

Officer Report

Application No.	24/0144/FH
Site Address	33 Castle Avenue, Hythe, CT21 5HD
Officer Name	Danielle Wilkins
Proposal	Render to some elevations, enlargement to flat roof dormer & two storey extension to rear

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-434117
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Refused
Recommendation Date	25 March 2024

Report

SITE

The application building is a single storey detached dwelling with the first floor in the roof space. It is finished in facing brick and hanging tile with a plain tiled roof. There is an original side dormer window within the north facing roof slope and front gable, the dwelling has an L-shaped planform with attached garage to the northern elevation. The street scene has a uniform appearance, particularly this side of Castle Avenue. The dwelling appears to have been extended to the rear in the past with the addition of a flat roofed single storey extension.

RELEVANT HISTORY

There is no recent or relevant planning history for the site

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey rear extension, dormer extension and the addition of render to the front gable, side dormer and the first floor element of the two storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey rear extension would be largely flat roofed and measure approximately 5.3m in height, 10.3m in width and 2.9m in depth, it would replace the existing single storey rear extension and extend the existing two storey gable with the flat roof adjoining the gable to the south.

The existing dormer window measures approximately 2.5m in length, 1.9m in depth and 2m in height this would be increased in size to measure approximately 8.9m in length, 1.9m in depth and 9m in height.

Internally it would provide for an increase in living space on the ground floor and the addition of 2 no. bedrooms first floor.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file. The main points raised are summarised below.

Hythe Town Council – no objections

REPRESENTATIONS

0 representations received

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 05/03/2024

RELEVANT POLICIES

Core Strategy Local Plan:

Places and Policies Local Plan: HB1 HB8 T2

NPPF & NPPG

APPRAISAL

Design and visual impact

Policy HB8 of the PPLP says that extensions should seek to reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building and not have a detrimental impact on the street scene, it adds that two-storey flat-roofed extensions will not be considered acceptable, unless the building itself is of a flat roof design and that loft conversions requiring dormer extensions will be in proportion to the existing roof, thus maintaining overall building proportions.

This side of Castle Avenue has a very uniform appearance, the dwellings are very similar in appearance with small box dormers on the north facing roof slope, these appear identical in size and occupy a very small area of the roof. While the depth and height of the proposed enlarged dormer has remained as existing it would be considerably extended in length and occupy the majority of the side roof slope. This would not be in keeping with the street scene which as described above, consists of almost identical small box dormers on the north side roof slopes.

In regard to the two-storey rear extension, the extension to the gable is considered to be of good design, however the two-storey flat roof that would adjoin this would be at odds with the form of the existing dwelling and appear jarring in the wider context of the site. While it is noted that the two-storey extension is to the rear, owing to the layout of dwellings on this side of Castle Avenue the side elevation is readily visible from the public realm, and the two-storey flat roof would be an uncohesive addition which would sit uncomfortably on the relatively modest single storey pitched roof dwelling.

It is therefore considered that, by virtue of the two-storey flat roof, the proposed extension and the overly large flat roofed dormer would be contrary to policies HB1 and HB8 of the Places and Policies Local Plan and result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Residential Amenity

The enlargement of the existing side dormer would result in the addition of one no. side facing window, however these would overlook the existing roof slope of no. 35 Castle Avenue and offer no views into the private amenity space or into the dwelling itself.

Turning to the two-storey rear extension this would introduce one no. window within the first-floor rear elevation, however owing to the existing single storey garage at no. 31 Castle Avenue, any views afforded into the rear garden of this neighbour would be obscured by the garage, additionally, there is an existing first floor window in this elevation and the potential overlooking is not considered to worsen the existing situation.

The dwellings to the rear (36 & 38 Seaton Avenue) are located approximately 45m from the rear wall of the host dwelling (as proposed) and therefore it is unlikely that the proposal would have any significant impact on this resident.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would not result in any significant harm to the amenities of adjoining residents.

Parking and Highway Safety

The proposal would result in the creation of one no. bedroom, increasing the number of bedrooms from three to four, the number of off-street car parking spaces required by policy T2 of the PPLP for a three or four bedroom dwelling in this location is the same, additionally the dwelling benefits from a long driveway affording off-street parking for between four and five cars, in excess of what is required by policy T2.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable with regard to parking and highway safety.

Environmental Impact Assessment

In accordance with the EIA Regulations 2017, this development has been considered in light of Schedules 1& 2 of the Regulations and it is not considered to fall within either category and as such does not require screening for likely significant environmental effects.

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.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the above, it is considered that planning permission should be refused for the reason outline above.

Recommended Refusal Reasons (2)

1

The proposed dormer window, by virtue of its size and design, would be a detrimental feature of development that would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. The development would therefore be contrary to policies HB1 and HB8 of the Places and Policies Local Plan (2020).

2

The proposed two storey rear extension, by virtue of its size, width, depth, design and flat roofed form would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the visual amenity of the wider street scene. The application would therefore be contrary to HB1 and HB8 of the adopted Places and Policies Local Plan (2020).

Suggested Informatives (1)

1

This decision is based on drawing nos. 22.47.03 Rev P1, 23.47.10 Rev P1 and 23.47.11 Rev P1