



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/D/20/3250994

Park House, Park Way, Maidstone ME15 7DL

- 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 Richard Parks against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/503171/FULL dated 04 June 2019 was refused by notice dated 16 August 2019.
 - The proposed development is a front extension to form 2 double storey bays with roof alterations to form second floor.
-

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.

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates a large two-storey, fully hipped roofed, detached dwelling of traditional design and proportions. It is distinct from other surrounding properties in that its longest elevation, and that containing the front door, is perpendicular to the road and faces west.
5. The proposed development would incorporate two matching extensions at either end of the west elevation with gable roofs. In between these extensions the hipped roof of the house would be altered such that a vertical wall containing a window at second floor level would be provided. Although it appears that there would be a small section of pitched roof above it, to match that of the house, the span and height of this vertical wall would be considerable. It would appear as a large and bulky addition in a prominent elevated position and would detract from the traditional roof style and design of the house.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposed development

would therefore conflict with Policies DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan, adopted 25th October 2017, (Local Plan), which seeks to ensure good design, and Policy DM9 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure proposals fit unobtrusively with the existing building. It further conflicts with the Maidstone Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, adopted May 2009, which also encourages high quality design. Good design is also a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. The appellant refers to pre-application advice received from the Council and amended the plans according to this advice. I do not have full details of this, nonetheless, I have determined this appeal on its own merits and find it unacceptable.

Recommendation and Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is 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