

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/Z2260/D/17/3166782

22 Lanthorne Road, Broadstairs, CT10 3LZ

- 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 Gary Broomfield against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/16/1235, dated 7 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor 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 proposed extension would be to a bungalow situated behind a bungalow of similar flat roof design. I agree with the appellant that the design of both bungalows is somewhat utilitarian and detracts from the appearance of the wider area which, whilst containing a variety of housing types and designs, is of a pleasant and village-like character.
 4. An extension to the roof might therefore improve the appearance of the property, and hence the wider area, and in a previous appeal on the site the Inspector similarly commented on the awkward position of the property on the road, and that there may be need for repair or replacement of the roof (ref. APP/Z2260/D/11/2163000, dated 30 November 2011). However, I share the concerns of the Council that the design of the current proposal is not suited to the host property or the area. The off-centre curved roof shape would be a dramatic change to the building, and would be visible from the road. The altered building would not appear to have any particularly cohesive design or form, due to the shape, position and use of timber cladding atop the conventional brick bungalow beneath. Rather than enhancing the appearance of the building, it would create a sense of imbalance and discordance, both in relation to the host building and to the wider area. This would then bring undue prominence to the property and its awkward setting along the road.
-

5. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to improve the appearance of the property and to provide additional accommodation, and that efforts have been made to address the previous appeal. However, unfortunately this design and form of building still would not achieve those goals without harm to the character and appearance of the wider area, and so there would be conflict with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006, which seeks to ensure all new development is of a high standard of quality and design.
6. I note the comments of neighbouring residents regarding the effect of the proposed extension on outlook and privacy. From my observations at the site visit I am satisfied that the distance retained to the site boundaries mean there would not be any undue overbearing impact, nor overlooking. However, my finding on this matter does not outweigh the harm in relation to the main issue identified earlier, and the appeal is dismissed accordingly.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR