



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/19/3239516

3 The Oast, Stuppington Lane, Canterbury CT1 3TJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Naveen Rishi against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01096 dated 15 May 2019 was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The proposed development is the provision of two new side windows.
-

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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates the end unit in a terrace of three converted from an Oast House. It is on a section of Stuppington Lane which is generally devoid of development with the surrounding area being predominantly agricultural land. It is set within an Area of High Landscape Value. Due to the open nature of the surroundings and its position on the outside of a bend in the road, the building is highly visible when approaching from both directions on Stuppington Lane. The side elevation of the appeal property is highly visible on the approach from the west on Stuppington Lane. The front elevation of the terrace contains traditional styled white windows, similar in their design and scale, and are symmetrically positioned. The windows to the side elevations are also the same size and design but aligned diagonally with one another. Overall, the windows provide a distinctive sense of uniformity.
5. The two proposed windows would have a grey aluminium frame which would be flush with the wall. They would be significantly larger than the majority of the windows present on the front and side elevations of the terrace and would be of a wholly different design, comprising one single pane instead of the series of

smaller panes on the existing windows. Even if the aluminium frames were painted a colour to match the other window frames, the modern design of the proposed windows would be a considerable deviation from the characteristic traditional design and size of the windows of the host property and wider terrace. As such, the proposal would disrupt the established character of the terrace and would appear as an incongruous addition, detracting from its appearance in the area.

6. For these reasons, I conclude the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It therefore conflicts with Policies DBE3 and DBE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan, Adopted July 2017, (Local Plan), which seek to ensure that developments are well designed and respect the character of the original building. It further conflicts with Local Plan Policy LB2 which seeks to ensure developments within Areas of High Landscape Value protect the local character. These policies are also echoed within sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. The increase in outlook and natural lighting received by the occupiers of No.3 as a result of the development would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR