

a) **DOV/16/01229 – Erection of single storey rear extension - 117 London Road, Deal**

Reason for report: Number of contrary views (11).

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraph 17 states that 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.
- Paragraph 32 states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- Paragraph 56 states that 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.
- Paragraph 64 states that 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

The Kent Design Guide says that for extensions to buildings the main principle is that the character of the building and the surroundings must be maintained or improved by the work done.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

DOV/15/00614 - Erection of a two storey side extension with integral garage, a single storey rear extension, a single storey rear conservatory extension and a raised patio (existing garage to be demolished). Approved.

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

Deal Town Council – object to the planning application as the plans were found inaccurate.

Public Representations:

Eleven (11) representations received objecting to the planning application and raising the following relevant planning matters:

- side door would cause loss of privacy to no.117
- extension is of poor design

- height of the extension is oppressive
- has an overbearing and negative impact on outlook of the occupiers of no.117

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

1.1 The application relates to a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse which falls within the settlement confines of Deal. The exterior facade of the property is white textured finish. It has a tiled roof and UPVC doors and windows. It has front and rear gardens. The application site makes provision for two offstreet car parking spaces. The application property constitutes the south-western half of the pair whilst no.115 constitutes the other half. The rear gardens of nos 117 (application site) and 115 (to the southeast) are divided by a 1.8m high close boarded wooden fence. There is mature vegetation along the northeastern, southeastern and southwestern boundary of the application site. The application property also shares boundaries with no.119 London Road to the southwest. The street scene of London Road predominately comprises of detached and semi-detached dwellinghouses with varying architectural styles.

1.2 This is a retrospective application which seeks permission to retain the flat roofed single storey rear extension with a roof lantern over. The extension is L-shaped and is sited 150mm from the dividing boundary with the attached neighbour at no.115 to the northeast. The extension has an exposed brick plinth with walls proposed to be finished in plain render and has UPVC fenestration. Originally, the application had several drawing discrepancies. The applicant was provided the opportunity to submit accurate drawings to the scheme, they were forthcoming and the amended drawings were received on 07 July 2017.

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

Assessment

Principle of Development

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

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area and Design

2.3 By virtue of its siting, the proposed rear extension is not readily visible from the public viewpoints in London Road. Whilst some glimpse views of the extension are achievable from the west in the street, given the limited scale and design of the proposal, it is not considered that the extension causes harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The extension is simply designed with a flat roof and a roof lantern. It is sympathetic in terms of its appearance to the original dwellinghouse.

Impact on Residential Amenity

2.4 No.115 London Road (semi-detached partner) to the northeast

No.115 has an existing single storey rear conservatory extension measuring approximately 3m in depth. The proposed extension projects beyond the rear wall of the extension at no.115 by approximately 1m. Given the fact that it is a single storey extension reaching a maximum height of 3.5m above ground level and having regard for the existing adjoining development at no.115, it is not considered that the living conditions in respect of any overbearing effect or overshadowing of the neighbouring occupiers of no.115 are unduly harmed.

2.5 No.119 London Road to the southwest

The finished extension lies at a distance of approximately 6m from the northeast (side) elevation of no.119. Having regard for the separation distance and the limited scale of the extension, it is not considered that the proposal causes harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

2.6 Concerns were raised regarding the potential for direct overlooking through the side door to the extension facing no.119 which was shown on the original plans received with the application. The applicant confirmed that side door was shown in error and the application was later amended and the door was removed. The drawings now accurately represent what is on site.

2.7 There are no other properties in the vicinity that would be directly affected by the proposal.

Conclusion

2.8 The extension is considered acceptable in design terms and does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. It does not cause harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

g) **Recommendation**

- I PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject conditions which include: ii) A list of approved plans (iii) No openings to southwest (side) or northeast (side) elevations of the extension.
- 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