

a) **DOV/16/00915 – Erection of a front dormer roof extension and insertion of first floor side window at Foreland, Queensdown Road, Kingsdown**

Reason for Committee: Number of views contrary to officer's recommendation.

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be refused.

c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Core Strategy (CS) Policies

- Policy DM1 states that development will not be permitted outside the settlement boundaries unless it is ancillary to existing development
- Policy DM16 restricts development which would harm the character of the landscape

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- The NPPF has 12 core principles set out in paragraph 17 which amongst other things seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future residents.
- NPPF – is relevant as the proposal should seek to be of a high design quality and take the opportunity to improve the visual quality and character of the area. Paragraphs 56-58, 61 and 64 seek to promote good design and resist poor design.
- NPPF – Chapter 11 seeks the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes, and that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Paragraph 115 places great weight on conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

The Kent Design Guide (KDG)

- The Guide provides criteria and advice on providing well designed development and advises that context should form part of the decision making around design.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

None.

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

There have been two public consultations, as the drawings have been amended.

Parish Council: The Parish Council has no objection in principle but has concern over light loss to the adjoining property. With regard to the amended consultation the Parish Council expressed concern over loss of privacy.

Public Representations:

There have been 13 letters received in support of the proposal, indicating that the proposal would not affect the character of the building or area, it would enhance the area and it would create more light and more usable space,

Twenty five letters of objection have been received. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of privacy and loss of views
- Harm to residential amenity
- The extension is over scale, out of proportion and poorly sited
- The extension is not in keeping with the area
- The extension would overshadow, be over-bearing and result in loss light.

f) 1. **The Site and the Proposal**

Site Description

1.1 The application property is a semi-detached bungalow that forms part of a group of similar designed and scaled properties on this part of Queensdown Road. Queensdown Road forms part of a private residential estate with narrow roads, no dedicated footways, soft landscaped verges and a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. These properties are a mix of single storey bungalows, chalet bungalows and some two storey properties built at separate times. Along this road the buildings are set back to a similar building line, with front garden parking.

1.2 The overall character of the area comprises mostly buildings that are not overly intrusive or prominent in the street scene, which are set back from the road within a landscaped and open setting. The buildings are not over scaled and the street scene has a degree of informality in appearance due partly to the lack of footways and presence of mostly soft verges and front gardens against the road. Some areas are hard surfaced to accommodate front garden parking and access

- 1.3 The application building is one of a pair and one of a few similarly designed and scaled buildings in this section of the road. The building has a pitched roof, gabled ends and with a relatively low eaves height. There is a rear roof dormer extension to the property. The adjoining semi-detached property has roof lights to the front serving a bedroom.
- 1.4 The application property, like other similar properties nearby, has an under-stated impact on the street scene – it is not imposing or intrusive and settles into its wider built and landscaped context.
- 1.5 The AONB is located to the west of the properties beyond the rear garden boundaries. The open setting and landscape is glimpsed through the gaps between buildings along Queensdown Road. The buildings sit appropriately within this wider open setting and landscape.
- 1.6 The proposal has been amended from its original submission. It comprises a front roof dormer extension that is rectangular and extends most of the width of the property. It has a flat roof with a ridgeline that almost matches the existing ridge line of the roof. The depth of the proposed extension allows a section of the lower slope of the roof area (2.6m depth) to be retained. The front dormer extension has two windows at either end and an additional window is proposed in the existing gable end of the roof – to serve existing accommodation. The proposal would accommodate an additional bedroom and the additional window would serve a walk-in wardrobe. The proposed materials would be timber cladding that would be allowed to age/silver.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The main issues are:
 - the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area, including whether the use conserves or enhances the AONB
 - the impact upon residential amenity

3. Assessment

- 3.1 The existing building is a modest sized dwelling. It has a simple rectangular form, with a pitched roof. It has an understated impact upon the street by reason of its modest scale and simple design features and appearance. The pair of semis also provide a symmetry and uniformity to the street scene, and remain largely unaltered from the front from their original construction in the 1950s.
- 3.2 There are other single storey buildings along this stretch of the road, which are also modest in scale and not prominent in the street scene. As such, the application building and the buildings along this stretch of the road make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene.

- 3.3 The proposal seeks to provide a roof dormer that would dominate the roofline through its scale and design. Most of the existing roof slope would be replaced by the dormer extension and it would have a prominence on the building that would appear obtrusive and poorly related to the simple built form of the application building and those adjoining.
- 3.4 The building would appear 'top heavy', through the extension and the roof bulky. The fenestration would fail to align and would be disproportionate - this exacerbates the incongruity of the proposal.
- 3.5 As the proposed roof dormer extension, as amended, is contained within the existing roof slope and set back from the front elevation of the host building, I do not consider that the open views to the AONB would be unduly affected and neither will there be a wider impact upon the landscape beauty of the AONB which lies beyond the rear roof slope and garden of the application property.
- 3.6 With regard to the impact upon residential amenity, I do not consider that the proposed windows in the extension would give rise to undue loss of privacy as the windows are no closer than existing windows in the ground floor of the property and the elevated height of these windows would not allow views into the private garden areas of the rear of the properties opposite.
- 3.7 There is sufficient distance between the extension and those roof lights on the adjoining property not to give rise to undue harm. The reduction in the depth of the extension (through the amended drawings) and the orientation of the extension (to the east of the neighbouring property) would mean some loss of morning sunlight towards these roof lights but this would not be substantial. The reduction in the depth of the extension also retains a reasonable degree of outlook from those windows.
- 3.8 The new window proposed into the gable end would serve a wardrobe and not a habitable room. As such, its location would not give rise to undue overlooking or loss of privacy. In any event, it could be obscure glazed by condition, should the proposal otherwise be acceptable.

Conclusion

- 3.9 Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making better places for people. It is considered that the design and appearance of the extension proposal poorly relates to the host property and fails to integrate with the existing context and harms the character and appearance of the area.

It is not considered that the proposal would give rise to undue harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties.

g)

Recommendation

- I PERMISSION BE REFUSED, for the following reason: (i) The proposed extension by reason of its design and appearance would be poorly related to the existing building and would harm the character and appearance of the street scene contrary to Paragraphs 17, 56-59, 61 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework

- II Powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary wording or additional reasons for refusal in line with the recommendations and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

Case Officer:

Vic Hester