

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2016

by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/16/3152325
South Barn, Brookestreet, Ash Kent CT3 2NP

- 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 James Evans against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref DOV/15/01281, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension over the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for an extension over the existing garage at South Barn, Brookestreet, Ash, Kent CT3 2NP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DOV/15/01281 dated 23 December 2015 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 plan: JE2 dated November 2015.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey dwelling with a single storey extension which includes a double garage, office and utility room. It forms part of a complex of former agricultural buildings which have been converted to residential use. The complex as a whole is set within the open countryside.
 4. With a pitched roof and gable ended roof form the appeal property contributes to the character of the complex of buildings and the rural character of the wider area.
 5. The proposal is to add an extension above the single storey element of the property. This would rise up to a ridge height which would be below the
-

existing two-storey element although the proposed eaves height would match the existing eaves. I consider that in terms of height, size and design the proposal would be an appropriately proportioned addition which would be subservient to the original building. It would not be out of character with the neighbouring two storey property to the west or the other buildings within the complex by virtue of the proposed form of development.

6. The introduction of three first floor windows facing into the garden, a single window facing towards the other buildings in the complex and changes to the fenestration at ground floor level would not be harmful to the character of the existing building or neighbouring properties. Moreover, through the detailed design and materials the overall appearance of the building would be in keeping with that of the original building and adjoining complex.
7. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) establishes core planning principles including securing high quality design. Paragraphs 56-59 of the Framework outline the principles to be adopted to secure good design including the need to respond to local character and to reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials. Paragraph 61 seeks to secure the integration of new development into the natural and built environment whilst paragraph 64 advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
8. In responding to the form and proportions of the existing building the proposal would contribute to the character of the group of adjoining buildings. It would reflect the materials of the host property and found locally and would be well integrated into the existing development when viewed from the wider area, partly because of trees and hedgerows which limit views of the property. Consequently I find that the proposal would not be in conflict with the objectives of the Framework in respect of good design. Moreover, the Council has not indicated any conflict with the development plan.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plan with which the scheme should accord as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is also necessary to ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having taken into account all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Kevin Gleeson

INSPECTOR