
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

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

Decision date: 19th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/D/17/3171778
Debonair, Howland Road, Marden, TN12 9ET

- 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 W Fisher against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/508253/FULL, dated 1 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Howland Road is a residential road in the village envelope of Marden. Detached and semi-detached properties provide a varied street scene in terms of their design and scale. The appeal property is one of 4 pairs of semi-detached houses sitting in a row, which create a sense of pattern to the street and contribute to the character of the area in respect of creating a rhythm of built form in what is a diverse street scene.
4. The neighbouring property, Orchard View, has been extended to the side. As a result there is now a limited physical space between the appeal site and the neighbouring property.
5. The appeal proposal would increase the built form in this limited space where the physical gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring property has been significantly eroded. The appeal site is set back slightly from the neighbouring property, and on my site visit it was clear that the current gap between the appeal site and Orchard View creates a valuable sense of space between the properties. The impact of the appeal proposal would be to almost entirely remove the gap between the properties, this would be visible when looking at the houses, and would result in an almost continuous building line. The sense of space between the properties would be entirely eroded, and as a result the built form of the appeal proposal would appear overbearing.
6. The appeal proposal would also affect the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses, of which the appeal property is one. The design of the

extension would introduce a 2 storey addition to the appeal property. This addition would be out of keeping with the remaining houses, and would appear at odds with the pleasant rhythm that these 4 pairs of semi-detached houses create.

7. I note the appellant's attempt to address the issues of the spatial gap and scale of the extension by setting the extension back behind the building line, and decreasing the ridge height. This assists in ensuring that the extension appears subservient to the host dwelling. However it does not stop the extension from having a terracing effect on this part of the street scene.
8. As such, I conclude that the design, scale and impact of the proposal would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area by way of materially altering the rhythm of the street scene, and introducing a terraced effect at this part of the street. Consequently the appeal proposal would conflict with saved policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan (2000) in respect of its failure to complement the street scene, adjacent existing buildings and the character and appearance of the area. The appeal proposal also fails to comply with paragraphs 4.16 and 4.17 of the Residential Extensions 2009 Supplementary Planning Document in relation to maintaining gaps between buildings and maintaining a rhythm to the street scene.

Other matters

9. My attention has been drawn to other properties where extensions have been allowed. However, I do not have the particular circumstances of those decisions in the evidence before me, and I have decided this appeal on its own merits. I note the positive impact that the appeal proposal would have on the living conditions of the occupants of the appeal property, however this benefit does not outweigh my concerns relating to the effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above and having had regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Johanna Ayres

INSPECTOR