

a) **DOV/20/00197 – Erection of single storey rear extension, front and rear dormers and raised side terrace - 26 Balmoral Road, Kingsdown**

Reason for Report: Seven contrary views

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning Permission be GRANTED

c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Dover District Core Strategy (CS)

Policy DM1 supports development carried out within the urban confines or is ancillary to existing development.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

NPPF 2019

Achieving sustainable development - Paras 7-14

Achieving well designed places - Paras 124-132

d) **Relevant Planning History**

88/00076 – Two-storey extension – Granted

19/00946 - Erection of first floor roof extension with terrace and balustrade, single storey side extension with steps, terrace and balustrade, rear extensions, dormer window to front roof slope and alterations to windows and doors (amended plans) – Refused

19/01439 - Erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor level dormer window extension to front and rear roof slopes, installation of balustrades to ground and first floor level and external alterations - Refused

e) **Consultee and Third-Party Responses**

Ringwould Parish Council – Object as this would overlook neighbouring properties

A total of six local residents have raised objections to the proposal summarised as follows:

- Out of Character
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Light Pollution
- Noise and disturbance from upstairs living room

Two local residents offer their support on the grounds that there are other properties in the area with similar extension and dormers

1. **The Site and the Proposal**

The Site

- 1.1 The application relates to a detached bungalow with accommodation within the roof space. There are existing single storey side extensions either side of the property and an existing 3.5 metres single storey flat roofed extension on the eastern corner of the dwelling. There is an existing two panel side hung door in the north east facing gable which appears to have replaced the original top hung window at some time after 2009. This door gives access to the garage roof but unlike the details proposed by the previously refused applications there are no other alterations to the garage roof to facilitate its use as a terrace.
- 1.2 On the north eastern (Edward Road) flank of the property there is a brick wall surmounted in places by trellis and a degree of hedging supplemented in places by trees on the adjacent highway verge. The principal elevation faces Balmoral Road and contains a gravelled car parking area sufficient for two cars. The neighbour to the south west has a similar bungalow albeit on slightly higher land. There is a substantial hedge separating the respective gardens. The rear boundary of 26 Balmoral Road abuts the rear boundary of a similar dwelling on Carlton Road. This property is somewhat lower than the applicant's property although there is a well maintained evergreen hedge on the common boundary.
- 1.3 The area comprises a quiet, well-established residential neighbourhood comprising single storey dwellings and chalet style dwellings with dormers within the roof slopes. The single storey bungalows are of a noticeably consistent low profile and dormer windows to both front and rear are a fairly common feature in the area.
- 1.4 The land slopes down gently from the north west to south east with the result that the application site is in a noticeably prominent corner plot at the junction formed by Edward Road and Balmoral Road. The bungalow is therefore widely visible from the surrounding streets.

### The Proposal

- 1.5 The proposal involves a number of elements:
  - The design concept for the house envisages a partial 'upside down house' with a large living area in the converted attic.
  - Two dormers are proposed on the front (road and north west) facing roof slope
  - A full width dormer on the rear (south east facing) roof slope with glazing over most of its width. It is set about half a metre below ridge height and half a metre back from the eaves and is slightly less than 20 cubic metres – i.e will be within the limitation of 50 cubic metres for a detached dwelling. In itself therefore the proposed dormer accords with the limitations for a Roof Extension granted Planning Permission under Part 1 Class B Permitted Development Rights.
  - A ground floor extension to the existing single storey flat roofed extension on the south east facing elevation by about 2.5 metres in depth. This extension to an existing extension would follow the existing flat roof addition, providing a three panel side hung window into the rear garden and patio doors inward looking to a semi enclosed patio area.
  - A ground level side terrace area with balustrade and steps down to the garden

## **2. Main Issues**

2.1 The main issues for consideration are:

- The principle of the development
- Residential amenity
- The character and appearance of the area

### **Assessment**

#### Principle of Development

##### Dover District Council Core Strategy 2010

2.2 Core Strategy Policy DM1 supports development within settlement confines. In this case the proposal accords with this policy.

2.3 The NPPF identifies that planning decisions should play an active part in guiding development towards sustainable solutions. The development proposed is a simple extension to a lawful dwelling which is acceptable in principle subject to considerations of details discussed below. The proposal is considered to comply with the objectives set out in paragraph 8 (b) to retain a range of homes to provide the needs of present and future generations. It is also considered compliant with paragraph 8(c) in that it makes effective use of land whilst protecting the natural environment

#### 2.4 Design Concept

The physical alterations to the exterior of the building appear to be designed to allow the first floor of the house to be used as the main living area. This would allow the occupants to take advantage of the outstanding views available from the property. Internal alterations to the layout of the house do not in themselves require planning permission but the design concept may have an impact on external features which do require planning permission.

#### Character and Appearance of the Area

2.5 The front dormers are of a simple box design and are acceptable in the street scene. There are other similar dormers in the surrounding area. The rear dormer straddles the width of the roof slope and is set about half a metre below ridge height and about half a metre back from the eaves. Whilst large it is similar to others in the surrounding area. Other elements of the proposal, individually, would have little impact on the street scene or character of the area.

#### Residential Amenity

2.6 In the case of the front dormers they primarily overlook the semi-private public realm. The property on the other side of the road however has a rear garden and private area side on to the proposed front dormers. Because: (a) the ground 'drops away' from this resident's rear garden i.e. the garden level to the neighbours property is slightly higher than that of the application property, (b) there is significant vegetation on this boundary, and (c) the private area is some distance from the dormers (in excess of 15m), I do not consider there would be any undue harm to this resident caused by the front dormers.

- 2.7 In the case of the short extension to the existing side extension of the south west flank of the property this area is well screened by existing vegetation and is in any case to the north east of the neighbour at number 26 Balmoral Road, I do not consider there would be any loss of privacy or overshadowing caused by the element of the proposal.
- 2.8 In the case of the residents of Carlton Road (to the south and south east) of the proposed rear dormer and rear extension there is a distance to boundary of about 16 metres and a minimum wall to wall distance of about 30 metres. This being the case, and notwithstanding the change in ground level, I do not consider that the proposed rear dormer, in itself, would unacceptably intrude into these resident's privacy and amenity. Because of the considerable amount of glazing on the rear I consider there may be a perception of overlooking and loss of privacy, but I do not consider that it would be reasonable to refuse planning permission on this ground especially in view of the fallback position being that this element of the proposal falls within Permitted Development allowances.
- 2.9 In the case of the side terrace areas with balustrade, this is low level and in view of existing boundary treatment would have no adverse impact on residential privacy and amenity.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 After two unsuccessful applications for alterations and extensions to this property which failed on design and residential amenity issues the current application is considered to be acceptable and has sufficiently addressed previous concerns.
- 3.2 I therefore recommend planning permission be granted.

### **g) Recommendation**

- I Planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions to include (1) time, (2) compliance with plans (3) Matching materials
- II Powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary issues in line with the matters set out in the recommendation and as resolved by planning committee.

Case Officer

Tony Jarvis