
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by **S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/19/3235621

6 Hever Place, Canterbury CT2 7QP

- 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 Douglas Wood against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00491, dated 16 March 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 24 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is first-floor side and first floor rear extension, canopy and gable feature to front, roof extension, Juliet balcony and cladding to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for first-floor side and first floor rear extension, canopy and gable feature to front, roof extension, Juliet balcony and cladding to dwelling at 6 Hever Place, Canterbury CT2 7QP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/00491, dated 16 March 2019 and 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; 'Proposed plans, elevations and extended area shaded' showing the lower roof level over the garage.

Reasons

2. Two versions of the 'proposed' drawings have been supplied by the Council to this Householder Appeal, both '*scale 1:50 A0_16.03.2019*' with no revision letter, showing minor differences in architectural treatment such as whether there is to be render above windows, but also showing 2 levels of extension ridge height. The Notice of Refusal relates specifically to a drawing received on 7 June 2019, and from the appellant's reference to '*the reduced ridge height of the extension*' it appears that this was the refused scheme. This Appeal Decision is based on that later drawing.
3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Hever Place area of Canterbury. Policies DBE3 and DBE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan on design and the built environment set out the principles of design and specific requirement for alterations and extensions, including not being detrimental to the character of the locality and streetscape, and the need to consider the character, setting and context of the site. Paragraph 124 within section 12 of the 2019 National Planning Policy

Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

4. There is considerable variety of design, layout and dwelling type along the *cul-de-sac* and the adjoining Wichling Close, and there are, as pointed out by the appellant, examples of close-spacing at the full two-storey height together with opposing gable ends. Whilst flat roofed garages to one site provide openness above, number 4 in particular has first floor accommodation across much of the site and over a double garage. There are also examples near the appeal property of chalet-style roofs of differing arrangements. Far from there being a regularity of line and design, this variety is a feature of the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal property has open space to the east of the main two-storey part through there being a flat-roofed double garage there, and open space to the west through there being a side garden before the boundary to number 7 and displays one of the more spacious arrangements on this part of Hever Place. The proposal is to erect an extension over the garage with a pitched roof from front to back having a ridge at a lower level than that of the existing house, and a linking piece of pitched roof between it and the hip end as existing, also having that lower ridgeline.
6. There would be changes to the front elevation entrance area and roofline over, together with a projection to the rear centre with 2 full gable additions. These items do not appear to be objected to by the Council as the Reason for Refusal cites an adverse effect on the open and spacious character of the street-scene, and the Officer's Report acknowledges the high boundary treatment to the rear where the view from a footpath is restricted. That appraisal is concurred with in this Decision.
7. Looking specifically at the effect of the building over the garage, this would reduce the space at first floor level between the main house and number 5, but would not be out of keeping with the street scene or otherwise harmfully erode the rhythm of space and built form in this part of the *cul-de-sac* and there would remain open space to the west within the curtilage of the appeal property to maintain the character and appearance of varied open space and closer gaps that is a feature of the area.
8. For the reasons given above the proposal is acceptable and in line with the Development Plan policies and national guidance set out above, and the conditions suggested by the Council stating the time limit for commencement and naming the drawings for the avoidance of doubt are all that is needed to control the development.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR