

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 19th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/17/3170826

September Cottage, Rayham Road, Whistable, CT5 3DY

- 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 Ray Westcar against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02494, dated 24 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as '*garage conversion*'.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises September Cottage, which is a detached bungalow; and a detached double garage with slate pyramid roof form, together with front parking area and rear/side gardens. The street scene of Rayham Road is formed by a mixture of dwelling styles; although there are many examples of detached bungalow style buildings. To the rear of September Cottage it is possible to see two storey semi-detached houses which face onto Virginia Road.
 4. The proposal seeks the erection of a side extension to the garage to form a three bay garage together with the creation of a first floor level with barn hip style roof form. The first floor would be accessed via an external side staircase, and provide space which is shown on the submitted drawings to be used as an art room, study and shower.
 5. The proposed extensions to the garage would not only increase its footprint to three bays, but also its height and overall bulk. Indeed, whereas the building currently appears as a subservient outbuilding to the single storey main dwelling, the proposal would result in a building of two storey height together with raised eaves height that would compete visually with this building. This visual conflict would be further exacerbated by the overall increase in the footprint of the garage building which would add to its width when viewed from the front. Added to this would be the introduction of the barn hip style roof form, which would introduce a visually dominant feature at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality.
-

6. When considered cumulatively, the various elements would result in a building that would be visually dominant when viewed from Rayham Road and from properties along Virginia Road. This incongruity within the street scene would be especially noticeable when viewing the garage alterations in the context of the single storey form found at September Cottage. I note the appellant's point that they consider the separation of about 3.5 metres between September Cottage and the garage gives each construction its own identity. However, the garage is clearly meant to be a subservient structure visually read in conjunction with the main property rather than as an independently individual building; hence, for example, the matching use of yellow stock bricks and hipped slate roof forms for both buildings.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the *Canterbury District Local Plan First Review 2006* (CDLP), which, amongst other aims, seeks to ensure that the form of the development and the visual impact and impact on local townscape character is taken into account when considering applications.
8. It would also conflict with unadopted Policy DBE3 of the emerging *Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft June 2014* which seeks similar aims to those of Policy BE1 of the CDLP. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst others, seeks to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSEPECTOR