
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/19/3223479

25 Spencer Road, Birchington CT7 9EZ

- 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 Crees against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/18/1559, dated 7 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor front extension at 25 Spencer Road, Birchington CT7 9EZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: FH/TH/18/1559, dated 7 November 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: 01, 04, 05A, 06
 - 3) The roof of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour that of the existing dwelling and the remaining external finishes those as approved on the ground floor garage conversion under application FH/TH/18/1199.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey dwelling located in a residential area on the northern outskirts of Birchington. The proposal before me is for the erection of a first floor front extension.
 4. I note that the appeal dwelling and those within the row of dwellings from 19 to 27 Spencer Road are not locally or statutorily listed and the site is not located in a conservation area. In design terms the dwellings are not of any particular architectural merit. No.21 has a pitched roof ground floor front extension, which contrasts to the flat roof projections of the other houses.
-

5. In addition, the building line is not entirely uniform, with No.19 in particular set further forward than the other dwellings. No.23 has a solar panel array to the front roofslope. Amongst other things, there are also differences in materials, windows and other detailing. These characteristics demonstrate the variation in built form within the immediate streetscene and such differences add to the visual interest of the area.
6. The ridge height of the appeal proposal would be lower than the original ridge line of the main house, thus creating subservience. It would also not project further forward than the converted ground floor element. I consider that the scheme would visually connect with the overall appearance of the host dwelling, without dominating it.
7. The second storey overhang to the covered porch area and the large upper floor windows would add interest to the front elevation and further variation to the streetscene, that would not detract from the visual amenity of the dwelling or the locality. The principle of the supporting pillar and the use of contemporary materials have already been established under the 2018 permission for the conversion of the garage.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling 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. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states at paragraph 127 that development should not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation or change and the proposal would also be consistent with the Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

9. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. I also impose a condition requiring the materials to match those on the existing house and those already approved for the ground floor extension under application FH/TH/18/1199, to ensure that the external appearance of the proposal is satisfactory.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR