

Officer Report

Application No.	20/0320/FH
Site Address	51 DOLPHINS ROAD, FOLKESTONE, CT19 5PN
Officer Name	Isabelle Hills
Proposal	Erection of a first floor side extension with a hipped roof and a new flat-roofed rear dormer

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-421446
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Refused
Recommendation Date	01 May 2020

Report

Date application valid: 06.03.2020

Applicable 8/13/16 week target date: 01.05.2020

Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) or Planning Extension Agreement (PEA) ? N

If Yes, revised 8/13/16 week target date:

Is the application being determined after 26 weeks without a PPA or a PEA? N

SITE VISIT

The property was viewed from within the streetscene.

SITE

The application site is located within the settlement of Folkestone, on Dolphins Road which is a residential street comprised of semi-detached two storey dwellings, set back from the road. The application property is one of a pair of two storey dwellings set back from the road with a driveway located to the front. The front elevation has a prominent bay feature and there is a single storey garage located to the side.

HISTORY

Y05/0056/SH Erection of a side conservatory. Approved with conditions.

It is noted that the adjoining property, no. 53 has a large dormer located to the side of the roof which is visible from within the streetscene however no evidence of planning permission for this can be found.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for a hip to gable extension to the main roof, a first floor side extension set down from the main roof and over the existing garage along with the installation of a rear dormer window.

The proposed alterations would enable a loft conversion to accommodate an additional bedroom with en-suite in the roof, increasing the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4. The side extension would allow for an increase in floorspace to one of the first floor bedrooms and a staircase leading up to the first floor.

A glass roof lantern is also proposed to be installed to the existing rear elevation.

The proposed materials palette is as follows – block and brickwork to match existing, concrete roof tiles to match existing and fibreglass to the dormer roof and white uPVC fenestration.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Folkestone Town Council – no objection subject to views of neighbours.

REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry 29.04.2020

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review saved policies: SD1 BE1 BE8

Emerging Places and Policies Local Plan: HB1 HB8

The Submission draft of the Places and Policies Local Plan (February 2018) was published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) for public consultation between February and March 2018. The Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in September 2018. Accordingly, it is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications in accordance with the NPPF, which confirms that weight may be given to policies in emerging plans following publication (paragraph 48). Based on the current stage of preparation, and given the relative age of the saved policies within the Shepway Local Plan Review (2006), the policies within the Submission Draft Places and Policies Local Plan (2018) may be afforded weight where there has not been significant objection.

Core Strategy Review Submission Draft 2019

The Submission draft of the Core Strategy Review was published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) for public consultation between January and March 2019. Accordingly, it is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications in accordance with the NPPF, which confirms that weight may be given to policies in emerging plans following publication (paragraph 48). Based on the current stage of preparation, the policies within the Core Strategy Review Submission Draft may be afforded weight where there has not been significant objection.

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

APPRAISAL

The main issues to be considered are design and visual impact and the impact on amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Design and visual impact

Saved policy BE8 (a) and emerging policy HB8 require extensions to existing buildings to reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building. Policy BE8 (b) states

that side extensions may be added to semi-detached dwelling where space is available; care should be taken to avoid creating a terracing effect which could result by extending up to the boundary; a minimum distance of 1 metre should be maintained from the boundary and any part of the extension above single storey level. Policy BE8 (d) states permission will not be granted for loft conversions requiring dormer extensions which are large in proportion to the existing roof, as these can completely alter the proportion of the building, presenting a top-heavy and flat-roofed appearance.

The proposed side extension would extend up to the boundary shared with number 49 Dolphins Road, failing to maintain a separation distance of at least 1 metre and as such is considered would give rise to an opportunity for a 'terracing effect' to occur, contrary to policy BE8(b).

The proposed hip-to-gable extension combined with the introduction of a first floor side extension is considered would fail to respect the scale and proportions of the original dwelling and would introduce an unacceptable amount of mass and bulk to the property. In addition to this, the visual transition between these two features are felt would not sit comfortably together and would create an awkward visual detail. As a result, these extensions are considered would unacceptably alter the character of the host property and would unbalance the symmetry of the pair of dwellings when viewed from within the streetscene. It is acknowledged that the adjoining property, no. 53 has a side dormer window, however this is set somewhat back from the streetscene and no relevant planning history for this addition can be found. This is therefore not considered that this would provide justification for the hip-to-gable extension and introduction of additional bulk and mass to the front and side elevations of no. 51.

The proposed rear dormer window would consume the majority of the rear roof slope and would be set down close to the eaves of the main roof. Due to this, the dormer window is considered to be excessive in size when viewed on the rear roof slope, would completely alter the proportions of the host dwelling and would present a top-heavy and flat-roofed appearance, contrary to saved policy BE8 (d).

The proposed roof lantern to the existing ground floor rear extension would be minor addition, and as such no objection is to be had to this.

As a result, the proposed extensions, by virtue of their scale, proportions, bulk and mass would fail to appear as subordinate additions and cumulatively would completely alter the original form and character of the host property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings when viewed from within the streetscene. Moreover, the proposed side extension would extend up to the shared boundary and as such is considered would give rise to the creation of a terracing effect. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved policies SD1, BE1 and BE8 and emerging Places and Policies Local Plan policies HB1 and HB8.

Amenities of neighbouring occupants

It is noted that the proposed side extension would extend up to the boundary shared with no. 49. However from viewing the property from within the streetscene, the two side windows of the neighbouring properties are fitted with obscured glazing and appear to serve a staircase and bathroom. As a result it is not considered that the additional bulk proposed to the side extension through the introduction of the hip-to-gable extension and extension over the existing garage would have a significantly adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupants by way of an overbearing impact or overshadowing.

From measuring the submitted location plan, the distance between the rear wall of the property and the rear boundary shared with properties on Walton Gardens is approximately 27.8 metres. It is considered that this is a sufficient distance to ensure that no unacceptable overlooking would occur from the proposed rear dormer window. Therefore no objection is to be had on the impact the proposal would have on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

Parking and highways

The proposed development would result in the creation of an additional bedroom within the property, creating a total of four bedrooms. However no alterations are proposed to be made to the existing hardstanding to the front of the property providing of-street parking and this is considered would be sufficient to accommodate any additional parking demand resulting from an additional bedroom. As such the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to its impact upon parking and highways.

Environmental Impact Assessment

In accordance with the EIA Regulations 2017, this development has been considered in light of Schedules 1& 2 of the Regulations and it is not considered to fall within either category and as such does not require screening for likely significant environmental effects.

Human Rights

I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view, the Assessment section above and the Recommendation represents an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) [and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties)] and the wider public interest.

Public Sector Equality Duty

In determining this application, regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set down in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular with regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. It is considered that the application proposals would not undermine objectives of the Duty.

It is considered that the application proposals would not conflict with objectives of the Duty.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the above, it is considered that planning permission should be refused due to the extensions adding a significant amount of mass and bulk to the property, which would unacceptably alter the character and appearance of the host dwelling and pair of semi-detached dwellings and by virtue of extending up to the boundary shared with no. 49 would give rise to a terracing effect.

Case Officer: I.Hills

Report and draft decision notice completed and passed to senior officer.

Name: I.Hills Position: Planning Officer Date: 01.05.2020

Report and draft decision notice agreed and passed to admin to issue decision.

Name: D Campbell Position: DM Team Leader Date: 01.05.20

Recommended Refusal Reasons (1)

1

The proposed extensions, by virtue of their scale, proportions, bulk and mass would fail to appear as subordinate additions and cumulatively would completely alter the original form and character of the host property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings when viewed from within the street scene. Moreover, the proposed side extension would extend up to the shared boundary and as such is considered would give rise to the creation of a terracing effect. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies SD1, BE1 and BE8 of the Local Plan Review and draft policies HB1 and HB8 of the emerging Places and Policies Local Plan.

Suggested Informatives (1)

1

Your attention is drawn to the fact that this application has been refused on the basis of drawing numbers EMA-2020-08-01 Re 01 and EMA-2020-08-02 Rev 01 received 02.03.2020.