
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/17/3179563

1 Upton Road, Broadstairs, Kent CT10 2AS

- 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 Mrs Lynda Carter against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref F/TH/16/1507, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as '*New house on vacant land adjacent to 1 Upton Road, Broadstairs.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. On the original application the appellant refers to the appeal site as 1 Upton Road, and indicates that it comprises an off-set to this dwelling's rear garden. However, more contextually, the appeal site abuts the curtilages of three properties, namely Nos 45 and 47 St Peter's Road and also No 1 Upton Road.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The dwellings along this stretch of the south side of St Peter's Road, although of varying styles, tend to follow a consistent front building line, markedly set back from the footway. This includes No 45, the last of this line of dwellings, whose flank wall lies alongside the common boundary with the terrace of small Edwardian properties fronting Upton Road. No 47 St Peter's Road, although a more recent development, continues the Upton Road frontage, but with access gained from a gate off St Peter's Road close to the Upton Road junction.
5. The proposal would involve developing the gap which exists between the front curtilages of Nos 45 and 47 with the erection of a new two-storey dwelling. The submitted Drawing No 08322-PL 00 06 depicts the streetscene with the proposed dwelling shown in situ. Notwithstanding the variety of house designs in the immediate area I find that the proposed building, with its simple form and low ridge height, would look out of place in its intended setting.
6. I note the appellant's comment that the proposed house has been specifically designed not to be prominent, but this is to miss the point. In particular, the

contrast with the accentuated verticality of No 45 would be stark, and the awkward relationship with its immediate neighbours would be exacerbated by its building line being pulled significantly forward, thereby at odds with the prevailing pattern of development along this side of St Peter's Road.

7. A consequence of the site lacking any relative depth means, in turn, that there is very little scope for other options as to accommodating the proposed footprint within. In the circumstances the proposed development, in not responding to or reflecting local character, would be unduly prominent and incongruous in its setting, despite the dwelling's modest size. It would appear as something of an anomaly and I find that the effect on the streetscene would be jarring.
8. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the appellant's various representations. I acknowledge the planning permission granted at the corner of St Peter's Road and Crawford Road involving new residential flats. However, parallels are not easily drawn as each case has its own particular circumstances and must be determined by balancing the proposal's individual merits against the considered impacts.
9. The sustainable location of the site is not at issue, neither is the ability of the proposed house to provide for a comfortable standard of accommodation. On-site parking would be provided and no resultant adverse effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers have been identified. Nonetheless, the absence of harm on such matters, even when taken together, does not outweigh the adverse effects which I have described.
10. The appellant comments that proposals such as this should be given the fullest consideration as they can make a contribution to addressing the need for more homes. I agree with this approach but, in this particular instance, the plot's significant constraints have dictated the proposal's siting and form, and the adverse impacts would outweigh the benefits resulting from an additional dwelling.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and this would materially conflict with the design objectives of Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan, and also relevant advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.
12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR