

This plan has been produced for Planning Committee purposes only. No further copies may be made.



**Not to scale**

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Dover District Council Licence Number 100019780  
published 2015

**Note:** This plan is provided for purposes of site identification only.

**Application: DOV/15/00590**

**118 Wellington Parade**

**Kingsdown**

**CT14 8AF**

**TR 37944873**



- a) **DOV/15/00590 – Erection of a two-storey side extension incorporating a garage and dormer Juliet balcony - 118 Wellington Parade, Kingsdown**

**Reason for report:** Number of contrary views.

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted.

- c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Core Strategy Policies

- DM1 - Development will not be permitted outside of the settlement confines, unless it is specifically justified by other development plan policies, or it functionally requires such a location, or it is ancillary to existing development or uses.
- DM12 – The access arrangements of development proposals will be assessed with regard to the Highway Network set out in the Local Transport Plan for Kent. Planning applications that would involve the construction of a new access or the increased use of an existing access onto a trunk or primary road will not be permitted if there would be a significant increase in the risk of crashes or traffic delays unless the proposals can incorporate measures that provide sufficient mitigation.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- p.17 “Securing high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings” is one of the 12 core planning principles set out in the NPPF.
- p.56 “The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- p.64 “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions”.

The Kent Design Guide (KDG)

- The Guide provides criteria and advice on providing well designed development.

- d) **Relevant Planning History**

DOV/92/0486 – Erection of one 2-bedroomed detached chalet style house.

- e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

Ringwould with Kingsdown Parish Council

No objection in principle to this application. However request Dover District Council look at a possible privacy issue with adjoining properties, due to the first floor window shown on the Proposed East Elevation and the new balcony shown on the Proposed South Elevation. Also request that a stipulation is made that the existing Scots Pine tree remains intact.

### Tree Officer

DDC's tree officer is satisfied with the findings of the arboricultural survey submitted by the applicant and has recommended the following conditions:

Hand dug excavation around the roots of the tree; and details to be submitted and agreed showing extent of the reduction of the canopy.

Public Representations: Twenty six letters of objection have been received, raising the following matters:

- The proposed extension is huge and would be out of proportion to the existing host property and its garden.
- The proposed extension would be only one and half metres away from the dividing boundary with no.116 and would overlook its garden.
- High roof causing loss of light
- The mature scotts pine tree would need to have its branches cut as the extension would be very close to the tree and the roots will be destroyed during building works.
- The proposed first floor balcony would overlook the back windows, including bedrooms of the next door house at no. 120 and intrude into the amenity of all those nearby with the potential for exuberant socialising. It would also overlook the adjacent properties nos 114 and 116 and would affect their privacy and outlook.
- The proposal would create a precedent which would change the character of the neighbourhood.
- Overpowering impact
- Unsuitable and unsympathetic development

f)

#### 1. **The Site and the Proposal**

- 1.1 The application relates to a chalet bungalow which lies within the village confines of Kingsdown. The site lies within a predominantly residential area located between Wellington Parade (fronting the seafront) and Cliffe Road which meets Kingsdown Road leading to Deal. The property was approved under planning permission DOV/92/00486 and was formally part of the garden of no.116 Wellington Parade. The site is accessed from an unadopted road which connects Cliffe Road and Wellington Parade.
- 1.2 The exterior façade of the property is partly painted render and partly painted feather-edge weatherboarding. It has a plain clay tiled roof and timber framed doors and windows. It has car parking space to the east side of the property with the majority of the garden area to the west. A mature Cedar tree lies within the southeast corner of the application site which is subject to a provisional Tree Preservation Order dated August 2015.
- 1.3 The character of this area in terms of the design, size and age of properties varies widely, from smaller terraced properties on South Road and North Road to more substantial detached houses sited within elongated plots fronting onto Wellington Parade. In recent years, there has been more modern development and infilling within the area.
- 1.4 The application dwelling is sited over 25m from the rear elevation of no.116 Wellington Parade to the east and about 7m from the common boundary with the same, formed by a 1.8m high close boarded wooden fence. The northern dividing boundary between nos.116 and 114 comprises a well established hedgerow and high fence which maintains privacy between each property.

There is dense mature tree planting within the private garden of no.116 along the west boundary and across its garden.

- 1.5 No.120 Wellington Parade lies to the south of the application property across the unadopted road leading to the seafront. It comprises a rectangular plot occupying a corner position at the junction of Wellington Parade with the unadopted access road. A boundary wall some 1.8m high forms the northern boundary of the property along the back edge of the access road.
- 1.6 This application seeks permission to erect a two storey side extension incorporating a garage on the ground floor and a new bedroom with a Juliet balcony within a dormer on the first floor. Originally, the application sought consent for a two storey extension with a south facing dormer balcony to the first floor which was later amended to a Juliet balcony to overcome the issues relating to the loss of privacy to the occupiers of no.120 Wellington Parade.
- 1.7 The proposed two storey extension would be sited to the east and join the L-shaped eastern elevation of the host property. It would be narrow towards the south measuring 3.7m in width and would increase to 4.9m in width towards the north. The depth of the extension would measure 6.5m. It would have a barn hipped roof. The extension would measure 2.3m in height at eaves level to the south elevation and 3.1m in height at eaves level to the east elevation of the extension (barn-hipped). The total height of the extension would be 6.5m in line with the ridge height of the main roof of the host property.
- 1.8 A Juliet balcony has been proposed to the south side elevation of the proposed extension to the first floor level which would serve the proposed bedroom. A double casement timber framed window and a single door would be inserted in the north elevation to the ground floor level and two high level rooflights would be inserted within the northern roofslope of the proposed extension. An obscure glazed window to the first floor level would be inserted in the east elevation of the host property. No new openings have been proposed to the east elevation of the proposed extension.

## 2 **Main Issues**

2.1 The main issues are:

- The principle of the development
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on residential amenity
- The impact on the highway network
- The impact on mature (Cedar) tree

### **ASSESSMENT**

#### **Principle of the development**

2.2 The site lies within the village confines of Kingsdown. It is considered that principle of the development is acceptable, subject to site-specific considerations.

#### **Impact on the Character and Appearance of the area**

- 2.3 In terms of design, the extension would be setback from the front elevation facing the unadopted road and would be in line with the existing ridge height. The proposed roof form and fenestration would be in keeping. The materials used for exterior finish would also match existing. Overall, the extension would be in keeping with the design of the property and would appear as a sympathetic addition.
- 2.4 For the foregoing reasons, it is considered that the extension would be sympathetically designed and would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the street scene.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

- 2.5 No.116 Wellington Parade to the east is sited 20m away from the dividing boundary with no. 118 (application site) and finished extension would be sited approximately 1.9m from the same boundary. The separation distance between the two properties and the proximity of the extension to the dividing boundary is considered to be sufficient to avoid any unacceptable overbearing and/or loss of light impacts to the living areas within no.116. Furthermore, on visiting the property at no.116, it was noted that apart from the existing 1.8m high solid close boarded wooden fence along the dividing boundary, there was mature tree planting at this point and across the garden which would screen any views from no.118. In addition, no windows have been proposed to the east elevation of the extension, thereby eliminating concerns about potential any overlooking into no.116. However, a window to serve the existing bathroom is proposed facing east, it can be conditioned to be obscure glazed. Even without the prevailing tree screening in place, your officers are satisfied that the living conditions at no.116 would not be unduly affected.
- 2.6 No.114 Wellington Parade to the north of no.116 is sited 20m away from the boundary to the east and would be 25m away from the proposed extension. The existing 1.8m high close boarded wooden fence and mature tree planting over 4m in height within the private garden of no.114 would screen any views from no.118. Two rooflights are proposed within the northern roofslope of the extension however these would be high level openings with no potential for harmful downward overlooking. Therefore, no harm from overlooking to the private garden at no.114 would result.
- 2.7 The separation distance between the front elevation of the extension and the north boundary of no.120 would be approximately 12m. No.118 benefits from an existing balcony to the first floor level of the north elevation and already overlooks the private garden at no.120 to some degree. The proposed extension would have a Juliet dormer balcony with doors opening inwards. Although it is recognised that the full height glazed doors of the proposed Juliet balcony might allow some views into the private garden of no.120, considering the degree of outlook that persists due to the existing first floor balcony to the application property and the distance of this area of garden from the private amenity area immediately to the rear of no.120, it is not considered that the addition of a new Juliet balcony with limited views into the private garden of no.120 would cause such an unacceptable loss of privacy to justify the refusal of the application. It is also important to note that the existing Cedar Tree would substantially limit views towards no.120 from the dormer. The importance of retaining this Cedar Tree for amenity reasons are considered further below.

- 2.8 Given the siting of the extension, substantial separation distances and its design approach, the proposal is not considered to cause loss of light, outlook, privacy or overshadowing and would not have an overbearing impact on the occupants of the neighbouring properties nos 114, 116 and 120.

**Impact on mature (Cedar) tree**

- 2.9 The existing Cedar Tree within the southeast corner of the site is considered to be an attractive feature within the street scene and should be retained. Concerns were raised regarding the possible loss of the Cedar tree due to the siting of the proposed extension. The applicant was requested to carry out a tree survey to assess the potential for damage to the Cedar tree. As a precautionary measure, the tree was made subject of a provisional preservation order on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2015. In response to the recommendation for a tree survey, a report containing an arboricultural survey and an initial impact assessment to demonstrate the feasibility of building the extension without harm to the tree was submitted by the agent to the Council.

- 2.10 The Council's Tree Officer is satisfied with the findings of the Arboricultural survey and have made the following comments:

*"The impact of the footprint of the extension will indeed only affect a small portion of the RPA (Root Protection Area) of the tree, this coupled with the soil type and compaction of the driveway and the likely depth of the rootstock, it is unlikely that the substantial root stock of the tree will be compromised. However, if during the excavation, substantial roots are uncovered, a hand dug excavation is recommended around these roots to minimise the damage incurred.*

*With regards to the reduction of the canopy, no more than 15-20% reduction of the affecting limbs should be permitted to address the issues arising from branch tips interfering with extension".*

- 2.11 Some cutting back of branches will be required to accommodate the extension, although the applicant's agent has stated that the extent of such works should be minor and it is anticipated that it would be well within the limits specified by the tree officer.

- 2.12 In summary, the potential for harm to be caused incurred to the Cedar tree in question has been demonstrated to be minimal and could be further controlled by making any permission subject to suitably worded conditions requiring the following:

Hand dug excavation around the roots of the tree; and details to be submitted and agreed showing extent of the reduction of the canopy.

**Impact on the Local Highway Network**

- 2.13 In the event of planning permission being granted, the extended application property would have 2 bedrooms. According to the policy DM12 – Road Hierarchy and Development, a provision of 1.5 spaces per unit should be provided for 1&2 bed houses within village confines. The proposed garage would make provision for only one car. There is also limited land in front of the garage which could be used for parking in addition to on street parking in the vicinity.

g) **Recommendation**

- I PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions: i) Timescale of commencement of development, ii) A list of approved plans iii) The

proposed single casement window to the East Elevation of the host property to be obscure glazed and fixed shut, and iv) Hand dug excavation around the roots of the tree (v) Details to be submitted and agreed showing extent of the reduction of the canopy (vi) Materials to match existing (vii) No new openings to south, north and east elevations.

- II Powers to be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

Case Officer  
Benazir Kachchi