
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/20/3252638

White Walls, Holland Close, Broadstairs CT10 3QJ

- 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 Peter Gaspa against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/20/0148, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor side extension incorporating roof terrace together with erection of a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of proposed development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form is more precise than that shown on the planning application form and I have therefore used it in the heading above and determined the appeal on this basis.
3. There is another appeal (Ref: APP/Z2260/D/20/3252636) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property consists of a large 2 storey detached dwelling which is located within the countryside and a designated Green Wedge. It has been previously extended, including a first floor side extension on the north-western elevation and a single storey side/front extension on the south-eastern side. The neighbouring properties in Holland Close are of varied size and design, and they are generally set within spacious grounds. The gaps around the buildings and views of trees provide a green and spacious feel to the area.
6. The existing single storey side/front extension projects a considerable distance to the front of the property, however its visual prominence is limited by its single storey scale and the screening provided by the boundary hedge. The proposal would be positioned above the existing single storey extension and it would project about 1.5 metres further to the front. Whilst the extension roof would be set down from the main roof, it would result in a significant increase

in scale and bulk. By virtue of its 2 storey height and its considerable projection of around 9 metres to the front of the main part of the dwelling, the proposed extension would appear as a dominant feature and it would not be subordinate to the existing property.

7. I appreciate that the proposed extension would be screened in wider views from the south by the nearby group of trees, however it would nevertheless appear visually intrusive in Holland Close and erode the spacious character of the area. The south-eastern elevation of the extension would be very bulky due to the considerable length of the 2 storey element, at around 16.5 metres, and the large expanse of unrelieved solid wall. Furthermore, the front elevation of the proposal would be largely featureless, and the roof of the extension would be separate from the main roof. The overall composition would appear as a substantial separate bolted-on addition that would not relate well to the existing dwelling. Moreover, the substantial size of the extended dwelling would appear out-of-scale with the neighbouring properties in Holland Close.
8. I note the appellant's comments in respect of the gabled roof of the existing extension, however it appears subordinate and I find that the proposal would be much more dominant and incongruous. Furthermore, I acknowledge that the Council has previously granted planning permission¹ for a single storey front extension to the garage, however this would have limited visual impact due to its single storey height.
9. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to saved Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006 (the Local Plan), which, amongst other things, states that all new development is required to provide high quality design, and will only be permitted if it respects or enhances the character or appearance of the surrounding area. It would also be contrary to Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, seeks the creation of high quality buildings and places.
10. The Council has referred to saved Policies CC1, CC2 and CC5 of the Local Plan and paragraph 170 of the Framework. However, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the wider landscape due to the topography of the site and the screening provided by nearby vegetation and neighbouring buildings. The proposal therefore would not conflict with the aims of these policies. Nevertheless, this would not overcome my concerns with respect to the design of the proposal and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.
11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR

¹ Council reference: FH/TH/17/0501