

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/16/3162857
6a Broadfield Road, Folkestone, CT20 2JT

- 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 John Verkaik, JV Architects, against the decision of Shepway District Council.
 - The application Ref Y16/0506/SH, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a mature area of housing of traditional design with pitched roofs, and it is evidently a more recent addition that fronts Broadfield Avenue. There have been alterations and extensions to the house, and the current proposals seek a side extension to the west. Due to the irregular shape of the plot the proposed extension would have a similarly irregular footprint, designed to follow the plot boundary. The resulting roof shape above that footprint would have a part pitched/part crown roof in order to address the change in angles for the extension.
4. I share the Council's concerns regarding the design of the extension. By following the shape of the plot, the resulting extension would be of odd proportions and form. The roof shape necessary to achieve that form would be very disruptive to the overall appearance of the house, since it takes little cue from the architecture of the house itself, or of other properties in the street. The existing house is of relatively modest and muted appearance and, whilst seen in views along Broadfield Avenue, is not especially imposing to the area. However, if the house were to have an extension of the size proposed, whose form bears no clear relationship to the host property, then the overall impression would be discordant and intrusive in the street scene. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area, and so conflict with

the relevant development plan policies, namely Policies SD1, BE1 and BE8 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review and Policy DSD of the Shepway Core Strategy the general thrust of which is to seek a high standard of design in all new development that accords with its locality.

5. I acknowledge the enhancements to the property that the appellant has undertaken in recent years, and that the proposed works would be undertaken to seek minimal energy use. I also consider that the siting and scale of the proposed extension would not be harmful to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. However, the harm on the main issue and conflict with the development plan is sufficient to outweigh other matters and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR