

a) **DOV/17/00226 – Erection of a single storey side extension (existing garage to be demolished) - 7 Chestnut Close, Whitfield**

Reason for Report:

Referred to Committee due to the number of contrary views

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted

c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Dover District Core Strategy 2010

- DM1 supports development within the built confines

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraph 7 – the three roles of sustainable development
- Paragraph 17 – securing a good level of amenity to existing and future occupants
- Paragraph 56 – good design as a key aspect of sustainable development

d) **Relevant Planning History**

No relevant planning applications since CH/6/66/0164 which was the final detailed application for the development of the entire close.

It should be noted that no conditions were imposed on the 1964 outline permission, the 1965 amended proposal nor on the 1966 detailed design application requiring the off-street parking and garages be retained for stationing of vehicles.

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

- Whitfield Parish Council

The Parish Council object to the proposal due to the reduction in off-street parking which would result from this proposal and the existing parking issues locally which would be exacerbated.

- Kent PROW

No comments were made regarding this application.

- Public Representations:

19 letters of objection have been received; the comments are summarized as follows:

- Proposal would lead to a loss of off-street parking
- Increase parking pressure in the Close and wider locality
- Inconsiderate parking of visitors to application site blocks driveways of other residents in the Close

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

- 1.1 The property is a detached bungalow located at the end of the cul-de-sac forming Chestnut Close in Whitfield. There is an existing garage and driveway and the house is set behind a front garden. Chestnut Close and the wider area are primarily residential.
- 1.2 The proposal is for a single-storey side extension to the property which would form a new living room. It would be located on the north-east face of the dwelling.
- 1.3 The extension would measure approximately 3.25 metres wide by 5.85 metres deep. The gabled roof would have a ridge height of approximately 4.5 metres. The eaves height would be 2.5m. The corner of the extension would be 0.5 metres from the boundary with 8 Chestnut Close.
- 1.4 The materials proposed for the exterior finishes are yellow brick, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows all to match the existing finishes of the host dwelling.
- 1.5 Windows have been proposed in the north-west (front) and south-east (rear) facing elevations of the extension and French doors would be inserted into the north-east (side) façade to give access to a patio area.
- 1.6 The existing garage would be demolished to allow for the extension and patio Area and the driveway would be shortened by one car length. A 1.8m high close-boarded fence would be installed along the boundary with 8 Chestnut Close; it would project 0.5m further forward (towards the road) than the existing fencing.
- 1.7 The applicant has written in support of the application saying:

“At present, the property is rented out to two people with mild disabilities, the extra rooms applied for would be used for the same - making a maximum of four people living at the address. The persons there are not noisy - in fact one of them is deaf and non-verbal, this person often enjoys walking and uses public transport - the other attends a work placement 5 days a week every week, so from Monday to Friday he is only ever picked up in the morning and dropped back in the evening. This does not create any such a parking problem. None of the people who will ever live at this property will drive cars. The driveway, which was at first very over grown from the previous owner has also since been cleared re-creating parking on the driveway. The extension applied for does not affect this. During the night time hours - there will only ever be 1 carer at the property to ensure their safety. At present one family member has a vehicle and may visit periodically - but this is not any different from any other household.” (Email, 19/04/2017)

**2. Main Issues**

- Principle of Development
- Impact on the visual amenity of the area
- Impact on the residential amenity of the area
- Impact on highways and parking

### **3. Assessment**

#### Principle of Development

- 3.1 7 Chestnut Close is located within the confines of Whitfield and is therefore DM1 compliant.

#### Impact on the Visual Amenity and Street Scene of the Area

- 3.2 The extension proposed reflects the character, materials and scale of the host property and would not be out of keeping in the area.
- 3.3 The application site is located in the north-east corner of the hammerhead turning at the top of the Close. Given the street layout and mature vegetation and land-level changes to the rear of the site, the extension would only be visible in very local views from within the upper half of the Close itself.
- 3.4 The existing gaps between the properties typify this street and play an important role in the street scene. Due to the siting of the extension in that it is predominately blocked from view by the host dwelling it is considered that the extension would not materially alter this situation and would not be harmful to this aspect of the street scene.
- 3.5 The proposal is of a relatively minor nature and given the location of the extension and the dwelling itself, the extension would not harm the visual amenity of the host dwelling or neighbouring properties nor would it impact the street scene to a degree which would result in harm.
- 3.6 It is considered that the design of the proposed extension would neither harm the visual amenity of the area nor the street scene and is considered acceptable.

#### Impact on the Residential Amenity of the Area

- 3.7 The application site, and the location of the extension within the site, are to the north and east of neighbouring dwellings and it is considered that the extension would not lead to a loss of light to these dwellings.
- 3.8 There is a window proposed in the front elevation of the extension. This faces the side elevation/front entrance to 8 Chestnut Close. There is a 1.8m high close-boarded fence existing and the fence would be extended towards the road as a result of this proposal. This would mitigate any overlooking or loss of privacy to what is the front of the neighbouring dwelling, and would largely safeguard against the opportunity for interlooking.
- 3.9 The patio area would be located adjacent to the remaining garage to 8 Chestnut Close. As it is not a raised platform, it would not require formal permission however, it is not considered that there would be any harm arising from this patio area, or from the access doors to this patio area from the extension, given that views would be largely blocked by the remaining garage and close-boarded fence.
- 3.10 The proposed extension would be located away from the boundary of 8 Chestnut Close by 0.5m. The roof of the extension would slope towards this boundary. Given the height of the eaves at this point, and the bulk of the

extension being away from the boundary, it is considered that the extension would not result in a sense of enclosure or have an overbearing impact on the neighbour.

- 3.11 It is considered that the proposed extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwellings.

#### Impact on Highways and Parking

- 3.12 There is unrestricted on road parking in the street. There was no condition imposed on the original planning permission to safeguard off-road parking.
- 3.13 It is acknowledged that there is local concern about the pressures on on-street parking in the local area. However, it is not considered that the proposed development, even with the loss of one car parking space, would materially worsen this situation. There is no evidence that the parking issues have led to highway safety concerns or increase in accidents in the area.
- 3.14 The driveway is divided by a double gate which means only one parking space is ever used. Whilst this proposal will remove the potential to make use of the second parking space (between the gates and the garage), it is not considered that this will have a significant impact on the parking issues raised by local residents. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not lead to undue highway safety concerns or materially impact on on-street parking pressure.

#### Other Matters

- 3.15 It has been suggested that this property is being used as a commercial residential home. At this point, there are two occupants with care needs living at the property with a single overnight carer staying on site. The extension will allow for the formation of two new bedrooms to accommodate two more residents who also have care needs. This will bring the total living at the property to four. Under planning legislation, up to six unrelated individuals can live in a dwelling before a change of use to institutional/HMO would occur. As such, there is no change of use at this property and it remains a dwelling with all permitted development rights of a single-family house.
- 3.16 Permitted development rights are important in considering this application. The extension only requires formal planning permission due to the ridge height of the extension being over 4.0m which is the maximum ridge height for a single storey extension allowable under permitted development legislation. If the ridge was lowered by 0.5 meters, this proposal could be carried out under permitted development rights in its entirety.
- 3.17 It is accepted that the proposal would enable an additional two occupants to live in the property and due to their circumstances, they may not be able to drive. This circumstance, of course, could change in the future if the property were sold and occupied by people who could drive. Parking pressures may become a little more difficult. However, due to the availability of on-street parking, it is not considered that this impact would unduly harm highway safety or amenity.

#### Conclusion

- 3.18 It is considered that the proposed extension is of an acceptable design and location and would not harm the visual amenity or street scene of the area.
- 3.19 It is considered that the proposed extension would not have a negative impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent dwellings.
- 3.20 It is considered that the proposal would not result in undue highway safety concerns or unduly increase pressure on on-street parking locally.
- 3.20 On balance, it is therefore concluded that planning permission should be granted.

**g) Recommendation**

- I Planning Permission BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions to include: 1) 3-year commencement; 2) Built in accordance with the approved drawings; 3) Finishes to match existing.
- II Powers 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

Andrew Wallace