

Planning Department <planning@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk>

12/6/2024 - 2:39 pm

To: info@credo-planning.co.uk

I refer to our pre-application meeting discussion on 27.11.2024 regarding the above site.

Following that meeting I provide below comments on the amended scheme which should be considered should an application for planning permission be submitted.

Site

The application site is within the defined settlement boundary of Folkestone and a short distance from the defined main town centre area. The application property is part of a four-storey building (lower ground, ground, first and second floors) located on the northeastern side of an open forecourt used for the storage of vehicles awaiting repair, but also fronting onto St Michaels Street. The application property can be accessed via an alley way from Dover Road, with the property above accessed from St Michaels Street.

The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of residential uses above commercial uses in Tontine Street/Dover Road, with properties varying significantly in architectural styles and eras.

Proposal

The pre-application submission seeks to overcome the 3 reasons of refusal for 24/0574/FH. The submission is supported by a site location/block plan, proposed floor plan, proposed elevation plan and a 7-page supporting statement.

Local Plan Policy

Places & Policies Local Plan (PPLP) 2020 □ Places and Policies Local Plan Adopted September 2020

Core Strategy Review 2022 □ Folkestone & Hythe District Council Core Strategy Review 2022

NPPF

NPPG

COMMENTS

Refusal reason 1 □

External space:

□ The external space in the rear external garden would be somewhat reduced from that shown within 24/0574/FH as the existing extension would only be partially demolished to retain a balcony at first floor (to overcome refusal reason 2).

□ To help counter the above and to increase external space overall, the external amenity area to the north elevation would now also form amenity space in place of the previously proposed driveway.

□ We discussed that the loss of the parking space here would not be overly problematic in this edge of centre location as the requirement for 1 parking space is a maximum requirement. Further, there is parking available along St Michaels Street. You could address the availability of (permit) on street parking in any written planning statement to account for the omission of the parking space previously proposed.

□ Although neither of the external spaces are of particularly high quality, the two combined spaces would go some way to alleviate concerns with external amenity issues.

□ The newly formed space to the north elevation fronting Dover Road would need a suitable boundary treatment.

□ We also discussed highlighting the nearby public recreational areas in any planning statement.

Internal space of the living/kitchen area:

□ There is limited change to this space although the floor area is to be slightly increased by the partial retention of the existing extension to accommodate the balcony above.

□ Consideration needs to be given as to how to avoid unneighbourly noise disturbance arising from use of the balcony impacting the internal living space of future occupiers. Some form of sound insulation? This could be covered with section drawings and/or forming part of any written planning statement.

□ Maximising light spill into the room should be considered as the only light source to this space is from the windows on the southwest elevation.

Bedroom 1:

□ An ensuite has been introduced to bedroom 1 which will sit along the elevation with the shared access, thereby overcoming issues here with privacy to the bedroom from the shared access.

□ The window serving the en-suite would need to be obscure-glazed and non-opening below 1.7m from internal finished floor level.

□ If the window is to be openable then the opening must not be at a height that could injure persons using the access. The position of the window and any method of opening needs to be included on any forthcoming plans.

□ It would need to be confirmed that the retained bedroom meets space standards.

□ The sole window now serving this bedroom has the potential to be overlooked by persons using the access. We discussed installing a boundary treatment to overcome this. The materials and appearance of the boundary treatment would need to be provided as part of any forthcoming application submission.

□ Outlook here would be over the newly formed private amenity area which is an improvement over views of the open parking space.

Bedroom 2:

□ The windows serving this bedroom have been moved and the bedroom now has a view into the depth of the rear external garden area (approx. 3.3m depth) which is an improvement on the plans submitted under 24/074/FH which also showed views onto the boundary fence serving the narrow access.

□ We discussed relocating the bike storage to improve outlook from bedroom 2.

□ A proposed fence on the boundary with the commercial area has been shown within the submitted preapplication statement to demonstrate light levels/privacy levels. It is understood from the information provided that the ground level of the commercial area is lower than that of the application site. It would be helpful to show that via a section drawing (through east to west) as well as part of any forthcoming application for clarity. This would also cover amenity of the living/kitchen space as well.

Other:

□ The proposed floor plan shows changes to the layout including the relocation of the access door and hallway layout. There is no concern with these changes.

Refusal reason 2 -

□ The preapplication proposes to only partially demolish the extension and rebuild the balcony at first floor in order to overcome this refusal reason.

□ We discussed serving notice on other owners/interested parties. The application forms set out when notice needs to be served.

□ The proposed site address provided on any planning application form needs to cover both the ground floor and first floor address point.

□ Details of materials and appearance of the balcony would need to be shown on any forthcoming plans.

Refusal reason 3:

□ The officers report for 24/0574/FH mentions a lack of supporting evidence with regard to any impact between the relationship of the existing commercial unit and the proposed residential unit.

□ Whilst there is planning history associated with the site, the lawful use if any remains unclear.

□ The preapplication submission provides information in this regard which does go toward establishing how the two sites would co-exist any why the use of the preapplication site for residential purposes would not be detrimental to the amenity of the future occupiers.

□ It appears the area is used for the parking of vehicles and that this has been the case for a number of years, lawful or otherwise. Notwithstanding, we discussed that it would not be reasonable for the Local Planning Authority to go as far as seeking a Lawful Development Certificate to establish the use of a unit not connected to the application site.

□ To seek to overcome this refusal reason I advise submitting supporting evidence to demonstrate how the commercial unit would not impact upon the amenity of future occupiers. The preapplication submission has already gone towards achieving this.

□ Points raised regarding the content of the NPPF and other planning history for residential use in the nearby vicinity are noted and will be taken into consideration as part of any application process.

Other issues -

The site would be CIL liable although the rate currently is calculated at £0.00.

I trust the meeting and the information above has been of assistance with regard to pursuing future redevelopment of the site.

Kind regards,

Katy Claw
Planning Officer

This advice is based solely on the information that has been provided in the pre application submission and does not take into account the views of statutory consultees and other third parties that would be consulted as part of any subsequent planning application, or unforeseen material planning issues that may arise during the processing of the application. Consequently, whilst this is the advice of officers, it does not guarantee any subsequent decision made or action taken by the Council in relation to the proposal when full account has been taken of all material considerations following the submission of a formal application.

