

OFFICERS REPORT

Application No: Y16/1285/SH
Location: 6 Coolinge Lane Folkestone Kent CT20 3RA
Proposal Erection of a single storey front extension.

ASSESSMENT

Performance data:-

Date application valid: 16.11.16

Applicable 8 week target date: 11.01.17

Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) or Planning Extension Agreement (PEA)? No

If Yes, revised 8 week target date: NA

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

SITE VISIT

The site visit was carried out on 6th December 2016. The site and proposals were assessed from the public domain to the front of the property.

SITE

The application site is located within the Folkestone settlement boundary. The site is also within the Area of Special Character. It is a two storey dwelling in a spacious plot within a largely leafy residential area.

HISTORY

The planning history shows:

- o Erection of police officers house/garage was approved in 1961.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey front extension.

The proposal would provide an open plan lounge, a sitting room, and a bathroom.

Planning permission is required as it is an extension forward of the front elevation of the dwelling.

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATION

This application is not liable for the CIL charge.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

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

Folkestone Town Council has no objection to the proposal (concerns about design).

REPRESENTATIONS

No representation has been received in response to the publicity for the application.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified by letter. Expiry date 13th December 2016

RELEVANT POLICIES

Shepway District Local Plan Review saved policies: SD1, BE1, BE8, BE12

Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan: DSD

NPPF

APPRAISAL

The main considerations in determining this application are the impact of the design on the streetscene, the Area of Special Character, neighbour amenity, and impact on highways.

The design is somewhat unconventional, extending the house forward rather than to the rear. However, the reasoning for this is justified in the accompanying Design and Access Statement. The main front entrance would be removed, with the secondary access to the side of the facade upgraded to become the unitary house entrance. Acknowledging that the proposal is contrary to the traditional dwelling frontage format, and the existing facade features visually pleasing tile hanging; nevertheless, it is not an historic building, and therefore loss of this feature to make way for the pitched roof of the extension and a smaller area of synthetic cladding is not considered significantly detrimental to visual amenity to resist this. It is considered acceptance of this to facilitate a pitched roof, is preferable to a flat roof to the proposed extension to enable the retention of the tile hanging. Furthermore, the front boundary fence would partially screen and dissipate the visual impact of the proposed extension. Overall, the materials and proportions of the proposed extension respect the original, and the contemporary appearance would not look out of place in the urban environment. Further to this the staggered building line would mean that the extending forward of the front elevation would not appear visually incongruous. As such, in the light of the above the proposed modest extension would not be significantly harmful to the appearance of the streetscene in accordance with saved policy BE8.

The site lies within the locally designated Area of Special Character. It is considered the proposed modest extension would not involve the removal of important landscaping, and would not compromise the spacious character of the plot, which remains largely unaffected by the proposal. As such, there would be no conflict with saved policy BE12.

In terms of neighbour amenity, being a front extension and single storey, there would be no residential amenity issues.

The proposal would not compromise the existing driveway parking arrangement, and no new bedrooms would be created. As such, there would be no net change in parking.

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.

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.

Case Officer:

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

Name: Paul Howson Position: Senior Planning Officer Date: 28.12.16

Report and draft decision notice amended (if appropriate)

Name: Position: Date:

Senior Officer

Report not agreed. Details of further work required as follows:

Name: NA Position: Date:

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

Name: Position: Date: