

Officer Report

Application No.	20/1643/FH
Site Address	138 Wear Bay Road, Folkestone, CT19 6PY, CT19 6PZ
Officer Name	Natasha McCann
Proposal	Erection of a rear extension and minor alterations to main dwelling

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-423729
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Approve with Conditions
Recommendation Date	22 December 2020

Report

Site Visit

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic it was not possible to undertake a site visit in person. However, appropriate assessment was possible via aerial photographs and google street maps.

Site Description

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling located within the settlement boundary of Folkestone. The building has a render finish with a tiled roof. It is noted that the host site benefits from a detached garage which aligns with the principle elevation, a rear conservatory and a detached outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling which adjoins and mirrors a building within the adjoining neighbours site.

Relevant site history

No relevant site history.

It is noted that there is no evidence of planning permission for the existing rear conservatory however given the condition of the existing conservatory and compliance with permitted development requirements, the existing conservatory is considered to be lawful due to the passage of time.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension to accommodate an enlarged open plan kitchen/dining/living area and associated alterations to the original dwelling following the demolition of the existing rear conservatory and detached outbuilding. The proposed single storey

rear extension would measure 7m wide x 6.4m deep x 4.2m high to the ridge of the proposed pitched roof. The single storey rear extension would include 1no full length rear elevation door and gable window and 1no side elevation window. The single storey rear extension would be constructed in natural timber weatherboarding, matching interlocking roof tiles and painted timber framed windows. The proposed works would include extending the cladding along the flank wall of the original dwelling, demolition the chimney above roof level, 1no new side elevation window and 1no rooflight to the front and rear roof slope.

It is noted that amended plans have been received during the lifetime of the application which has amended the proposed roof from a-symmetric to pitch whilst reducing the height to the ridge.

Consultation responses

Parish Council: No objection however stated that initial design was not in keeping with the character of the area.

Representations

None received.

Publicity

The application was publicised in accordance with the regulations.

Relevant policies

Core Strategy Local Plan:

DSD (Delivering Sustainable Development).

Places and Policies Local Plan:

HB1 (Quality Places Through Design), HB8 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Buildings) and T2 (Parking Standards).

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. Following changes to national policy, a further consultation was undertaken from 20 December 2019 to 20 January 2020 on proposed changes to policies and text related to housing supply. The Core Strategy Review was then submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 10 March 2020.

Accordingly, it is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications in accordance with the NPPF, which states that the more advanced the stage that an emerging plan has reached, the greater the weight that may be given to it (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 and NPPG:

The NPPF and NPPG broadly support minor householder development subject to general amenity considerations - Paragraphs 12, 124, 127.

Appraisal

Design and visual appearance

Policy HB1 says, amongst other things, that planning permission will be granted where the proposal makes a positive contribution to its location and surroundings, enhancing integration while also respecting existing buildings and land uses, particularly with regard to layout, scale, proportions, massing, form, density, materiality and mix of uses so as to ensure all proposals create places of character.

Policy HB8 says 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, either by themselves or cumulatively.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just in the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history;
- d) establish and maintain a strong sense of place;
- e) optimise site potential; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

The host dwelling is set within a mixed street scene in terms of design, scale and materials with several of the surrounding buildings having been extended beyond that of their original built form, particularly along the rear building line. As such, the proposed extension and associated alterations including the introduction of weatherboarding and cladding is not considered to appear incongruous to the existing street scene and would be an acceptable addition to the prevailing pattern of development.

The proposed single storey rear extension would align with the original side elevation and set wholly to the rear of the dwelling therefore would not be immediately visible from the public realm resulting in minimal impact to the existing street scene. The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the footprint of the existing conservatory and detached outbuilding therefore precedent of development to this depth is considered to be met and would not significantly alter the rear building line. The proposed single storey rear extension would measure less than the depth of the rear garden and would not extend beyond the original side elevation, therefore the proposed

scale of the extension is not considered to overwhelm the existing site and would retain a sense of openness to the side and rear of the plot which is noted to be an important characteristic of the residential area. The proposed angle of the pitched roof would align with the original roof form, set down below the original ridge height and therefore generally hidden from the frontage of the site reducing the visual impact of the extension. The proposed pitched roof is considered to blend well with the original roof form and would align with the eaves of the dwelling which would create conformity between the host dwelling and rear extension.

The proposed fenestration to the rear extension and addition side elevation window to the original flank wall is considered to respect the proportions of the dwelling and therefore acceptable. The proposed gable window would reflect similar high level windows to rear conservatories along Wear Bay Road and is therefore not considered to appear dominating or out of character. The proposed rooflights to the front and rear elevation are considered to be modestly located and are a common feature of the area. The proposed reduction in chimney height is not considered to harm the appearance of the dwelling. The proposed addition of cladding to the side elevation and weatherboarding to the rear elevation is not considered to have a jarring appearance in the context of the surrounding area, given the variety of materials that exist and the presence of cladding at nearby properties directly adjacent to the host dwelling. Overall, the introduction of new materials is not considered to result in a level of harm which would warrant refusal.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would appear in keeping with the overall form, detailing and proportions of the main house and would not cause harm to the existing street scene or character of the area.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the footprint of the existing rear conservatory and detached outbuilding which extends approx. 5.8m beyond the original rear elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed single storey rear extension would subsequently finish approx. 0.6m beyond the rear elevation of the detached outbuilding at both the host site and adjoining neighbour. By virtue of the existing layout, the proposed depth is not considered to breach the 45 degree rule beyond that existing and would not result in a level of overshadowing, loss of sunlight or overbearing impact beyond that of the existing situation. The proposed rear extension would not include any side elevation windows facing the adjoining property and therefore would not cause undue overlooking or loss of privacy upon No 136.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be set forward approx. 3m beyond the rearmost elevation of the adjacent neighbour at No 140 set in 4m from the boundary. As such, given the sufficient separation distance the proposed extension is not considered to result in an increased level of overshadowing or overbearing impact upon the adjacent property. The proposed extension would include 2 new side elevation windows resulting in an increased level of overlooking to the west however it is noted that the proposed openings would be largely shielded from the adjacent property by the existing boundary treatment and neighbouring garage and therefore are not considered to cause undue overlooking or loss of privacy.

On balance, the proposal is considered to safeguard neighbouring amenity and meets the aims of local planning policy in this regard.

Parking and highways

The proposed development would not result in any additional bedrooms within the property, nor would it alter the existing parking or access arrangements on site. As such, the proposal is considered to have no impact on parking or highways.

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.

Duty to cooperate

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a pre-application advice service and, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application. In this instance the application was acceptable as submitted.

Recommendation

Taking the above into account, 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.

Recommended Conditions (3)

1

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the

expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:

- Drawing 580-PP-01: Received 26th October 2020
- Drawing 580-PP-02: Received 26th October 2020
- Drawing 580-PP-03: Received 26th October 2020
- Drawing 580-PP-04 Rev A: Received 18th December 2020
- Drawing 580-PP-05 Rev A: Received 18th December 2020
- Drawing 580-PP-06 Rev A: Received 18th December 2020
- Drawing 580-PP-07: Received 18th December 2020

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in order to ensure the satisfactory implementation of the development in accordance with the aims of Places and Policies Local Plan.

3

The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those illustrated on Drawing 580-PP-05 Rev A received 18th December 2020 in terms of type, colour, and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.