
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/W/16/3159936

1 Brindles Field, Tonbridge, Kent TN9 2YR

- 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 Ade Town against the decision of Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref TM/16/00828/FL, dated 8 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing garage block with a single storey house and single parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site has been the subject of a previously dismissed appeal (appeal reference APP/Q1445/W/15/3009748) in which the Inspector commented that "due to their height and siting the garages are a diminutive feature in the street scene and therefore create a gap between closely spaced development and, in particular, they create a transition between the bungalows on College Avenue and the more substantial buildings on rising land in Brindles Field". Based on my observations I concur with the Inspector's findings.
 4. This is tight-knit residential area. The site is currently occupied by a garage block. Whilst the proposed development would be no higher than the existing building the footprint would be enlarged to the front and rear. The proposal would maintain the transitional gap between the two-storey residential development of Brindles Field to the south and bungalows in Collage Avenue to the north.
 5. However, the scheme would introduce a substantially smaller dwelling of a size unrelated to the surrounding residential development. It would also be positioned behind existing two-storey development which would not be in keeping with the pattern of development in the area. The proposal, with its large patio style doors in the front elevation, would create a dwelling of a very different appearance to that of an ancillary garage or dwellings in the area.
-

Although the proposed development would not be visible from College Avenue, the proposed development would be out of keeping with both the character and appearance of the area and would be clearly visible within the Brindles Field street scene.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would be contrary to Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy and Policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document which seek development that respects its surroundings, local distinctiveness and urban form. The proposed development would also be contrary to the aims of paragraphs 17 and 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

7. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is in a sustainable location and would make efficient use of previously developed land and existing infrastructure, as well as providing employment during construction. It would also add to the demand and choice of homes in the Borough that could provide housing for the elderly population in the area. It is also considered acceptable to the Council in terms of the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, highway safety and parking. However, these economic and social benefits would not outweigh the environmental harm that I have identified above in terms of the character and appearance of the area when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR