

**SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL**

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO  
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

**PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)**

**REF :** 19/00386/FUL

**APPLICANT :** Porters Porches And Conservatories

**AGENT :** Aitken Turnbull Architects Ltd

**DEVELOPMENT :** Erection of porch

**LOCATION:** 2 Deloraine Court  
Hawick  
Scottish Borders  
TD9 7QE

**TYPE :** FUL Application

**REASON FOR DELAY:**

---

**DRAWING NUMBERS:**

<b>Plan Ref</b>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Plan Status</b>
LOC	Location Plan	Refused
SK01	Existing Plans & Elevations	Refused
SK02	Proposed Plans & Elevations	Refused

**NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0**  
**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

No representations; no consultations.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:**

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Adopted Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016)

HD3: Protection of residential amenity  
PMD2: Quality Standards  
IS7: Parking Provision and Standards

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE**

Privacy and Sunlight

**Recommendation by** - Stuart Herkes (Planning Officer) on 19th June 2019

This application proposes a new single storey offshoot on the front elevation of a dwellinghouse at No 2 Deloraine Court in Hawick. The latter is a semi-detached property within a larger scheme ('cul-de-sac') of similarly designed houses. The area concerned is not within the Conservation Area. There is quite a substantial porch on a neighbouring property (No 3) to the southeast, which features masonry walls and a lean-to roof.

The proposal would have a footprint of around 2.5 sq m and would be fully glazed on its front elevation (Southwest Elevation); and on one of its side elevations (Southeast Elevation). The side elevation (Northwest Elevation) adjacent to No 1 Deloraine Court, would be a full height masonry fire wall. The roof would be hipped to the front, and also predominantly glazed.

This proposed extension is described by the Applicant as a "porch" and indeed, would be located anterior to, and envelope, the existing main front door of the dwellinghouse, while incorporating a new doorway on its southwest elevation. However, in its size; and in being such an extensively glazed structure, with a fire wall facing the boundary with the attached property, it would be liable to have the character of a small conservatory rather than of a front porch. If realised as proposed, the structure would give the property's principal elevation an ancillary 'rear garden' character, in complete contradiction to the street layout and the prevailing character of surrounding properties. This visual impact would also be exaggerated further by the presence of patio doors on the front elevation of the main dwellinghouse. Both singularly, and in culmination with the aforementioned patio doors, the impact of the proposal would be to give the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse a decidedly secondary, 'rear elevation' character.

A 2004 planning application (04/01382/FUL) for a conservatory (not a porch) on the front elevation of this same property was previously refused on the basis that: "(t)he proposed conservatory would be contrary to Policy 18 of the Roxburgh Local Plan in that that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area and residential amenity of the adjoining neighbour."

I have advised the Applicant of my concerns with respect to the secondary character of the proposal and its impacts upon the property and surrounding area, and have sought revisions to the scheme in order to make the proposal more in keeping with a front porch. In particular, I have asked that the structure should be reduced in its size and that it should feature neither fully glazed walls nor a glazed roof, nor any full masonry fire wall facing the neighbour's front door; all of which are out-of-character with a front porch structure. Rather than these conservatory features, I have specifically encouraged that the design be revised to incorporate masonry dwarf walls on all three external sides and that the roof should be revised to a lean-to. All of this would be more in line with the existing large porch at No 3. Ultimately I am content that the latter could be acceptably replicated at this property, and I have drawn this to the Applicant's attention. However, the Applicant has confirmed in writing that they are not agreeable to making any such revisions, and are concerned that the proposal should be determined in the form in which it was originally submitted.

For the above noted reasons, I consider that the proposal is objectionable on the basis of it introducing a predominant ancillary 'rear garden' character to the front elevation of the property; and therefore being unacceptably detrimental to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area. While the porch is relatively large; and beyond that which could be accommodated under Householder Permitted Development Rights; it would not have any unacceptable impacts upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties, although I do consider that the presentation of a blank fire wall to the front door of the neighbouring property would have a notably adverse impact upon the amenity of No 1. However, it would be a small-scale impact upon an area of movement, and as such, I do not consider that this is objectionable in planning terms. I note that the 2004 application was refused on the grounds of residential amenity but this was because of the inclusion of a fully glazed wall facing the neighbour which would have given rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking of No 1. However, there is no equivalent overlooking impact here. In addition, impacts on parking are not a concern.

While there are clearly no concerns with the principle of a new front porch being added to the property in this location - indeed, Householder Permitted Development Rights would allow for a smaller porch to be accommodated in this situation - the concern is with the design and form of this particular proposal. I recognise that frontage conservatories on a small number of other properties exist in the local area, but not within this street or immediate vicinity. If approved, this particular design of frontage extension would likely set an undesirable precedent for others within this street and surrounding area.

#### **REASON FOR DECISION :**

The development would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that its form and design would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area.

**Recommendation:** Refused

- 1 The development would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that its form and design would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area.

**“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.**