
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2017

by P W Clark MA MRTPI MCMI

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

Decision date: 1st November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/D/17/3180373

1 Hartley Close, Maidstone ME15 8SY

- 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 Mark Thompson against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/502506/FULL, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single and two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The sole main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Woolley Road. In the vicinity of the site, this road runs on a straight north-south alignment flanked by grass verges and footways between 2m high brick walls on its west side and 2m high close-boarded fences on its east. Considerable vegetation and substantial trees screen the development behind the fences to the east but the development to the west, including the site, is exposed to clear view above the screen walls.
3. The development including the site is clearly a planned development of several house types but with a common palette of materials and to a neatly composed plan in which the upper parts of the gable ends of the rows of houses align along Woolley Road. The ground floor part of the proposed side extension would be largely hidden behind the screen walls as are existing outbuildings and garages but the first floor part of the extension would intrude into and disrupt the clearly planned layout of the area.
4. By itself, that might not be so unacceptable, as is shown by a side extension to number 1 Longparish Close, almost opposite the site, built up to the back edge of the pavement and similarly compromising a former sense of openness. But, whereas that extension, whilst subordinate in scale, matches its original in both gable-ended form and rendered materials, the front and rear elevations of the proposal would be faced in brick in contrast to the ground floor render and upper floor tile hanging between brick piers of the existing house and would have a hipped roof form in contrast to the gabled form which prevails in the surrounding area.

5. In consequence, it would not only stand out proud of the general building line but would also be inconsistent in terms of form and materials and so the harm it would cause to the planned appearance of the area would be that much greater. For that reason, I conclude that the degree of change it would cause to the character and appearance of Woolley Road would be unacceptably harmful and would be contrary to policy H18 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000. That calls for extensions to complement the street scene, adjacent buildings and the character of the area.

P. W. Clark

Inspector