

Officer Report

Application No.	21/0038/FH
Site Address	25 Seaton Avenue, Hythe, CT21 5HH
Officer Name	Natasha McCann
Proposal	Proposed single storey side and rear extension

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-424213
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Approve with Conditions
Recommendation Date	11 February 2021

Report

Site Visit

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic it was not possible to undertake a site visit in person. However, appropriate assessment was possible via aerial photographs and google street maps.

Site Description

The site is located within the residential area of Seaton Avenue on the periphery of Hythe Town and close to the village of Saltwood. The site is located inside of the settlement boundary and a predominant residential area. The area has a visually pleasing suburban rural character, with family size detached and semi-detached houses. The house itself is a detached two storey dwelling that addresses the street scene of Seaton Avenue. It has a small front garden and parking area and spacious rear garden.

Relevant site history

No relevant site history.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side/rear wraparound extension to accommodate a dining room and utility room. The proposed rear element of the extension would measure 6.5m wide x 3.9m deep with the side element extending 2.8m wide beyond the side elevation and measuring 5.2m deep set back 2.5m from the principle elevation. The proposed extension would feature a mono-pitched roof to the side extending to form a pitched roof to the rear. The extension would include 1no rear elevation door, 1no southern elevation door, 1no front elevation door and window and 3no rooflights.

Consultation responses

Parish Council: No objection.

Representations

3no comments have been received during the public consultation period comprising of 1no objection letter and 2no letters of support. The objection letter raised concerns regarding potential overshadowing and loss of sunlight. The support letters comment that the proposed design of the extension is in keeping with the appearance of the dwelling. The comments received will be taken in to consideration during the assessment of the application and discussed further below.

Publicity

The application was publicised in accordance with the regulations.

Relevant policies

Core Strategy Local Plan:

DSD (Delivering Sustainable Development).

Places and Policies Local Plan:

HB1 (Quality Places Through Design), HB8 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Buildings) and T2 (Parking Standards).

Core Strategy Review Submission Draft 2019:

The Submission draft of the Core Strategy Review was published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) for public consultation between January and March 2019. Following changes to national policy, a further consultation was undertaken from 20 December 2019 to 20 January 2020 on proposed changes to policies and text related to housing supply. The Core Strategy Review was then submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 10 March 2020.

Accordingly, it is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications in accordance with the NPPF, which states that the more advanced the stage that an emerging plan has reached, the greater the weight that may be given to it (paragraph 48). Based on the current stage of preparation, the policies within the Core Strategy Review Submission Draft may be afforded weight where there has not been significant objection.

NPPF and NPPG:

The NPPF and NPPG broadly support minor householder development subject to general amenity considerations - Paragraphs 12, 124, 127.

Appraisal

Design and visual appearance

Policy HB1 says, amongst other things, that planning permission will be granted where the proposal makes a positive contribution to its location and surroundings, enhancing integration while also respecting existing buildings and land uses, particularly with regard to layout, scale, proportions, massing, form, density, materiality and mix of uses so as to ensure all proposals create places of character.

Policy HB8 says that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building and not have a detrimental impact on the street scene, either by themselves or cumulatively.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just in the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history;
- d) establish and maintain a strong sense of place;
- e) optimise site potential; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

The host dwelling is set within a mixed area in terms of scale, design and materials with several of the surrounding properties having been extended beyond that of their original built form including the adjacent neighbour to the north. As such, an extension to the side/rear of the dwelling would not be out of character and considered to be an acceptable addition to the prevailing pattern of development. The proposed side element of the extension would be set back 2.5m from the principle elevation located behind of the existing 1.8m high gate and as such whilst the extension would be visible from the public realm, the proposed position is considered to reduce the visual impact on the existing street scene. The side element of the extension is also noted to be set in 0.9m from the north boundary which would retain a scene of openness between the host dwelling and adjacent property which is noted to be an important characteristic of the residential area. The proposed roof height and contrast of materials to the front façade of the mono-pitched roof would align with colour contrast of the principle elevation result in the extension appearing as an integral part of the original dwelling.

The depth of the proposed rear element of the extension would measure less than half the depth of the original dwelling and rear garden and therefore is not considered to overwhelm the footprint of the dwelling and retain sufficient amenity space to the rear. The proposed pitched roof is considered to create a smooth transition between the side and rear elements of the extension and would appear sympathetic against the original roof form. The height of the eaves would align with the original dwelling which is considered to create conformity within the plot. The proposed doors to the south elevation and rear elevation are noted to be larger than the fenestration proportions of the

main dwelling however given that the openings would be generally hidden from the public realm and would reflect common glazed or bi-folding doors in the area is not considered that the use of such doors would result in harm to the appearance of the dwelling or street scene. The proposed front elevation door and window would reflect the fenestration of the main dwelling and therefore acceptable. The use of matching materials would complement the host dwelling creating a subordinate addition to the property.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would appear in keeping with the overall form, detailing and proportions of the main house and would not cause harm to the existing street scene or character of the area.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

The proposed side/rear wraparound extension would be set closest to the north boundary adjacent the neighbouring property at No 27. The proposed extension would be set in 0.9m from the common boundary, extend approx. 2.4m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring extension and would measure a modest eaves height of 2.2m. As such, whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed ridge height may result in some increase of overshadowing at certain times of the day, the proposed level of overshadowing or loss of sunlight would not result in a level significantly above that existing given the position of the host flank wall and therefore whilst not ideal does not warrant refusal in this instance. The objection comments noted that the neighbouring dwelling benefits from two side windows located within the neighbouring extension approved under application 14/0423/SH. However, whilst some loss of light into these side windows may result, both windows are noted to serve rooms which benefit from other windows which offer direct sunlight and therefore the potential for loss of sunlight is not considered to result in detrimental harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupier. Attention is given to the modest eaves height and sloping roofline which would also reduce the potential for loss of sunlight. The objection comment also notes that the proposed extension would result in loss of outlook however given that the windows directly face the existing boundary treatment and would continue to obtain adequate visibility this is not considered to offer material planning merit in this instance.

The proposed side elevation rooflights would be set significant above eye level and therefore would not result in an increased opportunity for overlooking or loss of privacy. The proposed south facing side elevation window would be set in approx. 8m from the boundary of the adjacent property at No 23 and would be largely shielded by the existing boundary treatment measuring 1.8m in height therefore the side door is not considered to result in undue overlooking or loss of privacy. The extension is considered to be set in a sufficient distance from each boundary to mitigate against any overbearing impact.

On balance, the proposal is considered to safeguard neighbouring amenity and meets the aims of local planning policy in this regard.

Parking and highways

The proposed development would not result in any additional bedrooms within the property, nor would it alter the existing parking or access arrangements on site. As such, the proposal is considered to have no impact on parking or highways.

Human Rights

I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view, the Assessment section above and the Recommendation represents an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) [and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties)] and the wider public interest.

Public Sector Equality Duty

In determining this application, regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set down in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular with regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. It is considered that the application proposals would not undermine objectives of the Duty.

It is considered that the application proposals would not conflict with objectives of the Duty.

Duty to cooperate

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a pre-application advice service and, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application. In this instance the application was acceptable as submitted.

Recommendation

Taking the above into account, it is considered the proposal is a sustainable development that complies with development plan policy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Case Officer:

Report and draft decision notice completed and passed to senior officer.

Name: Natasha McCann Position: Planning Officer Date: 12.2.2021

Report and draft decision notice amended (if appropriate)

Name: Helena Payne Position: Strategic Sites Team Leader Date: 12.2.2021

Recommended Conditions (3)

1

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:

- Drawing 0944-PL-200 RevB: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-201 RevB: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-225 RevC: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-226 RevC: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-300 RevB: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-301 RevB: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-350 RevB: Received 8th January 2021
- Drawing 0944-PL-351 RevC: Received 8th January 2021

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in order to ensure the satisfactory implementation of the development in accordance with the aims of the Places and Policies Local Plan.

3

The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those proposed on the application form submitted 8th January 2021 in terms of type, colour, and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

