

Officer Report

Application No.	20/0322/FH
Site Address	Harefield, Church Road, New Romney, TN28 8EY
Officer Name	Robert Allan
Proposal	Demolition of existing porch, erection of new porch and two storey rear extension. House render to be painted white.

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-421491
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Approve with Conditions
Recommendation Date	05 May 2020

Report

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 03.03.2020

Applicable 8/13/16 week target date: 28.04.2020

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

If Yes, revised 8/13/16 week target date: 08.05.2020

Is the application being determined after 26 weeks without a PPA or a PEA? No

SITE VISIT

The site and proposals were assessed from the public highway and submitted plans, with key features noted in the assessment.

SITE

The application site is located within the defined settlement boundary of New Romney in a residential area. The property the subject of this application is a two storey detached dwelling of possibly inter-war period, located at the end of the development along the southern side of Church Road, which is characterised by predominantly detached properties of a range of styles and period, although the southern side of the road is noted to have more bungalows. The plot faces the road to the north and open farmland to the west and south, with a neighbouring property to the east.

The property is finished in what appears to be a pebble-dash render with a brown plain tiled roof and white uPVC fenestration. Off-street parking provision is available in front of an attached garage.

HISTORY

There is no recent planning history relevant to this application.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing porch, the erection of new porch and the erection of a two storey rear extension, with the render to be painted white, although this does not require planning consent in this instance. Materials are proposed to match.

The porch matches the existing, but adds a mono-pitched roof and more solid construction. The two-storey extension is on the rear of the property, toward the eastern side, extending no closer to the boundary than the existing eastern wall of the property. It is approximately 6.5 metres wide and 3.8 metres deep, with a pitched roof to match the existing property.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

New Romney Town Council – no comments received.

REPRESENTATIONS

None received

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 29.04.2020

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review (SDLPR): SD1, BE1, BE8

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

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

Core Strategy Local Plan Review: n/a

NPPF: Paragraph 11, Section 12

NPPG

APPRAISAL

Design and visual appearance

Saved local plan policy BE8 and emerging policy HB8 refer specifically to alterations and extensions to existing buildings and says that works should reflect the scale, proportions, materials, roof line and detailing of the original building.

It is noted that the porch would be similar in scale to the one it replaces and being within the silhouette of the existing building and constructed in materials to match, would have no detrimental impact upon the character of the dwelling or the street scene. The two storey extension would be located to the rear, meaning that the proposal would not be readily visible in the street scene, but could be visible from the rear across farmland and should also accord with the principles of good design. It would utilise materials to match the existing property and is considered not to dominate the structure in respect of scale and massing. In terms of architectural detailing, the large windows are noted, which are at odds with those in the existing dwelling, but these are considered to be acceptable and not of significant detriment to the character of the building or the wider street scene.

Overall, in consideration of the character of the property, the materials are considered compatible with the existing structure and it is considered that the extensions would not be detrimental to the overall character of the building and would not dominate the structure. It is considered that there would be no detrimental impact upon the established street scene from the proposed alterations either. Overall, the extension is considered to comply with saved policy BE8 and emerging policy HB8 in design terms.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

Saved local plan policy BE8 and emerging policy HB8 refer to impact upon neighbours and says that alterations and extensions should not adversely affect the amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring properties, including issues relating to overshadowing or overlooking of neighbouring property.

The porch would have no impact upon neighbouring uses and is considered acceptable with regard to amenity. The proposed two storey extension would project out from the rear of the property, but the submitted block plan demonstrates that it would not get any nearer to the common boundary than the existing side wall, with the single storey garage maintaining a buffer to the boundary. The extension would also not project past the rear of the adjacent property to the east and the extension would be no higher than the existing. There are no windows shown in the eastern flank elevation. The windows shown in the extension would look to the rear (as existing) and west.

Overall, it is considered that there would be no detrimental impact upon neighbouring amenity from overshadowing, overbearing presence or overlooking and the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to neighbouring amenity in accordance with saved policy BE8 and emerging policy HB8.

Parking and highways

The proposal would see no change in the number of bedrooms within the dwelling and therefore parking provision does not need to be considered.

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.

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.

Local finance considerations

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. Section 70(4) of the Act defines a local finance consideration as a grant or other financial assistance that has been, that will, or that could be provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown (such as New Homes Bonus payments), or sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

In accordance with policy SS5 of the Core Strategy Local Plan the Council has introduced a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) scheme, which in part replaces planning obligations for infrastructure improvements in the area. This application is not liable for the CIL charge as it would fall beneath the threshold.

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.

Case Officer:

Name: Robert Allan Position: Principal Planning Officer Date: 05.05.2020

Recommended Conditions (3)

1

The development must be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason:

As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan, number 2813 - 11B.

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and in order to ensure the satisfactory implementation of the development in accordance with the aims of saved policy SD1 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review.

The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless alternative materials are approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason:

To ensure that the external appearance of the works when completed do not detract from the appearance of the building or the appearance of the area generally.