



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W/19/3234974

Farthings, Foxendown Lane, Meopham, Gravesend DA13 0AE

- 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 John Mellanby against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20190215, dated 1 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached Car Port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Farthings is a detached dwelling, located on the southern side of Foxendown Lane, within a rural settlement. The appeal dwelling is set-back from the road and has a private drive and garden to the front that are partly screened by a hedge. Neighbouring properties located on this side of the road also have a significant set-back from the road and open parking areas and landscaping to the front. The open space to the front of dwellings is therefore a feature that makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
 5. The proposed car port would be located to the front of the appeal dwelling and would occupy part of the garden area. Although the proposal would be set-back from the road and partly screened by the existing boundary treatment, it would still have a prominent position within the streetscene, as it would introduce a wooden structure in an open setting. Moreover, sited significantly beyond the building line established by the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings that are located to each side of the appeal site, the car port would appear as an incongruous addition and would harmfully affect the character and appearance of the area.
-

6. The appellant states that there are other properties on Foxendown Lane and throughout Meopham area with similar structures to the front. However, no details of these have been provided. Nevertheless, I noted during my site visit that some properties on Foxendown Lane have either attached garages that project beyond the front elevation of building or detached structures close to the front boundary of the site. These structures do not, however, reflect the prevailing character of the area and do not provide appropriate justification for the proposal.
7. Accordingly, I conclude that the introduction of the proposed car port in this location would adversely affect the established pattern of development, thus resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy, which requires, amongst other things, that development integrates well within the surrounding local area.

Other matters

8. While the appellant has raised concerns regarding the Council's delay in issuing the decision, this does not affect the proposal before me or the conclusion that I have reached.
9. I note that no objections have been made by third parties. However, a lack of objections from neighbours is not a determinative factor.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant is willing to amend the proposal. However, this is a matter for the Council. I can only determine the appeal on the basis of the scheme which was refused by the Council.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR