



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/19/3230577

Newington Post Office, 85 Newington Road, Ramsgate, Kent CT12 6PP

- 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 Dr Lakshmi Kanthan against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref F/TH/18/1546, dated 5 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is for the creation of 1 no self-contained residential unit of use class C3.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I saw from my site visit that there are some ongoing building works at the appeal site. I noticed that the garage and the wooden boundary fence have been removed and that a concrete slab has been constructed on the appeal site. I am considering this appeal based on the application as submitted to the Council.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey property which has vacant commercial space on the ground floor and residential use at the first floor. It is a corner property and sits on the junction with Princes Avenue. There is a rear yard area which is undergoing some works.
5. Newington Road has a mix of commercial and residential uses and displays a range of styles and designs in terms of both size and scale of the properties. The neighbouring property, 83 Newington Road, is a single storey dwelling with a garden area to the front and rear.
6. Princes Avenue is a residential street which accommodates a variety of one and two-storey dwellings. The houses vary in style with terraces, detached and

semi-detached homes. The dwellings sit within rectangular plots and have front and rear gardens. The properties also have a range of roof types which are either hipped or pitched. The dwellings are set back from the street and have low-level brick walls with some dwellings also having driveways. The separation distances between the dwellings also vary according to the design. Overall these features give the street a pleasant open character.

7. The proposed dwelling would be located to the rear of 85 Newington Road. The appeal dwelling has been designed to be a "standalone" property and would be single storey in height with a flat roof incorporating roof lights. The front elevation would face onto Princes Avenue and would contain the only fenestration. The proposal however lacks any design quality as it has a bland frontage with simple fenestration and would have the appearance of an ancillary building to the host property.
8. The side elevation of proposed dwelling would be approximately 1.5 metres from the rear wall of No 85 and the other side elevation about 1.8 metres from No 1 Princes Avenue. Due to these small separations it would appear cramped next to the two storey properties it sits in between and would jar with the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed dwelling would occupy virtually the entire development plot with only a small amenity area to the front of the dwelling. Unlike surrounding properties, it would not have a rear garden. I consider that the development would be out of character with the area, which is one of larger dwellings sat within plots which have significantly more amenity space. Whilst the appellant has stated that the dwelling would meet the minimum space standards, I do not consider that this would outweigh the harm identified.
10. I have been made aware that the proposal does not sit within a conservation area nor in an area of special residential character and is one where change should not be discouraged. The appellant has stated that whilst there are no details of boundary treatment this element could be secured by imposition of a suitably worded condition. I also note that the proposed dwelling has been designed with similar materials to the adjacent property. However, I do not find that these matters would outweigh the harm identified.
11. Overall, I find that the appeal proposal would be at odds with the surrounding pattern of development and would cause harm to its character and appearance. The proposal conflicts with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan (2006) which seeks to ensure a high standard of design which enhances the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

12. I note that the appeal proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of its neighbours. I have also been made aware that the appeal proposal is in an accessible location and is close to a range of services. The appellant has brought to my attention that the proposal would result in an additional dwelling and would contribute to the housing supply. Whilst this may be the case, one additional dwelling would have minimal impact on the total stock. Indeed, none of these considerations outweigh the significant harm that would be caused.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR