

OFFICERS REPORT

Application No: Y19/0132/FH

Location: Nelandi Grand Parade Littlestone New Romney Kent TN28 8NQ

Proposal Erection of enclosed front porch with balcony over following demolition of existing porch and balcony

ASSESSMENT

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 06.02.2019

Applicable 8/13/16 week target date: 03.04.2019

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

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

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

SITE VISIT

Carried out site visit on 19.03.2019

The site and proposals were assessed from the public highway and the following key features noted:

SITE

The application site is two storey detached dwelling in the settlement of New Romney. There are no other designations on the local policies map. The dwelling finished in white painted render, flat roof and uPVC fenestration. There is off road parking to the front of the property for two cars. The application building currently has a first floor balcony to the front elevation with access from the first floor.

RELEVANT HISTORY

There is no recent or relevant planning history for the site

PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the erection of a front porch with balcony above at first floor level to replace the existing balcony. The proposed porch would be finished in materials to match the host dwelling while the proposed balcony would be constructed of stainless steel balustrade and glazed panels to a height of 1 metre above the roof of the proposed porch.

The proposed porch would measure approximately 1.3 metres in depth, 3.4 metres in width and 2.9 metres in height, and would not project further forward than the front elevation of the dwelling.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file. The main points raised are summarised below.

New Romney Town Council

No objections raised

REPRESENTATIONS

0 representations received.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 06.03.2019

RELEVANT POLICIES

Local Plan Review Saved Policies: SD1, BE1, BE8, TR12

Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft: HB1, HB8, T2

The Submission draft of the PPLP (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: CSD8

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.

NPPF: paragraph 12

NPPG

APPRAISAL

Design and visual appearance

Saved policy BE8 and emerging policy HB8 require that Alterations and extensions to existing buildings should reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building and not have a detrimental impact on the street scene. The proposed extension would alter the general appearance of the dwelling from the street scene through adding additional volume to the ground floor. The replacement balcony to the first floor - there is already a balcony at this level - would not significantly alter the appearance or character of the property from the street scene, other than through the change of balustrade to a glazed style. Overall it is considered that there would be no detrimental impact upon the character of the dwelling or

the wider street scene, as the extension would not dominate the property through adding significant additional volume or appear incongruous in the street scene, as it projects no further than the existing front elevation and uses matching painted render, which is acceptable in this instance.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

The proposed extension is to the ground floor front elevation next to the existing garage/store of the adjacent property to the south, which has no side windows other than a high level window set some distance back. The existing front portion of the application sits between the proposed extension and the property to the north, so there would be no change in circumstance. Consequently, there would be no detrimental impact from overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing presence for either neighbour. In respect of the proposed first floor front balcony this would directly replace an existing first floor balcony and therefore not worsen the existing arrangement in respect of overshadowing or overlooking.

The proposed front extension and replacement balcony is found to satisfy the aims of saved policy BE8 and emerging policy HB8.

Parking and highways

There are no additional bedrooms proposed therefore there would be no impact on the current parking demand

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 the proposal is a sustainable development that complies with development plan policy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Case Officer:

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

Name: D Wilkins Position: Planning Officer Date: 02.04.2019

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

Name: Robert Allan Position: Development Management Team Leader Date: 03/04/19