

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 10 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/17/3169684
48 Reedmace Close, Singleton TN23 5GE

- 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 Geoffrey Darvill against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01477/AS, dated 27 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to provide additional living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. Reedmace Close is made up of 3 cul-de-sacs and it is part of a residential development within the settlement of Singleton. 48 Reedmace Close is situated on the corner of a junction within Reedmace Close. It is a two storey end of terrace dwelling in a row of three dwellings. No.47 is immediately to its west and no.46 to the west of no.47.
 4. The appeal site has a rear and side garden and, at right angles to the house, there is a detached two bay garage with off road parking in front of the garage. One of the bays with parking (which is closest to the house) is within the appeal site. The corner of Reedmace Close to the east and south east of house has been landscaped with shrubbery and the public footway passes through the shrubbery. Access can be gained to the side garden of no.48 via a pedestrian gate adjoining the east elevation of the house.
 5. The proposed two storey extension would infill the side garden and would extend up to the southern garage wall. It would have a lower roof than the main dwelling and part of that roof would be flat with pitched elements around the edges. There would be a new front door within the extended element and the rear garden would remain the same size as it currently is.
-

6. Whilst acknowledging that efficient use of urban land is a benefit in terms of sustainability, the size of the proposal would be disproportionate to the terraced dwelling and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of no.48. In particular, the proposed roof form would have little in common with the main roof form and would appear contrived and awkward against the simple main roof form and simple garage roof.
7. The height, bulk and mass of the two storey extension would remove the sense of openness which currently makes an important contribution to the streetscene, particularly as this junction is a prominent one when viewed from within Reedmace Close. The loss of separation of the garage building from both the main house and the side garden would also be visually detrimental, resulting in a significant stretch of built development around the junction. Whilst the landscaped buffer in the public domain would remain, this would not mitigate the identified harm. Overall, the scheme would not promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene. It would breach policies CS1 and CS9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 and advice in Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG10 *Domestic Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas* (June 2004).
9. Having taken into account all representations made, including the desire to have increased living space at the property, for the reasons given above, I find that the harm outweighs the benefits of the scheme and as such the appeal is dismissed.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR