
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/17/3181731

9 Rutland Avenue, Cliftonville, Margate, Kent CT9 3AX

- 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 Ms and Mr Rachel and Joshua Jones and Sims against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/17/0413 was refused by notice dated 7 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development on the planning application form refers to a single-storey side extension at first floor level over the existing garage. The proposal is actually for the extension to be situated over the existing kitchen. The description of the proposed development on the Council's decision notice is the erection of a first floor side extension. In the interest of precision, I have taken the Council's description to be the description of the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a predominately residential area comprising primarily two-storey detached dwellings and bungalows of various designs. An overriding characteristic is that dwellings are generally of traditional design.
 5. The appeal property is of traditional design with a single-storey side projection. The proposal includes a first floor flat roof side extension, set back from the main front façade. It would be of contemporary design and include vertical zinc tiled cladding on the front and side facades.
-

6. It can be appropriate to extend a traditional dwelling with a contemporary addition. In this particular instance, due to the proposed stark design, together with the stark materials and the prominent position of the proposed extension, I consider that it would significantly detract from the traditional character and appearance of the original dwelling. It would appear as a discordant addition creating an enlarged dwelling with no overall cohesive design. In particular, the flat roof at first floor level would appear as an incongruous addition. In this area of predominately traditional dwellings, this would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. I have been provided with details of a proposed alternative first floor side extension with a pitched roof. It is not for me to comment on this different proposal.
8. I have had regard to examples of other dwellings in the surrounding area, none of which is directly comparable to the proposal before me, which I have determined on its individual merits.
9. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D1 in the Thanet Local Plan 2006, where it seeks high quality design that respects or enhances the character or appearance of the surrounding area. I consider this policy is broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework in as far as it meets the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR