



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 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/19/3240691

The Tides, West Parade, Hythe, Kent CT21 6HD

- 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 Graham Pegler against the decision of Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref Y19/0422/FH, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a gable end with installation of full height glazed door with side panels and Juliet balcony, together with proposed balcony extension and external improvements including the introduction of horizontal cladding and colour coat render, along with additional fenestration and patio doors at basement level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. West Parade features residential buildings to one side which face the English Channel. The dwelling at the appeal site sits within a group of detached buildings of varied scale, form and appearance. The buildings of the immediate area feature a variety of materials, including render, cladding and brick. The remainder of West Parade consists of a mixture of terraced buildings and blocks of flats. Balconies at the front of buildings are a common feature of the area, with most being shallow projections that are enclosed with glazing or railings, thereby having a lightweight appearance that is subservient to the scale and proportions of the host buildings.

5. The dwelling at the appeal site features accommodation over 4 floors, with the lower ground floor being referred to as a basement and the top floor utilising the roofspace. The dwelling features a staggered front elevation with a projection at the front, above which is a balcony at first floor level. The balcony is enclosed by the upward continuation of the ground floor brickwork and a balustrade to the front. The dwelling features half-hipped gables to the roof. A vehicle access exists at the side of the dwelling which leads to a pair of integral garages at the rear.
6. The proposed alterations to the front of the dwelling would include the formation of a full gable, with a new opening and a Juliet balcony serving the top floor, and the installation of 2 windows at basement level. The existing balcony would also be extended forwards. The appellant's submissions indicate that the materials of the proposed balcony are not finalised, but it would be primarily formed of glazing. The dwelling would be clad and an integral garage door would be replaced with glazed doors at the rear of the site.
7. The forward extension of the existing balcony would result in the creation of a large balcony that would be much deeper than any other within the immediate locality. In this case, the resultant balcony would be disproportionate to the dwelling and would significantly contrast with the existing balconies of the surrounding area which are mostly shallower.
8. There would be some similarities between the proposed part of the balcony and others that exist within the locality, including the balcony at the neighbouring property of Bellavista which projects by a similar distance. As such, on its own, the proportions and appearance of the proposed balcony shows some regard to the architecture of the immediate vicinity. However, when considered in addition to the existing balcony, the resultant terrace would be dominating of the frontage of the dwelling. Furthermore, the combination of the existing ground floor forward projection, the recessed first floor and the proposed balcony would cause the frontage of the dwelling to have a contrived appearance. The resultant balcony would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street.
9. The addition of cladding to its elevations would not cause the dwelling to have a jarring appearance in the context of the surrounding area, particularly due to the variety of materials that exists and the presence of cladding at a nearby property. Furthermore, the other alterations would not detract from the appearance of the dwelling or the street. These aspects of the proposal were also found to be acceptable by the Council. This does not however represent a reason to reach a different conclusion in respect of the proposed balcony extension.
10. Whilst it has been indicated that the proposal would be of benefit to the appellant's living conditions and enable the enjoyment of their property and its surroundings, this does not compensate for the harm that would be caused by the resultant balcony being at odds with its surroundings.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies BE1 and BE8 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review 2006 which combine to require, amongst other things, that development accords with existing

development in the locality in terms of building form and elevational details and that extensions reflect the scale and proportions of the original building.

12. I have not been provided with sufficient evidence in relation to the status of emerging policies HB1 and HB8 of the Places and Policies Local Plan (2018) to be able to afford them more than minimal weight. However, as far as they would be relevant to this proposal, they appear to have a similar aim to the existing policies and would not therefore lead me to reach a different conclusion in respect of the proposed development.

Conclusion

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

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR