



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc CIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/W/19/3240055

11 Thorns Meadow, Brasted TN16 1NP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Mackie against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02136/HOUSE, dated 16 July 2019, was approved on 13 September 2019 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is a single storey side and front extension, including two roof lanterns.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that 'the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building'.
 - The reasons given for the condition is: 'to ensure that the appearance of the development is in harmony with the existing character of the area as supported by Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For the avoidance of doubt, while I have dismissed the appeal the existing permission for 'a single storey side and front extension, including two roof lanterns' and the associated conditions remains extant.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot in a cul-de-sac of brick and tile dwellings that are arranged as pairs of two-storey, semi-detached houses. The houses are further typified by brick-built side extensions, some of which are integral to the host dwellings, and some as more recent additions.
5. The existing permission for a single-storey side and front extension is subject to a condition which specifies that the materials used must match with those used on the existing building. The proposal is to replace the conditioned brick-work and other elevational materials with a condition for a silicone rendered elevation, and grey-coloured aluminium windows and openings.

6. The main parties agree that the permitted extension in this built up area would be a limited and proportionate development in the Green Belt, set away from the public views of the Area Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, in this specific location the relatively contemporary appearance of the extension in the street scene, that would be afforded by a change to Condition 2, would be incongruous with the character of the surrounding area which is typified by brick-built extensions. Indeed, I noted from my site visit that there are several dwellings in the cul-de-sac that have more recent brick-built extensions. While I am uncertain as to what type or quality of bricks have been used in these extensions it is likely over the course of time that they will weather to blend more precisely with the brickwork of these post-war dwellings.
7. Therefore, I conclude that the use of such contrasting elevational materials, including the use of grey window and door frames, would be overly prominent and harm the character and appearance of the area. The corner cul-de-sac location of the dwelling does not alter my view.
8. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks District Council Allocations and Development Management Plan Policy Listing 2015, Policy SP1 of the Sevenoaks District Council Core Strategy 2011, and the guidance in section 4.21 of the Sevenoaks District Council Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009 which say, amongst other things, that development should be designed to a high quality and respond to the distinctive local character of the area, and that particular care is required in the design of front extensions because of their prominence at the front of the property.
9. For similar reasons the proposal conflicts with Paragraph 127 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires that development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that there is a block and render side extension in the nearby St Martins Meadow. However, whether this is an acceptable form of development or not, I do not know the circumstances in which it was developed. Therefore, I have considered the proposal in this case on the basis of its own planning merits.

Conclusions

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

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR