
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/D/17/3172942

17 Gorse Crescent, Ditton, Aylesford, Kent ME20 6ES

- 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 A Dawling against the decision of Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref TM/16/03184/FL was refused by notice dated 10 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is extension and modernisation works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a row of detached bungalows of modest size. Whilst some of these bungalows have been extended, they have retained their modest size. Due to local topography, the appeal property is situated at a higher level than the adjacent property at 15 Gorse Crescent. This group of properties, with their modest scale, make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 4. The proposal includes a side extension and an increase in height of the roof to a maximum ridge height of some 6.7 metres to provide accommodation within the roof. The roof would be dominated by windows in the front elevation. From my observations, due to the scale and design of the proposed development together with the local topography, I consider that it would appear as an obtrusive addition to the streetscene, interrupting the scale and rhythm of this distinct group of bungalows. In particular, the bulk, design and height of the roof would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the surrounding group of modest bungalows.
 5. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. I have viewed the appeal site from neighbouring properties. From my observations, I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably overbearing
-

impact on neighbours. However, due to the harm I have identified above, this matter does not justify allowing the appeal.

6. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CP24 in the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Core Strategy (2007) and Policy SQ1 in the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document (2010), where they seek to ensure that new development respects, protects, conserves and where possible enhances the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding area. I consider these policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area and should be seeking to ensure high quality design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR