

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 17/502264/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL New double garage.			
ADDRESS 56 Valley Drive Loose Maidstone Kent ME15 9TL			
RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION/REASONS FOR REFUSAL The proposed garage development, compiles with policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000)), provisions set out in the SPD for Residential Extensions (2009) and the Loose Road Character Assessment SPD (2008), and there are no adverse impacts on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the vicinity of the site generally. The double garage development does not result in any adverse impacts on the amenities of surrounding occupiers. The proposals would preserve the existing character of the nearby Loose Valley Conservation Area.			
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	
DECISION DUE DATE 30/06/17	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 04/06/2017	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 12/05/2017	
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including appeals and 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/16/3 150675	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 uninspiring 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.
- 1.03 Part of the application site is defined by the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000) 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 polices would apply.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The detached double garage would be sited 3.5 metres from the north facing front elevation of the application property, close to the common boundary with the neighbouring dwelling to the north of the site (no.54 Valley Drive). It would be located approximately 7 metres from the rear south western elevation of this neighbouring dwelling, retaining a gap of between 1 to 3 metres with the common boundary. The distance from the front boundary of the site and the location of the double garage would be 35 metres.
- 2.02 The proposed double garage would have a width of 6.5 metres and a depth of 6.5 metres. It would be 4.2 metres in height from the natural ground level to the highest part of the roof, with eaves at 2.3 metres. The garage development would have a hipped roof with two south west facing garage door openings, each 2 metres in width. The proposal incorporates a door and small window on the southern elevation facing onto the host dwelling.
- 2.03 Design Amendments have been submitted removing the element of the proposals involving replacement of the Leylandi boundary hedging running along the common boundary with the neighbouring dwelling to the north west of the site (no.54 Valley Drive) with Yew hedge.

3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.01 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 56 and 57 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. 52, 54, 56 Valley Drive, objecting to the proposal on the following summarised grounds;

- ✚ Scale and form overbearing and out of character with Valley Drive
- ✚ Conflicting plans and lack of dimensions to drawings
- ✚ Loss of privacy resulting from the proposed removal of Leylandii hedge
- ✚ Proposals contrary to Loose Road Character Assessment document

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 **Loose Parish Council:** objects to the proposals and comments that: *The proposals do not enhance the streetscene. The proposed garage being in front of the existing bungalow will upset the setting of the bungalow. The height and size of this application is too big for position it is sited in and higher than most of the adjacent bungalows. The ratio of plan area to height is not aesthetic. The total mass of proposals is unacceptable. It detracts from the architectural integrity of the whole - as identified in the last Planning Inspectorate report. Valley Drive is an area of low scale buildings set back off the road. A feature of the Valley Drive properties is the adequate space around each property and this garage application impacts on the adjoining properties creating a cramped view along the north flank It has been noted that the hedge is to be removed and replaced. This will open up the visibility into the rear of 54 Valley Drive. Planting yew hedge will not mitigate this as yews take many years to grow to an adequate height No 56 is adjacent to the Loose Conservation area. Proposals should give enhancement to the character and setting of the conservation area. These proposals do not do so.*

6.0 APPRAISAL

Main Issues

6.01 Existing and emerging development plan policies allows for extensions and alterations to dwellings within the settlement boundary. The key issues for consideration and determination in this application are;

- The impact of the proposal on the space surrounding the application property.
- The impact of the garage development on the character of the general vicinity of the site.
- The impact of the development on the amenities of surrounding owners/occupiers.

Character and appearance of the area

6.02 The application property forms part five individually designed properties to the southern end of 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. The application site is screened by tall conifers, which terminates the views from within the street. Therefore, the proposed double

garage building by virtue of its design, scale and distance from the boundary, will not be readily visible from within the street at Valley Drive

- 6.03 At a height of approximately 4.2 metres from the ground level to the highest point of the hipped roof, the proposed garage development would be slightly lower in comparison to the main dwelling at the site, which is 5 metres at its highest point. Therefore, the garage building by virtue of its height, scale, design and siting slightly to the north west of the façade of the host dwelling, would appear as a subordinate and unassuming change within the curtilage of the dwelling.
- 6.07 The roof of the garage building would be hipped which is similar to the roof of the main dwelling, and given its scale and siting to the north west of the façade of the main building, the garage development would not appear of excessive bulk and massing when seen in the context of the site and neighbouring developments. Therefore, I do not believe that the garage development would appear cramped or significantly overwhelm the form of the host dwelling or the adjacent dwellings.
- 6.08 As indicated above, the neighbouring dwelling to the north west of the site (no.54 Valley Drive) is set forward of the application property by a distance of approximately 17 metres. Therefore, the garage building would be to the rear south east of this property and set back from it by approximately 7.5 metres. This neighbouring dwelling has a detached garage of a slightly smaller scale on its frontage. This dwelling is well screened from the application site by the established Leylandi hedge that runs along the common boundary with the application site. In the context of the site, the appearance of the application property that would result from addition of the detached double garage would not detract from the existing character and appearance of the area.
- 6.09 The neighbouring dwelling to the east of the site (no.41 Valley Drive) has a carport of similar scale and height to that proposed at the application site to its north western frontage. Given the presence of similar garage developments on the frontage of the neighbouring dwellings, it would be difficult to sustain any overriding planning objections to the proposed garage development which is essentially of a similar scale.
- 6.10 Overall, in terms of visual appearance, it is not considered that the impact of the proposed garage development would be any more significant than the existing garage and carport on the frontage of two neighbouring properties. Although, proposed to the north western facade of the host dwelling, the garage development would be proportionate to the scale of the application property. The garage development would not be prominent when viewed from within the street at Valley Drive.
- 6.11 The application states that external surfacing materials would be similar to those used in the construction of the existing dwelling.

Residential Amenity

- 6.12 The application property is set back from Valley Drive by approximately 42 metres, with views from the streetscene terminated by the established vegetation along its front boundary. The proposed garage building would be set back from Valley Drive by approximately 35 metres and sympathetically sited close to the north western boundary to minimise its impact on the façade of the main dwelling. Given that it would be located approximately 7 metres to the south eastern rear of this neighbouring dwelling to the north west of the site, it would not have any significant adverse impact on this property in terms of overshadowing, loss of privacy or views in any direction.

- 6.13 The garage application proposes a small window and a door on its southern elevation facing onto the host dwelling, which would not overlook the private amenity space of this neighbouring property or their rear garden. It is noted that the element of the proposal involving replacing the existing Leylandii hedge along the north western boundary with yew has been completely removed from the scheme in design amendments submitted to the Council. Therefore, the existing boundary treatment and separating distances with neighbouring dwellings would maintain acceptable levels of privacy.

Other Matters

- 6.14 In terms, of landscaping the submitted plans whilst showing some details of the existing driveway and the proposed garages do not indicate any additional landscaping within the site. As indicated above, the applicant has submitted design amendments removing the element of the proposal involving replacement of the existing Leylandii hedge with Yew. Considering that the site has a well landscaped front garden which would be retained, I do not consider it necessary to impose a landscaping condition requiring submission of details of landscaping within the site.
- 6.15 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 quiet 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.
- 6.16 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.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.01 The proposed development, compiles with policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000), the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions (2009) and the Loose Road Character Assessment SPD (2008) and there are no adverse impacts on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the vicinity of the site generally. The double garage development does not result in any unacceptable impact on the amenities of surrounding occupiers. The proposals would preserve the existing character of the nearby Loose Valley Conservation Area.
- 7.02 The proposal is acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, the NPPF and all other relevant material considerations. There are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning permission and the recommendation is to approve planning permission

8.0 RECOMMENDATION – GRANT Subject to the following conditions:

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; Drawing Number 15-24-LP - Site Location Plan; Drawing Number 15-24-13 - Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan; Drawing Number 15-24-10 – Proposed Site Layout received on the 27th of April, 2017.

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

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

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development

4. The double garage hereby approved shall only be used for car parking purposes incidental to domestic use of the related dwelling house known as 56 Valley Drive and for no other purpose whatsoever including any form of open storage.

Reason: In accordance with Policy DM27 and SPG 'Kent Vehicle Parking Standards' (2006) to ensure satisfactory parking at the site.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) no alterations shall be made to the double garage building hereby permitted without first obtaining the prior approval in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the general locality.

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.