

- a) **DOV/18/00209 – Erection of two-storey and single storey side extensions following the demolition of the existing lean-to structures and demolition of single storey rear extension - 63 Lewisham Road, River**

Reason for report - Number of contrary representations (9).

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be granted.

- 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, standards and legislation which are material to the determination of planning applications including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, 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.

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**

There is no relevant planning history on file for this application site.

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

Representations can be found in full in the online planning file. A summary has been provided below:

River Parish Council: “No comments”

Public Representations:

There have been 10 letters of OBJECTION from the public consultation of the application, saying in summary:

- The proposal would create a terracing effect with little or no separation between the two properties
- The site location plan is misleading
- It would give rise to overlooking and a loss of privacy
- It will adversely affect the character of the road and would impact neighbouring houses
- Work has already started on site

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

1.1 The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse set back from the public highway by a front driveway and garden area. The dwelling is finished in red brickwork on the lower portion with a pale render over the exterior of the first floor. Windows and doors are framed in white uPVC. There is a single storey lean-to timber structure that has been erected to replace the single storey garage that was attached to the neighbouring dwelling (number 65).

1.2 The main dwellinghouse is visible within the streetscene. It has a two storey bay window on the front elevation and appears symmetrical with its pair, number 61 Lewisham Road. This part of Lewisham Road includes mainly two storey pairs of semi-detached dwellings, some of which have two storey side extensions with pitched roofs and some with flat roofs, such as number 65 to the north-west of this site which has a two storey flat roof side extension. There is no uniformity in the width of the gaps between each dwellinghouse.

1.3 To the rear of the application site, the garden area is laid to grass. There is a small single storey rear extension finished in red brickwork and there are a number of small outbuildings and structures in the rear garden. Due to the topography of the site, the rear garden slopes up towards the rear (south-west) and as such, the very rear of the garden is much higher than the ground level of the dwellinghouse. The boundary is made up of close-boarded fencing along the north-west side boundary which is approximately 1.8m in height with a tall brick

wall along the south-east boundary. There are a number of hedges and trees as well as outbuildings that help form the boundary treatment.

1.4 The approximate dimensions of the site are:

- Width – 10.5 metres
- Depth – 56.5 metres.

Proposal

1.5 Permission is sought to erect a two storey side extension and a single storey side/rear extension. The proposal includes a pitched roof over the two storey side extension which would be hipped. The single storey rear/side extension would have a mono-pitched and hipped roof over. Materials are proposed to match those used on the host dwelling including; brickwork, pebble-dash, matching roof tiles and white uPVC to frame windows and doors. The two storey extension would replace the single storey side garage. A gap of 1 metre would be retained along the north-west boundary of the site, in between the application site and number 65 Lewisham Road.

1.6 The dimensions of the proposed two storey side extension are as follows:

- Width of extension– 2.9 metres.
- Depth of extension – 5.5 metres.
- Height to eaves – 5.2 metres.
- Maximum height – 7.5 metres.

1.7 The dimensions of the proposed single storey rear/side extension are as follows:

- Width of extension – 6.2 metres.
- Depth from proposed rear of two storey side extension – 7.2 metres.
- Height to eaves – 2.4 metres.
- Maximum height – 3.3 metres.

2 Main Issues

2.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Principle
- Visual Amenity and Design
- Residential Amenity
- Parking and Highways

3 Assessment

Principle

3.1 The site is located within the urban boundaries of River and the erection of an extension is considered acceptable in principle, subject to its design details and any material considerations.

Visual Amenity and Design

3.2 By virtue of its siting, the application site is visible from public vantage points

along Lewisham Road, River. Many other dwellings along Lewisham Road have undertaken development, similar to that proposed. The neighbouring property (no. 65 Lewisham Road) has undertaken a flat roofed two storey extension, for instance.

- 3.3 In terms of design, the NPPF seeks to secure high quality design for all proposals, attaching great importance to the design of the built environment. In Paragraph 56, the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The proposal includes a pitched/hipped roof that projects from the side roof slope of the host dwelling with eaves that match the host. The ridge height is set down and the roof slope would project slightly over the front elevation of the proposed extension. The integral garage door at ground floor level would be set back from the main front elevation. Overall, it is considered that the two storey side extension would appear as a subservient feature which is in keeping with the design and appearance of the host dwellinghouse. The materials proposed would match those used on the host dwelling, which would blend well. The design detailing of the existing brickwork would be copied onto the proposed extension which helps to increase the design quality and visual appearance of the extension. In terms of scale and proportions, the extension would not dominate the host property. This is assisted by the ridgeline of the extension being below ridgeline of the existing dwelling. The windows match the proportions, fenestration and detailing of those on the host dwelling so as to not detract from the character of the host dwelling.
- 3.4 The NPPF sets out that new development 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. Due to the sympathetic form and scale of the proposal, the wider visual amenity and quality of Lewisham Road would be preserved. For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the design solution is acceptable in this location and would cause no undue harm to the character or appearance of the streetscene. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and is therefore acceptable in this regard.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 3.5 The application site shares a boundary with number 65 Lewisham Road (to the north-west) and number 61 Lewisham Road (to the south-east).
- 3.6 65 Lewisham Road: This residential neighbour is located nearest to the proposed extensions and is sited to the north-west of the application site. This property includes a flat roofed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension which adjoins the boundary with number 63. This neighbouring property has no windows at ground floor level on its side (flank) elevation, however does have three roof lights in its single storey rear extension that serve the kitchen and shower room. Currently, a single storey garage/lean-to structure on the application property is attached to this neighbouring dwelling.
- 3.7 In terms of the proposal, there are no windows proposed on the side elevation of

the two storey extension, as such, no direct overlooking into this neighbouring site would occur. There are two new windows proposed at first floor level on the rear elevation of the two storey extension, serving the proposed bedroom, however, both windows would be fitted with obscure glazing and only have fanlight openings 1.7m above the finished internal floor level. As such, no overlooking would occur. The proposed development would not protrude past the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling, and given the orientation of the application site in relation to the neighbouring property (being sited to the north-west); it is considered the proposal would not lead to any significant level of overshadowing or loss of natural light. Given that the application proposes to leave a 0.5 metre gap along the side boundary of the site (the north-west boundary) and that there are no windows on the side elevation of this neighbouring dwelling; the proposal would not result in an overbearing impact. Furthermore, the proposal would not infringe the 45-degree line if drawn from the ground floor windows of the neighbour's rear elevation; it's considered that no loss of light would occur to the living accommodation of no. 65. Concerns have been raised that from the first floor rear window at no.65, views would be possible directly into the proposed ground floor extension at no. 63. It is not considered that this arrangement would be harmful to the occupants of no.65 and in any event, where properties sit in such close proximity (as here) some degree of interlooking is likely to be inevitable.

- 3.8 61 Lewisham Road: This residential neighbour is the other half of the semi-detached pair with the application property. The proposed two storey extension would be located on the opposite side to the location of the proposed extensions at 63 Lewisham Road (to the south-east). There is a tall (approximately 2.5 metres in height) brick built wall that forms the boundary treatment along the shared boundary between this residential neighbour and the application site.
- 3.9 The two storey element of the proposal would be set well back (3.6 metres) from the rear elevation of the host dwellinghouse. This arrangement would preserve the privacy, natural light and outlook enjoyed by the neighbouring occupiers of 61 Lewisham Road. The single storey rear/side extension would project out 3.5 metres from the original rear elevation of the existing dwelling and would be 3.2 metres from the shared boundary. Given the dimensions, the low eaves height, the gap between the boundary wall and the side of the proposed rear extension, together with the tall brick built boundary wall itself, it is considered that the rear/side extension would cause no demonstrable harm to the residential amenity enjoyed by these neighbouring occupants by way of increased overshadowing or by creating an overbearing effect. As there would be no windows on the south-east facing elevation of the single storey extension, no overlooking would occur. Due to the gap that would be left between the side elevation or the proposed single storey rear extension and the neighbouring property, the proposal would not infringe the 45-degree line (taken from the nearest ground floor window of no. 61), as such; no unacceptable loss of light would occur to the living accommodation of no.61.
- 3.10 The NPPF sets out in paragraph 17 that planning should enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives, and that new development should preserve a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. For the reasons set out above, it is considered that a good

standard of amenity would be preserved for the neighbouring occupiers. It is considered that no undue harm would be caused to the residential amenity they enjoy. Overall, it is considered that that the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Parking and Highways

- 3.11 The application site is currently served by one off street parking space and a garage. The dwelling currently has three bedrooms. The proposal includes the creation of one additional bedroom on the first floor, making it a four bedroomed dwellinghouse, and would retain the one off street parking space and proposes an integral garage. As only one additional bedroom would be created, and no parking would be lost, it is considered that the proposal would not cause significant or adverse parking pressure on the street. In any case, on-street parking is not restricted here and although Lewisham Road can be busy at times, it is not considered that the pressures associated with one additional bedroom would give rise to a planning objection. It is considered that the proposal would not unduly impact parking or highways, and is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The proposal is considered acceptable. The design is considered to be sympathetic and it would not unduly detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene or the host dwellinghouse. It is considered that no significant or adverse impact would be caused to neighbouring occupiers and that the residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers would be adequately preserved. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of parking and highway safety. The proposal is considered acceptable in all other material aspects. Accordingly the development would comply with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

g) Recommendation

- I. PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following (summarised) conditions:
- (1) Standard time condition (2) In accordance with the approved plans (3) Materials to match those used on the existing dwelling (4) Restriction of PD Rights for openings on first floor on north-west elevation (5) Obscure glazed windows that are fixed shut below 1.7m above internal finished floor level to be inserted on south-west elevation.
- 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 planning committee

Case Officer

Elouise Mitchell