

a) **DOV/17/01451 – Erection of a first floor side extension - 1 Bulwark Road, Deal**

Reason for report - Number of contrary representations (12).

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be refused.

c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Development Plan

The development plan for the purposes of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) comprises the Dover District Council Core Strategy 2010, the saved policies from the Dover District Local Plan 2002, and the Land Allocations Local Plan (2015). Decisions on planning applications must be made in accordance with the policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In addition to the policies of the development plan there are a number of other policies and standards which are material to the determination of planning applications including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) together with other local guidance.

A summary of relevant planning policy is set out below:

Dover District Core Strategy (2010)

Policy DM1- Settlement boundaries  
Policy DM13 – Parking provision.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

- Paragraph 17 sets out 12 core principles. Amongst other things, it states that planning should ‘enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives’ and should also always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- Paragraph 56 attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. It states that good design as a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- Paragraph 61 states that although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. It states that decisions should integrate new development into the natural, built and historic environment.
- Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

The Kent Design Guide

The guide provides criteria and advice on providing well designed development, emphasising that context should form part of the decision making around design.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

DOV/93/00735 – One pair of semi-detached houses – GRANTED

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

Deal Town Council: Object as over-development of site.

Public Representations: There have been 9 letters of objection and 12 letters of support from the public consultation of the application. A summary of the responses is set out as follows:

Objections

- Property is in a prominent location.
- Over-development of site.
- The extension would appear as a large, overbearing and incongruous feature in this prominent location.
- It would appear as a particularly awkward and discordant feature on this simple cottage.
- This extension would destroy the symmetry of the semi-detached houses
- The planned extension would be an eyesore.
- It will give a bizarre effect of overcrowding and the architectural features of different roof pitches and cantilevered extension will not look attractive the way they would in their own setting.
- Highway safety – possible distractions for motorists.
- Loss of the original character.
- It detracts from the original character of the streets, both Capstan Row and Bulwark Road.

Support

- The building is aesthetically pleasing.
- The extension would improve the house.
- It would have no adverse impact on the appearance of the property or the surrounding neighbourhood
- The extension would have a limited negative effect in terms of loss of light.
- The extension would overlook my garden, but others already overlook this space.

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

1.1. The application site comprises a semi-detached two storey dwelling that has a large box dormer rear roof extension. The site includes an attached garage to the side (south) with one off street parking space in front of the garage. The dwellinghouse has been finished in a white shiplap style cladding on the external surfaces. The roof is finished in grey slate tiles with darker tiles on the rear dormer. To the rear of the site, there is a small courtyard with a tall brick built wall that surrounds it.

1.2. The site is located on a prominent corner plot on Bulwark Road and Capstan Row. The dwellings surrounding the site are mainly two and three storey terrace houses, some of which feature small, single storey additions that appear quite organic. The application site can be accessed off of The Marina and down Capstan Row or along Bulwark Road, off of Snowdown Road.

1.3. The area is tightly built in nature, with the front elevations of dwellings on Bulwark Road facing over the rear gardens of dwellings on Sandown Road. Nevertheless, the dwellings relate well to one another in this close-quarters

arrangement. There are many attractive period properties near to the site and other dwellings of a similar scale. Capstan Row is narrow and only wide enough for a single lane of traffic. The existing site arrangement still allows for a degree of openness at the end of the Row, leading onto Bulwark Road. The application dwelling has been clad and in terms of its finish no longer relates to its attached pair which retains its original red brickwork on the lower portion of the property and a pale render on the top portion. The pair of dwellings is fairly modern (permission granted in 1993) with a similar footprint to other dwellings nearby. The application site is quite constrained in terms of available space to develop.

1.4. The approximate dimensions of the site are:

- Width – 7 metres.
- Depth – 13 metres.
- Set back from highway (Capstan Row) – 1 metre.
- Set back from highway (Bulwark Road) – 1.1 metres.

### Proposal

1.5. Permission is sought to erect a first floor side extension above and forward of the existing attached garage. The extension has been designed to cantilever out above the existing parking space which is to be retained. The extension would include a pitched roof, finished in artificial slate tiles, new aluminium framed window and would have white cladding on the external surfaces, which would all match the materials used on the host dwelling. There would be cedar cladding above the garage floor and the underside of the cantilevering first floor. The front elevation would include a small pitched roof dormer, which would match the existing dormer on the front roof slope of the host dwelling.

1.6. The extension would appear to jetty out, with no front supports proposed.

1.7. The height of the ridge is lower than the ridge of the host dwelling and the proposed extension would be recessed back from the existing front elevation by approximately 1.5m.

1.8. The proposed extension has been designed to create an additional first floor bedroom whilst retaining the existing garage space and off-street parking space

1.9. The dimensions of the proposal are:

- Width – 2.5 metres
- Depth – 6.0 metres.
- Ridge Height of the extension – 7.0 metres.
- Height to Eaves (front) – 4.2metres
- Height to eaves (rear) 2.2 metres

## **2. Main Issues**

2.1. The main issues to consider are:

- Principle
- Visual amenity and design
- Residential amenity
- Highways

## **3. Assessment**

### Principle

- 3.1. The site is located within the urban boundaries of Deal and the proposed extension is acceptable in principle, subject to its design details and any material considerations.

### Visual Amenity and Design

- 3.2. In terms of design the cantilevered extension appears as though it is lunging forward and encroaching into the street. It would appear bulky and discordant compared to the simple form and character of dwellings here. Other dwellings have been altered in an organic way, with small, single storey extensions and sympathetic additions. However this proposal would appear as an unusual and alien addition. It is considered that the proposal, because of its design, would lead to an intrusive and overbearing effect on the street in this location. A first floor addition above and forward of the garage would serve to remove the already limited openness to the street that exists here.
- 3.3. The NPPF is clear with regards to the importance of design quality and the securing of good standards of amenity and identifies that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, which is expected to contribute positively to making places better for people. Streetscapes are expected to create attractive places to live. It is accepted that an existing car park space would be retained however. In this case the contrived design solution would not achieve a good standard of design quality and would not contribute positively to the appearance, character or visual quality of the street scene and is therefore contrary to the sustainability aims and objectives of the NPPF.

### Residential Amenity

- 3.4. The proposal would include one new window on the front elevation which would face the rear gardens of the dwellings along Sandown Road. However, as the rear gardens are already overlooked at first floor level, it is considered that the proposal would not materially worsen the existing arrangement. Accordingly, as a result of this, the proposal is likely to be acceptable in this regard.

### Highways

- 3.5. Both the existing off-street parking space and the existing garage would be retained with this proposal. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and is compliant with Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy.

### Conclusion

- 3.6. The proposed extension is considered to be unacceptable.
- 3.7. It is considered that the proposed extension would be an intrusive, contrived design feature. It would appear incongruous in the streetscene and would not relate well to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would cause harm to the streetscene by detracting from its appearance, character and its visual quality and as such, the recommendation is to refuse planning permission.
- 3.8. All comments have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

g) **Recommendation**

I. Planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

In this prominent location, the proposed extension, if permitted, would result in an incongruous and intrusive addition to the street scene. By virtue of its resultant design and its relationship with the existing dwelling, the proposed extension would appear as a contrived and alien feature in the streetscene. The proposal would result in harm to the streetscene, contrary to the aims and objectives of the aims and objectives of the NPPF, in particular, paragraphs 17, 56, 58, 61 and 64.

Case Officer

Elouise Mitchell