

Officer Report

Application No.	24/0090/FH
Site Address	23 Broadfield Road, Folkestone, Kent. CT20 2JT
Officer Name	Macey Douglas
Proposal	Conversion of existing side garage to provide a home office, erection of a first-floor side extension above the garage and the erection of a single storey rear extension.

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-434170
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Approve with Conditions
Recommendation Date	02 April 2024

Report

Site

The application site is within the settlement boundary of Folkestone to the northern side of Broadfield Road. The application property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with an adjoining flat roof single garage. The property is finished in a mixture of red facing brickwork with pebble dashing to the first-floor elevation. It also features uPVC fenestrations throughout and a ceramic tile roof. There is suitable parking for two off street parking spaces.

Site History

23/1271/FH - Division of semi-detached house into 2 separate houses, conversion of existing side garage with additional storey above and single storey rear ground floor extension - Withdrawn by applicant

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension and the erection of a first-floor extension above the existing garage in the form of a catslide roof to provide two ensuite bathrooms for the two main bedrooms on the first floor. The proposal also includes the conversion of the existing adjoining garage. The proposed garage conversion would serve a home office. The garage door would be replaced by a secondary door as well as windows either side of the door.

The rear extension would measure the width of the existing host property, at a height of 3.8m and a depth of 3.75m.

The introduction of a catslide roof, first floor extension would measure the depth of the existing garage below.

The materials proposed to be used are to match the existing property.

Consultation Responses

Folkestone Town Council – No objection but raised concerns regarding disruption to the symmetry of the original design of the property

Publicity

Neighbour Letters Sent – Expiry 07/03/2024

Site Notice Displayed - Expiry 06/03/2024

Representations

No representations received.

Relevant Policies

NPPF and NPPG:

The NPPF and NPPG broadly support minor householder development subject to general amenity considerations – Paragraphs 12, 131

Places and Policies Local Plan (2020):

HB1 (Quality Places Through Design), HB8 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings)

Core Strategy Review (2022)

Appraisal

Design and Visual Appearance

The single storey rear extension would extend across the entire width of the rear elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed rear extension is considered to be of an acceptable scale and would appear as adjunct to the existing property.

The proposal includes the addition of a first-floor extension in the form of a catslide roof above the existing adjoining garage to accommodate the addition of two new ensuite bathrooms. The catslide roof extension has been designed to match the neighbouring property at no. 21 Broadfield Road and would not therefore be an uncommon feature within the street scene. Furthermore, the use of the catslide roof form would reduce the dominance of the extension within the street scene and would retain an element of spacing between the neighbouring properties at first floor level to prevent an undue terracing effect within the street scene. Therefore, the proposed cat slide extension is considered to be acceptable in this instance. The introduction of two roof lights to the slope of the catslide and small window to the front would not present as unacceptable additions to the property.

The proposed garage conversion would involve the replacement of the existing garage door with two new windows and secondary front door as well as infilling the remaining space with matching facing brickwork. The addition of a secondary access door to the front elevation is not commonly found on other properties within the street scene, however it is not itself considered to result in a level of harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider street scene sufficient enough to warrant refusal.

Concern has been raised regarding the potential that the proposed development may have regarding unbalancing the symmetry of the existing pair of semidetached properties. However, given that both of the properties have previously been altered/extended yond their original built form, their symmetry has already been affected. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in further and unacceptable unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached

dwelling. It is not considered that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwellings within the street scene.

All elements of the proposed development would seek to use materials to match the host dwelling. This is considered to be an acceptable approach.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension to the rear of the property would measure 3.80 metres in height with a depth of 3.75 metres. The proposed single storey extension to the rear of the property would contravene the 45-degree angle when measured from the centre of the nearest ground floor window of the neighbouring property to the east (no. 25 Broadfield Road) as well as the 25-degree angle. However, the existing 1.80-metre-high boundary fence also results in a degree of overshadowing to this neighbouring property and therefore it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a significant loss of light above and beyond the existing circumstances to such a degree as to warrant refusal.

Further to this, it is of note that the portion of the extension which would contravene both the 25-degree and 45-degree angle would be able to be achieved under the householder permitted development rights which provides a significant fallback position.

Turning to its potential impact upon the neighbouring property of no. 21 Broadfield Road to the west, the proposed single storey extension would not contravene the 45-degree angle when measured from the nearest ground floor window. Therefore, it would not result in a loss of light.

No side elevational openings are proposed to the proposed rear extension and would therefore not provide an opportunity for interlooking or overlooking, thus protecting the privacy of neighbouring occupants.

Turning to the proposed first floor cat slide extension above the existing garage, given that it would not extend towards the front or rear of the host dwelling being located entirely within the footprint of the existing single storey garage to the side and therefore would have no impact upon the neighbouring property to the east (no. 23).

In regard to its potential impact to no. 21 to the west of the application site, whilst the side extension would be opposite the western neighbouring properties roof light within their cat slide roof, the proposed extension would not contravene the 25-degree angle and would not result in a loss of light or overbearing impact upon this neighbouring property. Furthermore, given that it features a cat slide roof, the proposed first floor extension would not result in any further impact above and beyond the existing circumstances resulting from the flat roof garage.

In regard to the potential for interlooking or overlooking to no. 21 from the two proposed roof lights, given their orientation within the roof slope, it is unlikely that this will allow for a loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants. However, given the close proximity to this neighbouring property, to prevent any undue loss of privacy to this neighbouring property, in the event of an approval a condition shall be imposed requiring the rooflights to be obscure glazed and non-opening to prevent a loss of privacy. The roof lights would provide light into non habitable spaces (utility rooms and w.c's) at first floor and ground floor and secondary light into the master bedroom at second floor. The obscure glazing required to prevent overlooking would not impact on outlook,

where other windows are present serving bedroom spaces and would continue to allow for appropriate light serving these rooms.

The proposed garage conversion itself would not extend to the front or rear of the host dwelling with the extension at first floor assessed above. Therefore, it would not result in a loss of light or overbearing impact to neighbouring properties.

New openings are proposed to the front elevation of the existing garage following its conversion. The openings to the front elevation would only overlook the driveway to the front of the property and therefore would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy through interlooking to surrounding neighbouring dwellings.

In light of the above the proposed development would not result in harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants by way of loss of light, overbearing impact or a loss of privacy through interlooking or overlooking.

Highway Safety

Kent County Council no longer recognises garages as formal parking spaces. Under Policy T2 of the PPLP two off street parking spaces should be available for three or more-bedroom properties. To the front of the dwelling there is an existing area of hard standing sufficient to provide two off street parking spaces and the proposed development would not lead to the loss of this hard standing and the existing two off street parking spaces would remain and continue to meet the aims of Policy T2 in this regard.

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.

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.

We reverted back to the applicant requesting more details yet those provided failed to meet the requirements.

Recommendation

Taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the proposal is sustainable development which complies with the development plan policy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommended Conditions (4)

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 following approved drawings and documents:

P0600 - Site Location and Proposed Block Plan - received 22/01/2024

P2110 - Proposed Elevations - received 22/01/2024

A2010 - Proposed Ground and First Floor Plan - received 22/01/2024

P2011 - Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plan - received 22/01/2024

P2700 - Proposed External Views, received 22/01/2024

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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details of materials as specified in the application form received 22/01/2024 both in

colour, type and texture.

Reason:

In the interests of visual amenity.

4

The two roof lights, to be installed within the roof slope of the catlside extension to the side of the dwelling hereby approved, shall be obscure glazed to not less than the equivalent of Pilkington Glass Privacy Level 3, and these windows shall be incapable of being opened and subsequently be maintained as such.

Reason: To prevent interlooking from adjoining properties to the extension and safeguard the privacy of occupants.