

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

**by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 23 October 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/D/17/3179338**

**2 Boleyn Road, Kemsing TN15 6RY**

- 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 David Smith against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
  - The application Ref SE/17/00181/HOUSE, dated 19 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is for a front extension to ground and first floor.
- 

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site finds itself situated within a residential cul-de-sac comprising 5no pairs of semi-detached houses. These have all been altered in some way since originally built, but with the exception of 3 Boleyn Road, their original front elevations are still largely intact in terms of their form and appearance.
4. The appeal site is set forward of no3 and therefore the proposed extension, in particular its first floor element, would accentuate the forward positioning of the appeal dwelling within the street in relation to its neighbour, as well as adding significant bulk to its built form. The proposal would also unbalance the overall architectural composition of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms part with 1 Boleyn Road. I accept however that there would be no material impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.
5. It has been suggested by the appellant that the dwellings in the street are lacking architectural merit, whether or not that is so, that is not a reason to allow any form of development to go ahead. I note the cited examples of other extensions within the locality, however with the exception of that at no 3, the others are generally single storey front extensions, but in any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
6. Therefore, whilst I note that the materials proposed would match the existing building, I consider that the proposed extension, by reason of its overall scale

and design would give rise to a prominent and incongruent feature within the street scene, harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. I find the proposal contrary to Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan (2015) and Policy SP1 of the Sevenoaks Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) which require proposals to create high quality design and their respective form to respond to the scale, height and site coverage of the area. The proposal also conflicts with the Council's Residential Extensions SPD as the front extension would not be acceptable within the street scene, its scale would not respect that of the building to which it would be attached and would compromise the relatively unified visual appearance of the street scene.

### **Conclusion**

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

*C J Tivey*

INSPECTOR