
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2019

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/19/3221858
105 Sea Road, Westgate-on-Sea CT8 8QE

- 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 Taffs against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/18/1325, dated 20 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a rooflight and door with associated first floor balcony to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a rooflight and door with associated first floor balcony to the front elevation at 105 Sea Road, Westgate-on-Sea CT8 8QE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: FH/TH/18/1325, dated 20 September 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001, 002, 005, 006

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development used above differs to that stated on the application form. However, an amended description as set out above was agreed by the parties prior to the determination of the application. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The host property is a detached, seafront bungalow in a residential area on the outskirts of Westgate-on-Sea. The proposal is the installation of a rooflight, door and balcony to the front elevation.

5. The host property is not locally or statutorily listed and the appeal site is not located in a conservation area. There is no prevailing architectural style in the area and in design terms the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of substantial variety with regard to age, size, appearance and detailing. In particular there are numerous examples of balconies at upper floor levels facing towards the estuary. These characteristics demonstrate the variation in built form within the streetscene and such differences add to the visual interest of the area.
6. The proposed alterations would be on the front roofslope of the host property and the rooflight and door would be set flush with the roofslope. The proposals would be positioned below the main ridge and above the eaves of the host property such that elements of the original roofslope would remain clearly visible. The balcony is of a fairly simple design with uncomplicated railings in keeping with the style of the property. The recessed walls would be finished with painted render, which is present elsewhere on the host property, and to my mind would result in a pleasing contrast with the roof tiles. Overall, I consider that the proposal would therefore integrate with the overall appearance of the host property, without appearing incongruous.
7. Within the context of the area, given the considerable variation in built form and design features, the proposal would be a relatively minor addition. It would add interest to the front elevation of the host property, add further variation to the streetscene and would not detract from the visual amenity of the host property or the surrounding area. Although sited in a prominent position, the modest scale and particular design of the proposal means that the alterations would not be an awkward, discordant or contrived form of development, nor would they be disproportionate to the host property or unduly affect its largely horizontal emphasis.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently it would comply with the requirements of Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006, which seeks to ensure that development is of a high standard of quality and design. It would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and have considered them in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR