance in relation to the host property and the visual amenity of the street scene. It would be unlikely to result in any significant harm to existing residential amenities. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of parking provision. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal would comply with the guidance of the NPPF and policies SP35, QD02, QD03 and CC04 of the Thanet Local and is recommended for approval.

Case Officer

Vicky Kendell-Bryant

TITLE:

FH/TH/23/1534

Project

74 Stone Road BROADSTAIRS Kent CT10 1EB

