

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2016

by Ray Wright BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/D/16/3156311

9 Crawshay Close, Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 3EJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Spencer against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref SE/16/00728/HOUSE was refused by notice dated 19 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 'two storey side/rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side/rear extension, at 9 Crawshay Close, Sevenoaks, Kent TN13 3EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SE/16/00728/HOUSE, dated 9 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development, hereby permitted, shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1754-14 -PL702 Rev P3 and 1754-14 -PL701 Rev P2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension, hereby permitted, shall be as shown on the approved plans and match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern semi-detached, two storey dwelling within a cul-de-sac. The proposal involves a two storey side and rear extension.
 4. The Council raise no objection to the proposed rear gabled part of the extension which, although wider in this scheme, follows the depth of a previous planning permission. In addition, no objection is raised to the extension following the ridge line of the main dwelling. The adjoining property has a recent two storey, gabled rear addition and the appeal scheme would be only slightly deeper. There are other examples of extensions within the immediate area where the ridge line of the existing properties have been followed by later extensions. In consequence, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessments of
-

these elements. The main issue of contention is the proposed raised eaves line to part of the east facing front elevation.

5. The extension, as proposed, would have a staggered elevation with the principle part of the side extension set back around 1.6 metres from the main frontage of the property. A further recess of the addition by another 1.5 metres is proposed to ensure a metre gap is retained from the side boundary. Even with the original ridge line being followed this design would mean the extension would not dominate the main dwelling and give it the appearance of a later, subservient addition. It would also not unduly affect the symmetry of the pair of dwellings of which it forms a part. These details would generally accord with the guidance set out in the Sevenoaks 'Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document 2009 (SPD).
6. The southernmost part of the extension would have a higher eaves line to the main dwelling and be above the top line of the first floor window giving a slightly irregular roof shape. However, the property is at the end of the cul-de-sac where there would be very limited viewpoints from the public realm. The extension, and in particular its roof form, would only be clearly evident from the turning area at the end of the Close. The raised eaves section would be a small element within the overall design and, even when in view, this part of the roof would not, to my mind, be particularly prominent or visually jarring.
7. I conclude the development would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or wider area. As such the development would not conflict with the high quality design and character requirements of the Framework, Policy SP 1 of the Sevenoaks 'Core Strategy' 2011, Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks 'Allocations and Development Management Plan' 2015 or SPD.

Other Matters

8. The appellants have referred to other properties, the roof forms adopted in their extensions, and identified a perceived inconsistency in the decision making regarding these and the current appeal case. However, while I have had regard to the examples given, in particular that at 14 Crawshay Close, I do not have full details of the circumstances of these schemes. I have, in consequence, considered this appeal on its individual merits, based on the specific site circumstances.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council should the appeal succeed against the advice in Planning Practice Guidance and for clarity. The standard commencement condition is required as is, a condition referring to the relevant plans, for certainty. To integrate this extension with the existing house it is important that suitable external finishes are used, therefore a condition requiring proposed external materials to accord with the submitted plans and match those existing is necessary.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR