

a) **DOV/20/00663 – Erection of a single storey side extension - Teal House, 7 Mill Race, River, Dover**

Reason for Report: Six contrary views

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning Permission be GRANTED

c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Dover District Core Strategy

- 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 (2019) (NPPF)

- Paragraph 2 states that “planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.
- Paragraph 7 seeks to achieve sustainable development.
- Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These three overarching objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in a mutually supportive way.
- Paragraph 11 states that where development accords with an up-to-date development plan it should be approved without delay; or where there are no relevant policies or the most important policies for the determination of the application are out of date, then also granting consent. Where there is a clear reason for refusing the proposed development due to conflict with an area/asset of particular importance (as identified in the framework); and/or where any adverse impacts of granting permission significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when taking the Framework as a whole, then planning permission should be refused.
- Paragraph 127 requires that planning policies should ensure that well-designed places are achieved, with the creation of high-quality buildings and places being fundamental to what planning and development process should achieve.
- Paragraph 130 requires that permission be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Kent Design Guide

National Design Guide

d) **Relevant Planning History**

No relevant planning history

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

River Parish Council – would like to see verification of the boundary with No.6 Mill Race, as the line drawn on the plans seems to differ from that on the land registry. We would also like to seek confirmation of the intended use of the extension.

County Archaeologist - no archaeological measures are required

Environmental Health – no objections, condition recommended –

In the event that, at any time while the development is being carried out, contamination is found that was not previously identified, it shall be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment shall be undertaken and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme shall be prepared. The results shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, are minimised and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors.

Public Representations - A total of six individuals have raised objections to the proposal summarised as follows:

- Concerns over proposed use of extension
- Material finish of extension
- Harm to trees
- Bin storage
- Damage caused by contractors when it is a private road
- Blocking of road caused by deliveries
- Dust caused by construction
- Loss of light to neighbouring property
- Issues regarding boundary and land ownership
- Noise from construction

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

1.1 The application relates to a detached two storey dwelling on the south of Mill Race in River. This property is finished in brick with dark brown timber weather boarding, brown timber windows and clay plain roof tiles.

1.2 The site is located within the village confines of River, and within the River Conservation Area. The principal elevation faces towards the Mill Race development with the garden land to the rear towards Lower Road. The site includes a gravelled car parking area sufficient for at least 3 cars. The property has a garage attached on the north elevation that has a bedroom space above.

1.3 Teal House is bounded by 6 Mill Race to the northwest; however, the property has a private shared access with numbers 4, 5 and 6 Mill Race. The area comprises a quiet, well established residential area comprising of two storey detached dwellings and a block of apartments.

- 1.4 The application is for a single storey side extension on the southwest elevation. The extension would measure 3.9 metres wide by 11.5 metres deep with a maximum height of 5.3 metres. The extension would create a living room/ dining and kitchen space with stairs connecting to the existing bedroom at first floor level above the garage. The extension would be finished to match the host dwelling, with the exception of the rear bi-fold door being powder coated aluminium. This wouldn't be visible from the street or from the Conservation Area.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The main issues for consideration are considered to be:

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

Assessment

The Principle of Development

- 2.2 The site is located within the settlement confines and the development therefore accords with Policy DM1.

Character and Appearance

- 2.3 The NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments 'will function well and add to the overall quality of the area', be 'visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping', be 'sympathetic to local character and history' and 'establish or maintain a strong sense of place' (paragraph 127).
- 2.4 The proposed extension would not be visible from the public highway, as Mill Race is a private development. The views from Lower Road would be largely obscured due to the planting along the boundary and separation distance caused by the River which runs along the southern boundary.
- 2.5 The extension has been designed to blend in with the host dwelling and the neighbour properties which are all built with similar materials. Initial concerns were raised about the materials, which the applicant noted and has made subsequent amendments to ensure the materials all match and are appropriate for the Conservation Area. The modest size of the extensions allows it to remain subservient to the host dwelling.
- 2.6 The scale and appearance of the development is considered to be acceptable in such a location and is considered to fit within its context. Consequently, it is concluded that the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Residential Amenity

- 2.7 The nearest property to the proposed extension is 6 Mill Race which is to the northwest of the host dwelling. The west elevation of the extension has no proposed windows, such that there would be no loss of privacy. The proposed rooflights on this elevation are set at a high level above the finished floor levels, such that views out of the rooflights would not be possible. As such, the rooflights

would not cause an unacceptable level of overlooking. The size and scale of the extension combined with the separation distance between the application site and 6 Mill Race will prevent any overbearing impact or overshadowing. The living conditions of 6 Mill Race would not therefore be unacceptably harmed.

- 2.8 No other properties share a boundary with the host dwelling and as such it is my opinion that no other properties will be affected by the extension.
- 2.9 I do not consider there would be any harm to the residents of these properties caused by this extension.

Other Matters

- 2.10 Concerns have been raised by third parties as to how the proposed extension will be used. The applicant has confirmed that the extension will provide ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling, in the short term for visiting family members and, perhaps, in the longer term to provide space for a carer should this be necessary. It is not considered that the provision of such accommodation is unusual or unacceptable. However, it is considered that it would be reasonable to attach a condition requiring the extension to be used ancillary to the main dwelling only.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The proposed erection of a single storey side extension, due to its design and appearance, would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Furthermore, for the reasons outlined above, the development would be unlikely to result in significant harm to the residential amenities of surrounding occupiers in respect of overshadowing, overbearing or loss of privacy. Consequently, the proposals would accord with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.
- 3.2 I therefore recommend planning permission be granted.

g) Recommendation

I Planning permission be GRANTED subject to the imposition of the following conditions:

(1) 3-year time limit for commencement; (2) compliance with the approved plans; (3) unknown contamination; and (4) extension to be used as ancillary accommodation to Teal House, 7 Mill Row.

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 the Planning Committee.

Case Officer

Amber Tonkin