

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: 6th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/17/3166505

4b Poplar Drive, Herne Bay, CT6 7PX

- 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 Mrs Lydia Lee against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02511, dated 24 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a narrow, flat-roofed building that lies between properties in mixed commercial and residential use to the north and bungalows to the south. The scale and design of the property is notably different to both those groups of properties, with the width of the appeal plot less than the bungalows to the south, and so there is a discordant element to the building in the street scene.
 4. The proposed development would see an extension that would add an additional storey to the property, partly contained within a new pitched roof. The proportions of the building as a result of that extension would appear odd: the narrowness of the building and plot would be unfortunately emphasised by the height of the addition, leading to an elongated and unbalanced building that would relate particularly awkwardly to the lower bungalows to the south.
 5. I accept that the existing building could be improved in its design, however I do not think the current scheme achieves such an improvement; indeed, it would detract from the appearance of the wider area by appearing as an incongruous and cramped building. The increased height of the property arising from the proposed works would also lead to an unacceptable overbearing effect on the outlook of the residential dwellings to the north.
-

6. The proposals would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Canterbury District Local Plan First Review 2006, and Policies DBE3 and DBE10 of the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft 2014, the general thrust of which is to seek a high quality of design in all new development proposals, including alterations and extensions to buildings. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR