

REPORT SUMMARY

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------|
| REFERENCE NO - 17/502032/FULL | | | |
| APPLICATION PROPOSAL Erection of front porch. | | | |
| ADDRESS 56 Valley Drive Loose Maidstone Kent ME15 9TL | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION Approve Subject to Conditions | | | |
| SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION This current resubmission is considered to overcome the Council's previous reasons for refusal, and the reasons as to why the previous appeal was dismissed. The scale and design of the proposed front porch is in keeping with the existing character and appearance of the property. There is no adverse impact upon the character, appearance and visual amenity of the locality generally. | | | |
| REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Loose Parish Council requested that the application be determined by the planning committee if the case officer was minded to recommend approval. | | | |
| WARD Loose | PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL Loose | APPLICANT Dr Pancholi AGENT Prime Folio Ltd | |
| DECISION DUE DATE 22/06/17 | PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 26/05/17 | OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 05/05/2017 | |
| RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and relevant history on adjoining sites): | | | |
| App No | Proposal | Decision | Date |
| 15/505586/FULL | Single-storey side extension, front porch and first floor extension; First floor sun room and balcony at rear | REFUSED | 03.09.2015 |
| 15/510004/FULL | Erection of a single-storey side extension, front porch extension and first floor rear extension. | REFUSED | 27.01.2016 |
| APP/U2235/D/16 /3150675 | Erection of a single-storey side extension, front porch extension and first floor rear extension. | APPEAL DISMISSED | 12/09/2016 |
| 17/504355/LAWP RO | Lawful Development certificate for proposed single storey side extension and conservatory. Conversion of existing integral garage to bedroom/gym. | PERMITTED | 24/08/2017 |

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The application site is located on the southern end of Valley Drive within the settlement and Parish of Loose. The property is a relatively large detached bungalow on a large, irregular shaped mature garden plot. The application property is of brick construction with a hipped tiled roof. It has a bland main façade featuring a double integral garage. The property is set back from Valley Drive and the immediate neighbouring property to the north no. 54 Valley Drive. The front boundary of the

application site has matured vegetation and trees which screens the site from Valley Drive.

- 1.02 The neighbouring development comprises of a mix detached bungalows of varied design and scale, interspersed with a handful of detached two-storey properties all set within a sizeable and well planted and manicured garden plots. The site is located outside the Loose Valley Conservation Area, which runs along its western boundary. A 1.8 metre high evergreen hedge of Leylandii species runs along the common boundary with the neighbouring dwelling to the north west of the site no 54 Valley Drive. The character of the area is depicted by low scale buildings set well back from the road with generally low boundary wall treatment and glimpses of the countryside beyond.
- 1.03 Part of the application site is defined by the Borough-Wide Local Plan as being within the urban boundary of Maidstone with the other half within the countryside. The part of the site where the development is proposed is within the urban boundary, therefore the relevant development policies would apply.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposed front porch would project 1.7 metres from the front elevation, which constitutes a reduction of 0.5 metres when compared with the previously refused application. It would extend 4 metres across the width of the front elevation which is similar to the width of the previous proposal. It would have a pitched roof which projects out on two supporting timber columns with a brick base. The porch would have a height of 3.5 metres from the ground level, with the roof set significantly below the ridge line of the host dwelling. The porch development would have open sides with a roof light opening on both sections of the pitched roof slopes. The proposed front porch would be stepped in by approximately 0.5 metres from the existing front projection forming the double integral garage.

3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 57, 60 and 61 of the government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Development Plan: Policy H18 Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan, Policy DM8 of the Final Draft of the Maidstone Local Plan
Supplementary Planning Documents: Residential Extensions (May 2009), Loose Road Character Assessment SPD (2008)

4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.01 The owners/occupiers of dwellings adjoining the site were notified of this application by letter and a site notice displayed. Representations were received from neighbouring occupiers of nos. 37, 52 and 54 Valley Drive, objecting to the proposal on the following summarised grounds;
-  Overlooking and loss privacy
 -  Lack of dimension to drawings and conflicting plans for porch
 -  Loss of Leylandii hedge
 -  First step to commercialisation of the site

- 4.02 The planning issues raised by the neighbouring objectors are addressed in the main appraisal section of the report.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.01 Comments received from Loose Parish Council stating that; *“The detail of the extension to the kitchen and conservatory is architecturally not sympathetic to the host property. The poor design does little to address the issues in previously rejected applications. The porch, when viewed from the side of the property is poorly proportioned and detailed relative to the host property. It is noted that the Leylandii hedge is to be removed and replaced with yew. This will open up the rear of no. 54 Valley Drive, resulting in loss of privacy. Yew will take many years to become an effective screen. The application is adjacent to and detrimental to Loose Conservation Area. There is no enhancement”*.

6.0 APPRAISAL

Main Issues

- 6.01 Existing and emerging development plan policies allows for extensions and alterations to dwellings within the settlement boundary. Therefore, the key issues for determination in this submission are the impact of the design and scale of the now proposed front porch on the character and appearance of the application property, the immediate vicinity of the site, and whether it overcomes the comments made by the appeals inspector.
- 6.02 The current re-submission forms part of the previous planning application under reference 15/505586/FULL and 15/510004/FULL for a single-storey side extension, front porch and first floor extension and balcony at rear. Both previous applications were refused on grounds relating to the first floor addition. Officers took no issues with the proposed porch.
- 6.03 The comments now forming the basis of the Loose Parish Council’s objection to the proposed front porch were set out in the appeals inspector report. The inspector considered that the porch addition when viewed from the street would appear as an attractive addition that would serve to break up and modulate an otherwise bland and uninspiring main façade. Whilst the inspector criticised the view of the pitched roof from the side due to its overall projection, it must be noted that this element did not materially form the main basis for the inspector’s decision to dismiss the appeal.
- 6.04 In response to the inspector’s comments, the applicant have reduced the projection of the front porch by 0.5 metres, setting the porch in from the existing garage projection and giving the facade of the dwelling a stepped appearance.
- 6.05 Therefore, it is considered that the current resubmission which has a limited forward projection, is appropriately designed and would not appear overly prominent or detract from the character and appearance of the existing property. In the circumstances, the reduced 1.7 metre forward projection when viewed from the side is acceptable as it would not significantly detract from the existing character and appearance of host dwelling when viewed from within the street. It is considered to overcome the criticism outlined in the inspectors report.

Residential Amenity

- 6.06 The application property is set back from the neighbouring dwelling to the north (no. 54 Valley Drive) by approximately 17 metres. The proposed front porch would not overlook the private amenity space of this neighbouring property or their rear garden.

Other Matters

- 6.10 Comments have been received from neighbours objecting to the proposals on grounds that it is contrary to the Loose Road Character Assessment. However, as indicated in my assessment above, the proposal does not obscure the existing views and connections to the open countryside. The proposal respects the quite residential character and scale of developments on the Valley Drive and therefore considered to protect the character and setting of the nearby Loose Valley Conservation Area and the vicinity of the site generally.
- 6.11 Further comments have been received from neighbouring occupiers objecting to the proposals on grounds that the submitted plans/drawings are conflicting and lack dimension. The submitted plans/drawings are of appropriate dimension and there is no evidence to substantiate the claims made that the submitted scheme is conflicting.
- 6.12 There was one objection from a neighbour stating the dwelling is being set up for commercial use. The submission before members is a full planning application for a side extension, conservatory, front porch and conversion of the existing integral garage. Any new use of this dwelling would require a formal planning application for change of use, which would be determined on its own merit. Therefore, there is no evidence in the current submission to support this contention.
- 6.13 Whilst Loose Parish Council have raised concerns over the loss of the hedge running along the common boundary with the neighbouring dwelling to the north west of the site, this is not classed as development and therefore, cannot be considered as part of the application.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 Overall, the scale, design and use of materials in the proposed front porch is in keeping with the current appearance of the property and considered to overcome the issues raised by the appeals inspector. I recommend that this application is approved subject to appropriate conditions.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS to include

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/drawings received on 27th April, 2017

Planning Committee Report

Drawing Number 15-24-20 Rev C Site Layout

Drawing Number 15-24-21 Rev C Proposed Plans and Elevations

Reason: To ensure the quality of the development is maintained and to prevent harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external work to the front porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

Case Officer: Francis Amekor

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.