

Officer Report

Application No.	25/1498/FH
Site Address	Building Rear 29 To 37 Broomfield Road, Folkestone, Kent, CT19 4DJ
Officer Name	Lizzy Nash
Proposal	First floor extension to an existing flat roofed, single storey building to include external staircase.

Recommendation

Report Number	RD-438592
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Refused
Recommendation Date	17 October 2025

Report

Site

The proposal building is located behind Broomfield Hall a village hall that hosts various community and private events. The building to the rear of the hall has a flat roof and consists of a single storey with two doors one to the front and one to the rear, no windows are within the ground floor. Form the submitted design and access statement the building is currently used by Folkestone, Hythe and District Model Railway Club. The area to the rear of the building is a shared access road to the rear of the dwellings with several garage outbuildings along its length. The site sits within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone and an Archaeological Notification Area.

Relevant Site History

99/1127/SH – Erection of a replacement garage and storage building – Approved with Conditions
95/0447/SH – Erection of a replacement meeting hall (as amended) – Approved with Conditions

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for the following:

- First floor extension
- Pitched roof with skylights
- Cladding at first floor level
- First floor to be used as a workshop in association with the Model Railway Club

Consultation Responses

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file.

Folkestone Town Council – No Objection.

Environmental Health – No Objection.

KCC Highways and Transportation – No Comment.

Representations

15 Representations have been received 11 objecting to the proposal and 4 in support. These have been summarised below:

Objections:

- Overbearing height
- Visually intrusive
- Loss of light
- Inappropriate materials
- Vehicular access
- Disturbance during construction
- Parking
- Anti-social behaviour
- Environmental impact
- Change of use
- Overdevelopment
- Reduced outlook
- Scale
- Lack of privacy
- Increased Noise

Support:

- Community asset
- Additional space
- No harm to neighbours amenity

Relevant Policies

NPPF and NPPG

Paragraph 11, 48, 131 and 135

Places and Policies Local Plan (PPLP):

HB1 and HB8

Appraisal

Design and Appearance

The proposal seeks to add a first floor to the existing single-storey, flat-roofed building, originally approved in 1999 for storage ancillary to the main Hall. This addition would significantly increase the building's bulk and scale, resulting in a structure that would stand 0.68m taller than the main Hall. The increased height and massing would cause the building to appear visually dominant in relation to the main Hall, creating a discordant and harmful impact on the site's overall appearance.

The building would be clearly visible from the front of the site, rising above the existing Hall, and would also be widely seen from the rear access track shared with residential properties on Broomfield Road and Park Road. This rear area is characterised by modest, single-storey outbuildings and garages, most with flat roofs, serving predominantly residential dwellings. The proposed development, by contrast, would introduce a significantly larger and taller structure that is

uncharacteristic of the surrounding built form. Its scale and prominence would appear excessive and overly dominant, resulting in visual harm and an incongruous addition to the area.

For these reasons, the proposal fails to comply with Policies HB1 and HB8 of the Places and Policies Local Plan 2020.

Residential Amenity

The proposal site is surrounded by residential dwellings both to the north, south and east. The dwellings are all two storey terraced properties with rear amenity spaces that can be accessed from the shared road to the rear.

The dwellings to the east of the site are set over 16 metres away, so the proposal would not lead to a direct increase in overshadowing or loss of light. However, the introduction of additional bulk in an area characterised by modest, single-storey buildings would create a more overbearing presence. Furthermore, the inclusion of skylights within the west-facing roof slope may give rise to a perceived increase in overlooking.

The perceived overbearing impact of the proposal would be particularly pronounced for the occupants of the dwellings to the north and south of the site. In addition, the proposed external staircase—being the sole access to the upper level—would introduce a new source of overlooking, with intensified use further exacerbating the loss of privacy, especially for the rear elevation of 27 Broomfield Road. Although a screen is proposed on the northern side of the staircase, its effectiveness is limited due to the orientation of 27 Broomfield Road to the north-west of the site. Consequently, it would not sufficiently mitigate the level of overlooking. The inclusion of skylights within the west-facing roof slope would further contribute to the loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

The proposed workshop use would be limited to small scale works on models (which is understood to already take place on site) and therefore it is not considered that there would be a significant increase in noise from the proposed first floor extension.

In light of the above the proposal would result in harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants by way of overbearing presence an increase in perceived and actual overlooking.

Highway Safety

The proposal site would increase the floor space of the existing building by approximately 106sqm. Under T2 this would increase the number of parking spaces required by 5. However, the site does not currently have on site parking and is not capable of accommodating vehicles. The surrounding area does not have any on street parking controls and while the site could increase the number of vehicles parking this is not considered to amount to a refusal reason given the existing situation.

Other Matters

The site is within both an Archaeological notification area and SSSI impact risk zone, however due to the minor scale of the development mitigation measures are not required.

Comments have highlighted during construction disturbances, these would be temporary and while unfortunate is not a material planning consideration. The hours of construction could be secured via condition to limit the disturbance caused should the application be recommended for approval.

Similarly, the ecological impact of the development would be limited as the proposal is for the erection of a second storey to an existing building.

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), 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 considered unacceptable and there are no amendments to the proposal that would make it acceptable.

Recommendation

Considering the above, the proposal constitutes poor design would lead to unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants by way of an overbearing presence and increase in overlooking and an overly dominant out of character addition to the area, and it is considered that planning permission should be refused.

Recommended Refusal Reasons (2)

The proposed development, due to its design, bulk, and scale, would form an unduly dominant and visually intrusive addition that fails to remain subordinate to the main building. As a result, it would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the street scene and detract from the character and appearance of both the host building and its surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HB1 and HB8 of the Places and Policies Local Plan 2020.

2

By virtue of its height, scale and siting, the proposed first floor extension would result in an overbearing impact that would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupants. The proposed external staircase would result in an increase in overlooking towards the rear elevation of 27 Broomfield Road that would be detrimental to the privacy of the occupants of this dwelling. The application would therefore be contrary to policies HB1 and HB8 of the adopted Places and Policies Local Plan 2020.

Suggested Informatives (1)

1

Your attention is drawn to the fact that this refusal of planning permission is on the basis of the following submitted documents:

Design and Access Statement (Received: 04/09/2025)

PL12 Proposed First Floor & Roof Plan (Received: 07/08/2025)

PL13 Rev P1 Proposed West & North Elevations (Received: 03/09/2025)

PL14 Rev P1 Proposed East & South Elevations (Received: 03/09/2025)

PL10 Rev P1 Proposed Block Plan (Received: 03/09/2025)

PL11 Rev P1 Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Received: 03/09/2025)