

- a) **DOV/22/00820 - Erection of front and rear dormer roof extensions, front balconies to first and second floors, replacement windows and installation of glazing to gable end - 37 The Marina, Deal**

Reason for report – Number of contrary views (20)

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission be refused.

- c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Core Strategy Policies (2010): CP1, DM1

Local Plan (2002) Saved policies

Regulation 19 draft Dover District Local Plan

PM1 – Achieving High Quality Design

H6 – Residential extensions and annexes

HE1 – Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021): Paragraphs 7, 8, 11, 130,

- d) **Relevant Planning History**

No site history.

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

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

Deal Town Council – Object. Visual disruption of roofline and damaging architectural integrity of roofline. Roofline will be changed and the heritage of the building will be damaged. Front dormer out of character for surrounding buildings, over development of loft extension and overlooking neighbouring properties. Historic integrity of the terrace will be lost.

Third-Party Representations:

9 representations of objection have been received and are summarised below:

- Loss of privacy caused by balcony
- Will spoil the roofline of the properties
- Overlooking to private garden space at 38 The Marina
- Detrimental to historic character of cottages

20 representations in support of the proposals have been received and are summarised below:

- Isn't highly visible

- Dormer won't set a precedent
- Similar proposals nearby
- The cottages have evolved over time due to other alterations
- Good design
- Sympathetic to area
- Other properties have dormers

1 representation was received

- Asking for committee date and report to be shared

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

- 1.1 The application site relates to a two storey dwellinghouse located at the northern end of a row of terraced properties, previously known as the Coastguard cottages. The front of the property faces out to Deal beach, with the rear gardens extending to Sandown Road. The property is bounded by 36 The Marina to the south.
- 1.2 This application seeks permission for the erection of front and rear dormer roof extensions, to incorporate a change to the existing roof from hipped to gable end, front balconies to first and second floors, replacement windows and installation of glazing to new gable end.

**2. Main Issues**

- 2.1 The main issues for consideration are:
- The principle of the development
  - The impact on visual amenity
  - The impact on residential amenity

**Assessment**

Principle of Development

- 2.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.3 CP1 states that the location and scale of development in the district must comply with the Settlement Hierarchy which informs the distribution of development in the Core Strategy(CS).
- 2.4 Policy DM1 seeks to ensure that new development is located within the urban boundaries and rural settlement confines unless ancillary to existing development or uses. As the proposals are ancillary to the residential use of the property and located within the settlement boundary of Deal, the proposals would accord with DM1.

Impact on Visual Amenity

- 2.5 The application site sits at the end of a row of houses, which are similarly designed, with an element of symmetry, with the half-hipped roofs at either end

and two central front facing gables. The neighbouring property has a rear dormer which extends the width of the roof, and other properties have front balconies at first floor level.

- 2.6 The proposed rear dormer would be similar to the neighbouring property and, save for the part which requires the existing roof to be extended from a hip to a gable, could be completed under permitted development rights. That said, the proposal would include a change to the roof to accommodate the dormer which would change the symmetry of the properties. The assessment of whether the rear dormer would cause harm must consider the presence of the dormer to the neighbouring property, which was carried out under permitted development rights. Whilst the rear dormer proposed by this application would be similar in scale and form to its neighbour, the change in roof form required in order to facilitate the increased width of the dormer (meaning that this dormer would not fall under permitted development) would have a significant impact on the symmetry of the terrace as a whole and would be more prominent by virtue of it being to the end of the terrace. Whilst this is a more balanced assessment compared with the assessment of the front dormer (discussed below), it is considered that the dormer would detract significantly from the appearance of the terrace and its contribution to the character of the area.
- 2.7 The front facing dormer extends from the ridge of the main dwellinghouse. In turn, the central element extends for the full height of the roofslope. The subordinate elements sit high up in the roofslope. As well as altering the symmetry of roof alterations to this row of houses it would also create unacceptable bulk to the roof, which would adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene. The visual amenity of the locality would be harmed as a result.
- 2.8 The balcony at first floor level, together with the change to the fenestration to support the balcony, would be similar to the balconies present on other properties within the row of houses. The design is considered to be acceptable and would not create an unacceptable change to the front elevation.
- 2.9 Regard has been had for how visible the dormers would be from public vantage points, with some third parties commenting that they would not be prominent in views. From The Marina, views of the northern end of the terrace are partially obscured from some viewpoints by the coastguard building which abuts the highway. However, clear views of the roof of this property can be gained, where the dormer would be seen in conjunction with the rest of the unaltered roof of the terrace. From Sandown Road, the rear dormer would be plainly visible and would disrupt the rear roof slope, albeit it would be seen in conjunction with the neighbouring dormer. From here the rear dormer would be seen as a bulky and out of character addition to the building, in particular due to it extending to the side elevation of the building (facilitated by the hi to gable roof extension).
- 2.10 For the reasons above, the dormers are considered to be unacceptable, resulting in a negative impact to the street scene, contrary to Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021).

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

- 2.11 Due to the nature of the proposals, it is not considered that there would be any overbearing impact or overshadowing to neighbouring properties.
- 2.12 Concerns were raised regarding loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, as a result of the introduction of a balcony. The balcony would be located on an elevation which already has first floor windows, which could overlook private garden areas of neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 While the balcony at first floor level, together with the change to the fenestration to support the balcony, is considered to be acceptable due to its design, the proposed front and rear dormers would result in an unacceptable bulk to the roofslope, which in turn would negatively impact the character and appearance of the street scenes and the symmetry of the row of cottages. For this reason, it is recommended that permission be refused.

### **g) Recommendation**

I Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

- 1) The proposed front dormer, to the eastern roof slope, and rear dormer, to the western roof slope, by virtue of their size, design and location would create dominant and discordant features on the roof slope which would be prominent in views from The Marina and Sandown Road respectively. The dormers would consequently not be sympathetic to the local character and would fail to add to the overall quality of the area, contrary to paragraphs 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

II Powers to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary wording in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

Case Officer

Amber Tonkin