

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2017

**by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 9<sup>th</sup> March 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/D/16/3162955**

**Cardus, Old Rectory Ground, Church Road, West Malling, Kent ME19 5NY**

- 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 and Mrs Jackie McLean against the decision of Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council.
  - The application Ref TM/16/01957/FL, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as the "extension and refurbishment of the existing dwelling".
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house with a detached garage to one side. It is located opposite the cricket ground towards the edge of the village and close to open countryside. The property forms part of a group of detached houses of similar size and appearance with lawns to the front, which are open to the street. There are substantial gaps between each house which reflect, and form part of, the relative spaciousness of this part of the village. This, together with the high degree of unity displayed by the group of houses, are matters to which I attach significant weight.
  4. The proposal would primarily comprise a 2-storey side extension. This would be set very slightly behind the line of the front and rear elevations of the house and would have a pitched roof to match the slope of the existing. It would extend close to the side boundary and therefore infill a large proportion of the gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring house, Thessaly. The loss of this gap would have a detrimental effect on the spacious character of the area and the unity of the group.
  5. The proposal would also include the re-modelling of the property and erection of a single-storey rear extension. The former would include weather-boarding, stone cladding and the installation of new windows, including arched windows
-

in the front and rear elevations of the side addition. This would be entirely out of keeping with the group of properties of which the appeal property forms part, the street scene and the surrounding area.

6. I conclude therefore that, due to its siting, bulk and design, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal is contrary to Policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document (2010) which seeks development that protects and conserves the character and local distinctiveness of areas and the pattern of development. There is also conflict with saved Policy P4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan (1998) and Policies CP1, CP13 and CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007. Amongst other matters, these policies seek development that respects its surrounding and is appropriate to the scale and character of a settlement.
7. I note the appeal decision relating to the approval of a new house in the village in 2010 and the planning permission granted more recently for the extension of "Camelot" in Teston Road. Neither is directly comparable to the development before me and, as each application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, I attribute limited weight to these schemes.

### **Conclusion**

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR