



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/17/3180385
10 Cornford Road, Birchington CT7 0AG

- 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 Jason Bailey against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref F/TH/17/0139, dated 28 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached two bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The proposal is for a detached two storey dwelling at the end of the rear garden of No 10 Cornford Road, a property on the corner of Farrar Road in a well-established residential area. The area is characterised by traditional semi-detached houses lining the road frontages with open front gardens and good sized rear gardens behind.
4. The new property would front onto Farrar Road on approximately the same building line as the adjacent pair of semi-detached houses, Nos 20/18. It would also be sited a reasonable distance from the rear elevation of the host property and an acceptable distance from No 20, about 1.2 m from the common boundary and 2.5 m from the flank wall. However, the house would be sited only 1.5 m or so from the rear boundary of the plot which backs onto the long rear garden of No 12 Cornford Road.
5. The new house would therefore occupy a significantly smaller plot than other properties in the vicinity and have a narrow amenity strip behind the property rather than a good sized rear garden which is characteristic of the area. An area of amenity space would be provided to the front of the property but in order to provide privacy this would require a tall close boarded fence or hedge along half of the site frontage and a return to the front elevation of the house next to the parking space. This would also be out of character with nearby properties which have open front gardens across the full width of the property

behind low walls or fences. If the amenity space were to be enclosed by a low fence or hedge it would not provide adequate privacy for the users and would expose an unusual front facing patio door to view. The nearby examples of tall fencing and hedges cited as a precedent by the appellant enclose the side or rear gardens of the properties concerned rather than gardens in front of their front elevation. The main exception to this, the tall hedge around a property on the corner of Cornford Road and Park Road, provides privacy and reduces noise and disturbance from the adjacent mini-roundabout.

6. For these reasons the dwelling would appear contrived. It would form an incongruous and discordant feature in the street scene resulting in significant harm to the established character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006 which requires new development to provide high quality design, to respect the character or appearance of the surrounding area and be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces.

Other matters

7. The external amenity space of the dwelling would be well below the standard enjoyed by the occupiers of surrounding properties. The outlook from the main lounge would also be poor, with the rear window just 1.5 m or so from the tall rear fence and the front window only 5 m or so away from the tall front fence.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling in a sustainable location and would have social and economic benefits for the area. The Council accept they cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. However, having regard to the deficiencies of the scheme identified above, the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR