

Justification for Appeal for the refusal of case ref: 6/2018/0776/EM

**Proposal: Erection of a front porch, alterations to elevations and removal of a front hedge**

We wanted to appeal Estate Management Decision on following grounds:

**1. Moving the door location:**

We have a shared driveway and even if we enclose the existing canopy to match the street scene (as suggested over the phone by our current case officer in an informal conversation) that would restrict the access to our garage and reversing the car in the driveway. On street parking here is a nightmare already. It has now started to affect the neighbourhood relations as well. It will also affect the parking scenario for house no. 9 due to shared drive. We do not want to intrude on a shared driveway that would spoil our relations with our neighbours. Also, we have been up and down the street and there is not as such a particular pattern. There are semi detached houses on the street with the front entrance: number 31 and 33, some end of terrace have front entrance e.g.- number 15 and some end of terrace has the side entrance e.g. number 9. Photos

11\_Lady\_Grove\_Shared\_drive\_1, 11\_Lady\_Grove\_Shared\_drive\_2 and 11\_Lady\_Grove\_Shared\_drive\_3 support the above justification. The location of our plot is on a T-junction; we are on Lady Grove and opposite is Pinnate Place; there is never going to be a possibility of a symmetry on a T-junction plot.

**2. Building the Porch:**

We were initially planning for a rear extension but due to the angle of the property we cannot extend properly and there are more complications to do so. While we were still working with the architect regarding that we found out we are expecting another child and hence cannot vacate the property for 4 months (rear extension time frame) especially with another toddler in the house too. Hence, we had to reduce the workload and opt for front extension (1 month time frame without disruption to the rest of the house) in order to increase the need of space as the family expands. We cannot have a full rear extension purely because our house is built at an angle, due to the limited plot space. We also maintain our limited rear garden space for our family's outdoor use. Having a part extension, would neither suffice the space requirements, nor justify the loss of part garage and limited part garden space that we currently have. Photos referenced

11\_lady\_grove\_rear\_1, 11\_lady\_grove\_rear\_2, 11\_lady\_grove\_rear\_3 are attached to support this justification.

In terms of the existing modifications that can be seen on Lady Grove, below are some examples:

a) House numbers 17,19,37 & 41, which have a small, porch like entrance (enclosed canopy)

In view of our planning application, this would help us shuffle our internal planning to make kitchen/diner and lounge with enough space for play area. This will make our internal structure as well like number 37 (verified on Rightmove) and most of other houses on this street.

Since we have a shared driveway, we cannot have porch build on the side. Hence we applied for relocation of the door and then erection of porch which would look smarter compared to the side porch and would not affect the shared space between us and no 9. If anything regarding street scene it will match the street even better.

We have applied for a little bigger porch than just an enclosed canopy (similar to the above mentioned houses) and this purely taking into account the hygienic requirement of utilising that space for downstairs landing space and shoes removal whilst entering the house. This would also provide us with added security of having two doors instead of one front door. With kids in the house last thing we would want is shoes coming inside the living space.

b) Number 46 has an enclosed canopy like structure and have made a wooden porch like erection, which looks even more alien to the neighbourhood as it does not even match the original building works. In that case, our plan consists of closely matching to the existing building work and we are applying for a proper cavity wall and fully insulated build including windows in appropriate position to make it symmetrical.

In our justification, in order to make the property look more within the surroundings, we have applied for a complete brickwork porch after moving the door to the front. The modified plan has been attached, which shows that from the previously submitted porch size, we have reduced the size further from 3 sq. m to 2.25 sq. m.

Under permitted development rights, a porch is part of permitted development. Until the estate management will not approve one, there will be no houses around the area that would be able to start building them. If as part of the Estate management plan porch is something that is not going to be approved then we would have appreciated if it would have been written on the website or Estate management planning policy so there would be no waste of time, money and resources. We had initial discussions about this with the duty officer as well, and all we were informed was to make an application.

Nationally under permitted development laws, people can build a good-sized (3 sq. m max) porch for security and space reasons, whereas it is unfair on us that due to estate management regulations, those rules of national permitted development regulation cannot be applied.

On your justification you will say but moving door is not allowed, but if we cannot build at the existing door site- due to shared driveway, blocking of the garage and also if you create a drawing the property looks completely skewed and build would have to be in an angle which would waste a lot of space and practically it is a bad plan. Suppose if we apply for the porch at the existing door the space behind the porch cannot be utilised for anything and it would not look symmetrical either. That would not match the surroundings at all. It is

shame that in such a modern world the street scene is given so much more importance that people's living standard would need compromising. Also, considering the street scene that has been justified as a reason for rejecting our initial application, it does not matter to the neighbours who are more than happy for the plans to go ahead (no objection from no. 13 Lady Grove and support from No. 3 Pinnate Place for planning application ref: 6/2018/0727/HOUSE). Those are the people that are going to see the property on day-to-day basis and they have not raised any objections to this planning or EM application.

### **3. Hedge Removal:**

We requested for a complete or partial hedge removal as attached is the photo of the current hedge (11\_Lady\_Grove\_Hedge\_1), It is very uneven and impractical - more like overgrown hedge converted into thick-stemmed trees. It has been difficult for us for the last 3 years (since we moved in to the property) to trim and keep it clear of the adjacent pathways, as the stems are very thick. They do not match the hedge on the side of property (no. 9 to no. 3 nor the opposite side even numbered lady grove houses). There are a number of houses around Lady Grove, which do not have any existing hedges (maybe removed a while back). Opposite to us is Pinnate Place, and they do not have any hedge around their front of the houses. So as per the street scene, it is better to have the hedge completely or partly removed, or newly grown hedge installed as our current hedge does not match and individually it looks unappealing. Also, as part of the new door entrance facing towards the front, it would be ideal to remove part/complete hedge and make a pathway to enter the proposed main front door from the sidewalk, rather than having it from the same place currently (side ways). We are on a T-junction, and opposite to us is Pinnate Place, who do not have any front hedge and instead driveway parking.

From planning point of view, it is understood that the symmetry or street scene is taken into account for neighbouring houses only, however, the entire street does not have any symmetry as such. This would effectively mean that on the account of street scene, in future, the EMS would reject any possible front planning application. This in our regards is unacceptable from the council's EMS viewpoint.

We also request you to actually come and visit Lady Grove, WGC, in order to actually see the asymmetry of the front/side entrances of the entire street for terraced/semi-detached houses, enclosed/open canopies and hedges removed/retained. This would add value to what we are trying to justify for our planning application.

#### **Attachments:**

- 1) Photos
- 2) Original Planning documents (original\_plans.zip)
- 3) Proposed new planning documents with reduced porch size (new\_plans.zip)