

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/16/3155632

25 Meadow Rise, Iwade, ME9 8SB

- 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 M Hancock against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/504105/FULL dated 11 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*first floor side extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Although the development applied for states only a proposed first floor side extension the scheme also involves the erection of two separate dormer roof extensions to the rear roofslope. The Council raises no objections to this element of the proposal and I agree with this approach. As such I will limit my assessment to that of the side extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached post-war property that sits off a hammer-head at the end of Meadow Rise. At my site visit I observed the general development pattern in the immediate vicinity and noted the characteristic gaps between the dwellings and their side boundaries, at least at first floor level. In illustration, the appeal property has a side garage, albeit recessed behind a car port which sits almost flush with the front building-line. Its neighbour, No 27 also has a side garage, but set further back along the common boundary in accordance with the recessed footprints of Nos 27 and 29.
 5. The proposal would involve the introduction of a side extension, two-storey in height, part of which would sit directly above the line of the existing car port. At first floor level it would be flush with the dwelling's frontage, then follow the angled boundary line rearwards before straightening up to accord with the dwelling's existing flank.
-

6. I consider that the extension would be of significant width, relative to the dwelling's main frontage and, with the absence of any set back at first floor level, the extension would lack subordination to the host dwelling. Indeed, the effect would be compounded by the intention to build partly along the angled boundary which would give it a rather awkward appearance.
7. In the above connection the appellant, in his grounds of appeal, mentions that a similar extension for the property was granted planning permission in 2007 and, having been supplied with the Council's ref. no, I have examined the plans approved at that time. In comparison the approved two-storey extension was set back from the frontage with its roof also set down from the dwelling's main ridge, lessening any impact. Notwithstanding this, I also note that the date of the planning permission precedes the adoption of the Swale Borough Local Plan (LP) and also the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders' (SPG) which, for proposed domestic additions, mentions that a gap of 2m between a first floor side extension and the boundary is normally required. The proposal does not fully comply with this guideline.
8. Directly related to the above I have had regard to LP Policies E1, E19 and E24 which together, amongst other things, indicate that development should be of a high quality design, responding to its local context and maintaining the character of the streetscene. In this instance I consider that the extension's siting and design would impact on the general feeling of openness, unduly affecting the streetscene.
9. Although the proposed dormer extensions are considered acceptable I have considered the possibility of a split decision. However, given that the roof conversion appears intrinsically linked with the proposed side extension I am of the view that the proposal's two elements are not severable.
10. The appellant suggests that he has concerns at the manner in which the Council dealt with his application. My remit, though, is only to examine the planning merits, or otherwise, of the proposal. Any grievance as to procedural matters relating to the original planning application should be taken up with the Council itself. He also mentions that there are other similar extensions in the area. However, I was not provided with details of such and did not witness any developments similar to that proposed. Besides, each case must be taken on its individual merits.
11. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the aims of LP Policies E1, E19 and E24 and also relevant advice contained within the Council's SPG.
12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR