

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

AREA 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE

09 July 2009

Report of the Chief Solicitor.

Part 1- Public

Matters for Information

1 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

- 1.1 Site **6 Jerome Road, Larkfield**
Appeal **Against the refusal of permission for a dwelling adjacent to the current dwelling**
Appellant **Mr Dunster**
Decision **Appeal dismissed**
Background papers file: PA/04/09

Contact: Cliff Cochrane
01732 876038

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Two previous proposals for a dwelling on this site were refused due to the impact on the street scene and the occupants of the dwellings to the rear.

The proposed bungalow would replace the existing garage and face towards Jerome Road. It would maintain the staggered building line of the adjacent dwellings, but would differ considerably in terms of its scale and roof form. Although it would be similar in appearance to the existing bungalows in Christie Drive, due to its prominent position at the entrance to the estate it would be viewed in conjunction with the neighbouring two storey dwellings. The Inspector considered that it would fail to integrate with or complement these dwellings and would detract from the overall appearance of the estate.

The existing landscaped verge to the side and rear of the proposed bungalow would be maintained. However, at the front of the appeal site, the proposed parking spaces would extend into the landscaped area and dominate the appearance of both the existing and proposed dwelling, and thereby detract from the spacious, well landscaped appearance of the estate.

The Inspector therefore concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would fail to comply with policy CP24 of the Core Strategy.

- 1.2 Site **251 Lunsford Lane, Larkfield**
 Appeal **Against the refusal of permission for the erection of a 3 bedroom house**
 Appellant **Mr A Pask**
 Decision **Appeal allowed**
 Background papers file: PA/03/09 Contact: Cliff Cochrane
01732 876038

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Properties either side of the appeal site are detached and semi-detached two-storey houses set back from the road with large rear gardens. The gap between no's 251 and 253, which forms the appeal site, is uncharacteristically wide.

Given the openness of the area surrounding the Lunsford Lane/Gighill Road, junction, the narrowness of the front elevation of the proposed dwelling, and the spacing between the development and neighbouring properties, the Inspector did not consider that the proposal would result in cramped or overcrowded development which would be out of keeping with, or cause unacceptable harm to, the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the appearance of the proposal will not match that of its immediate neighbours, given the varied appearance of properties in the surrounding area, the Inspector did not find that the proposed dwelling would have an incongruous appearance which would be out of keeping.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed dwelling would be designed to respect its site and surroundings and would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with the aims and objective of Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007.

- 1.3 Site **Rear of 173 Lunsford Lane, Larkfield**
 Appeal **Against the refusal of permission for a new two bedroom bungalow including integral garage, parking and amenity areas**
 Appellant **Mr Stephen Brooker**
 Decision **Appeal dismissed**
 Background papers file: PA/05/09 Contact: Cliff Cochrane
01732 876038

The Inspector considered there to be two main issues:

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and

- Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants with particular regard to privacy.

Character and appearance

The appeal site forms part of the rear garden of 173 Lunsford Lane, a two bedroom semi-detached house. Planning permission has been granted for a detached dwelling adjacent to the existing dwelling, although construction has not commenced.

Policy CP24 of the Core Strategy requires new development to respect the scale, density and layout of the site and surrounding area.

Lunsford Lane is characterised by predominantly frontage development. Due to the narrow width of the access and the distance from the proposed bungalow from Lunsford Lane the Inspector considered that it would not intrude unduly on the street scene. Nevertheless it would be clearly visible from the surrounding dwellings and gardens. The long rear gardens of dwellings in Lunsford Lane form a tranquil and secluded area. The proposal would occupy almost two thirds of the existing rear garden of 173. The Inspector considered that together with the substantial parking and turning area, the proposed bungalow would appear as an area of more intensive development out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The activities associated with the proposal, in particular the cars and other vehicles visiting the site, would add to this impression.

The Inspector acknowledged that the proposed materials would blend with the surrounding dwellings but the proposal would fail to reflect the scale and proportions of other dwellings in the locality, and would not integrate with or compliment the established linear pattern of development that characterises this part of Lunsford Lane. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would fail to comply with Core Strategy policy CP24.

Living conditions

Whilst there would be a degree of overlooking from the first floor of the surrounding dwellings, in the Inspector's opinion this would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants of the proposed dwelling. On this issue the Inspector therefore concluded that the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants and in this respect would comply with Core Strategy policy CP24.

Ian Henderson
Chief Solicitor