



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/19/3238002

146 Canterbury Road, Hawkinge, Kent CT18 7AX

- 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 Alex Green against the decision of Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref Y19/0518/FH, dated 26 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description used in the heading above has been taken from the application form and the Council's decision notice. The appellant's statement highlights that this does not reflect that the proposal includes a 2 storey element at the rear. Whilst I have had full regard to the proposal shown on the submitted plans, as no alternative description has been agreed, I have used the description that was used by both main parties prior to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area that consists of detached and semi-detached dwellings within a verdant setting. Generous gaps exist around the built form of the area and most dwellings are set back from the main road, thereby creating a spacious environment. Other than the group that includes the dwelling at the appeal site, the dwellings of the locality feature significant variety in terms of scale and appearance.
5. The dwelling at the appeal site is at the end of a group of 4 similar, semi-detached dwellings. Some of the dwellings have been the subject of extensions including, as acknowledged by both main parties, a side extension at 140 Canterbury Road. Due to the setback of the neighbouring detached dwelling, both the front elevation and side elevation of the dwelling at the appeal site are visible from the public domain. Moreover, the rear elevation can be seen from the higher ground of Woodland Drive.

6. The proposed side extension would replicate the depth and height of the existing dwelling, being built towards the boundary of the site that is shared with 148 Canterbury Road. To the rear of the existing dwelling and the side extension would be a single storey addition and a further 2 storey extension that would have a lower ridge than the main roof but a matching eaves height.
7. When viewed from the front, the side extension would be comparable to the extension that has occurred at 140 Canterbury Road and would restore a degree of symmetry to the 4 dwellings that would be of some benefit to the appearance of the group. This element of the proposal, considered in isolation, was also found acceptable by the Council.
8. However, the combination of the 2 storey extensions to the side and the rear would cause the side elevation to be particularly deep and would result in a substantial increase of the bulk and mass of the dwelling. This would cause the extension to have a dominating effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The lower ridge height of the rear part of the extension would not be sufficient to reduce the effect of the bulk of the extension. Due to the setback of the neighbouring dwelling, the long side elevation would be visible from the public domain and would therefore have a significant effect on the appearance of the dwelling and the group it is part of.
9. When viewed from the elevated ground of Woodland Drive, the depth of the 2 storey rear extension would cause it to appear as a bulky and disproportionate addition to the dwelling. The single storey element of the extension would not be at odds with the group of 4 dwellings, as several feature single storey projections and outbuildings to the rear. However, none of the single storey built form is of comparable size as the proposed 2 storey rear extension and therefore, as a result of its scale, the extension would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and the group it sits within.
10. The presence of a replacement dwelling and other extensions to dwellings in the locality have been brought to my attention, but insufficient details have been provided of the planning history of those developments to be able to afford them weight. In any event, the group of 4 semi-detached dwellings are of distinctly different appearance and character to the other examples that have been identified and, as such, the context and the effect of the developments do not appear to be comparable.
11. Whilst I have had regard to the encouragement for pre-application engagement that is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and note that this was sought by the appellant, this does not alter my assessment in respect of the effect of the development.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to policy BE8 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review 2006 which requires that, amongst other things, alterations and extensions to existing buildings reflect the scale and proportions of the original building and do not have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene.
13. I have not been provided with sufficient evidence in relation to the status of emerging policy HB8 of the Places and Policies Local Plan (2018) to be able to afford it more than minimal weight. In any event, the proposed extension

would not accord with the requirements of the policy as it would not be subordinate to the property. As such, the policy would not lead me to reach a different conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR