

Application No: Y18/0209/SH

Location of Site: 31 Warren Way Folkestone Kent CT19 6DT

Development: Erection of two storey side and rear extension with single storey rear element, following demolition of existing single storey garage.

Applicant: Mr Adam Smith

Agent: Mr Dan Kincaid

Date Valid: 12.02.18

Expiry Date: 09.04.18

Consultation Expiry Date: 20.04.18

PEA Date: 01.05.18

Date of Committee: 24.04.18

Officer Contact: Miss Beth Lennon

SUMMARY

This report considers whether planning permission should be granted for a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension to the existing dwelling. The report recommends that planning permission be granted as it is considered that the design of the proposed extension is in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would not be harmful to the streetscene. It is also considered that the amenities of neighbouring occupants would be safeguarded.

<p>RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at the end of the report and any additional conditions the Head of Planning Services considers to be necessary .</p>
--

1.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application is for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension with a single storey rear element, following the demolition of the existing single storey garage.
- 1.2 The proposed extension would extend to the shared boundary with no 29 at ground floor but would be set away by 1 metre from the boundary at first floor and at the rear element of the extension. The proposed extension would extend 4 metres from the existing rear elevation of the dwelling. The rear extension would have a total width of 6.6 metres, with the two storey element having a width of 4.1 metres and the single storey element having a width of 2.5 metres.

- 1.3 The single storey element at the rear of the dwelling would have a flat roof with a roof lantern and the two storey element would have a pitched, hipped roof. At ground floor the extension would comprise a WC, cloakroom and kitchen / dining room area. At first floor the extension would provide a fourth bedroom.
- 1.4 Proposed materials would be clay roof tiles to match the existing dwelling, render to the external elevations (to match the existing dwelling) with timber cladding to the rear elevation and white uPVC fenestration. With regards to windows, the extension would include two additional windows on the front elevation (one at ground floor and one at first floor), one additional first floor window and one window and a set of bi-fold doors at ground floor on the rear elevation. No additional side windows are proposed.

2.0 SITE DESIGNATIONS

2.1 The following apply to the site:

- Inside settlement boundary

3.0 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 3.1 The application site is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling sited along Warren Way. The property is constructed of red brickwork with painted render to the first floor. The dwelling has an attached single storey garage to the side with hardstanding to the front which provides off street parking. The dwelling has a long rear garden which backs onto Warren Close.
- 3.2 Warren Way is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of similar character, many of which have single storey side additions extending up to the boundary.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 There is no planning history for the site.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1 Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file on the Council's website:

<https://searchplanapps.shepway.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Responses are summarised below.

5.2 Folkestone Town Council

Object on grounds of the size of the extension being overbearing and intensive with unacceptable daylight angles.

6.0 PUBLICITY

6.1 Neighbours letters expiry date 08.03.2018

6.2 Neighbours consulted on amendments expiry date 20.04.2018

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Representation responses are available in full on the planning file on the Council's website:

<https://searchplanapps.shepway.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Responses are summarised below:

7.2 1 email received objecting on the following summarised grounds:

- Size and scale would be imposing
- Overbearing impact
- Overshadowing / loss of light
- Loss of light would result in conservatory being uninhabitable
- No dimensions on the plans
- Rear extension has been drawn incorrectly on the site plan to make the neighbours' extension look larger than it is or the extension to look smaller than it is
- No side elevation from the perspective of the neighbouring property
- Side extension extends up to the boundary line (terracing effect)
- Floor plans show the front door extending outward but this is not reflected on the front elevation
- Materials are vague
- Vertical timber cladding is not in keeping with the brick character of the property

8.0 RELEVANT POLICY GUIDANCE

8.1 The full headings for the policies are attached to the schedule of planning matters at Appendix 1 and the policies can be found in full via the following links:

<http://www.shepway.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/local-plan>

<https://www.shepway.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/documents-and-guidance>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

8.2 The following saved policies of the Shepway District Local Plan Review apply: SD1, BE1, BE8

8.3 The following policies of the Shepway Local Plan Core Strategy apply: DSD

8.4 The following paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework are of particular relevance to this application:

7 – Achieving sustainable development

9.0 APPRAISAL

Relevant Material Planning Considerations

9.1 The relevant issues for consideration with regard to this application are design and visual impact, neighbouring amenity, and parking and highways.

Design and Visual Impact

9.2 Saved policy BE8 states that extensions to existing dwellings should reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building and should not have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene. Saved policy BE8(d) also states that “permission will not be given for flat-roofed extensions, unless the proposed extension would not be generally visible from a public place and would serve only as an adjunct to the main building, or the provision of a flat roof is the only practicable means of providing an extension”.

9.3 It is recognised that the proposed extension would be large, however, it is not considered to dominate the existing building as it would be a subservient addition with a lower ridge line to the existing dwelling and the proposed front elevation would also be set back slightly from the front elevation of the existing dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would clearly be read as an extension and would not significantly alter the scale or proportions of the existing dwelling.

9.4 With regards to materials, the proposal would include rendered external elevations and clay roof tiles which would match the materials used in the existing dwelling and are therefore considered acceptable. The proposal would also include timber cladding to the rear elevation of the extension and while this is not a material which features on the dwelling at present, it is considered that as it would not be highly visible from a public place, the use of cladding would not be significantly detrimental and therefore on balance is considered to be acceptable as it would not result in harm.

9.5 The proposed two storey element would have a pitched and hipped roof which would reflect the roof pitch of the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would also include a flat roof to the single storey rear element which would only have a width of approximately 2.5 metres and would therefore be an adjunct to the main building. As the proposed flat roof

element would be to the rear of the property it would not be highly visible from a public place. As such, the proposed flat roof element is considered to meet the requirements of saved policy BE8(d) and is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

- 9.6 Saved policy BE8(b) also states that “side extensions may be added to detached or semi-detached dwellings 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 including the roof”. The proposed extension would extend to the boundary at ground floor level however, following amendments to the plans, the first floor element would now be set in by 1 metre and therefore meets the requirements of saved policy BE8(b) and would not result in a terracing effect. The existing dwelling has a single storey garage which extends up to the shared boundary and therefore the proposal to have a single storey element to the boundary with the first storey element set in would still result in the dwelling being clearly read as a semi-detached dwelling, even if the neighbouring property (no 29) were to have a two storey side extension in the future.
- 9.7 For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposed extension would be in keeping with character and appearance of the host dwelling and would not be harmful to character of streetscene, complying with saved policy BE8 and is therefore considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 9.8 Saved policy SD1 states that all development proposals should “Safeguard and enhance the amenity of residents” and saved policy BE8 states that extensions to existing buildings should not adversely affect the amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states planning should “always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings”.
- 9.9 Part (a) of saved policy BE8 states that “extensions should not cause undue overshadowing of neighbouring property and should allow adequate light and ventilation to existing rooms within the building; single storey extensions should be designed so as to fall within a 45-degree angle from the centre of the nearest ground floor window of a habitable room or the kitchen of the neighbouring property. In the case of two-storey extensions, the 45-degree angle is taken from the closest quarter-point of the nearest ground floor window of a habitable room or kitchen.”
- 9.10 In this instance, the 45 degree line has been shown on the submitted plans and it has been demonstrated that the proposed extension would not breach the 45 degree line on either of the adjoining properties (Nos. 29 and 33 Warren Way) and it is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not result in undue overshadowing to neighbouring property. The impact of the two storey element on upper floor windows has also been

considered and it is considered that the two storey element is set sufficiently away from the boundary so that it would not cause overshadowing to the first floor windows of no 33 (which are set further back than the existing ground floor conservatory belonging to this neighbour) and would also meet the 45 degree line set out in saved policy BE8.

- 9.11 The two storey element is also considered to be set sufficiently away from the boundary so that it would not result in an overbearing impact to either neighbouring property.
- 9.12 With regards to overlooking, saved policy BE8(e) states that “alterations or extensions which cause undue loss of privacy for occupiers of neighbouring properties through overlooking windows, doors or balconies should be avoided”. In this instance, the existing dwelling and both adjoining properties have first floor rear windows and in an urban area such as this, some level of overlooking would be accepted. The proposed extension would not include any additional windows on the side elevations and would only include one first floor window on the rear elevation of the proposed extension. It is considered that this first floor rear window would not result in any significant increase in overlooking to the private amenity space of neighbouring properties when compared to the existing first floor rear windows.
- 9.13 The proposed ground floor window and bi-fold doors are not considered to result in a significant increase in overlooking. The proposed windows on the front elevation of the dwelling would look out onto a public place and would therefore not result in overlooking to private amenity space.
- 9.14 as such, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in undue loss of privacy for the occupiers of neighbouring properties and their amenity would therefore be safeguarded in accordance with saved policies SD1, BE8 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

Parking and Highways

- 9.15 The proposed extension would provide one additional bedroom in the dwelling, resulting in a total of four bedrooms. Kent Highways Services IG3 (residential parking) recommends 2 independently accessible spaces per unit for 4+ bedroom dwellings in a suburban location such as this. Garages are no longer considered as parking space by Kent Highways and therefore the loss of the existing garage is not considered to result in the loss of off street parking on site.
- 9.16 The existing dwelling has hardstanding to the front which provides off street parking for one dwelling. This parking space would be retained but no additional parking would be provided within the site. As such, the proposal would be deficient by one off street parking space. However, the proposal would only increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling by one and due to the availability of unrestricted on street parking it is considered that the lack of one additional parking space is not considered to be sufficiently detrimental to warrant refusal of planning permission on this ground.

9.17 As such, the proposal is not considered to have a significant impact in terms of parking and highways and is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Other issues

9.18 One point raised within the objection received was that no dimensions are shown on the plans. The submitted drawings have been drawn to an identified scale and therefore even though no dimensions have been identified, the plans can be measured on the public portal which is standard practice and considered to be acceptable in accordance with national validation requirements. The objection also raised the point that the side elevation facing no 33 had not been submitted, this drawing has since been received.

Human Rights

9.19 In reaching a decision on a planning application the European Convention on Human Rights must be considered. The Convention Rights that are relevant are Article 8 and Article 1 of the first protocol. The proposed course of action is in accordance with domestic law. As the rights in these two articles are qualified, the Council needs to balance the rights of the individual against the interests of society and must be satisfied that any interference with an individual's rights is no more than necessary. Having regard to the previous paragraphs of this report, it is not considered that there is any infringement of the relevant Convention rights.

9.20 This application is reported to Committee as the applicant's partner is an employee of the Council and an objection has been received.

10.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

10.1 The consultation responses set out at Section .0 and any representations at Section 7.0 are background documents for the purposes of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and any additional conditions the Head of Planning Services considers to be necessary:

1. Standard time condition
2. Approved plan numbers
3. Materials as per application

Y18/0209/SH
31 Warren Way
Folkestone

