

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2021

by C Jack BSc MA MA(TP) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/D/20/3262204

22 Allards, Pett Road, Guestling, Hastings TN35 4EZ

- 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 Kent Taylor against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref RR/20/1022/P, dated 27 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front single storey extension at 22 Allards, Pett Road, Guestling, Hastings TN35 4EZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RR/20/1022/P, dated 27 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 22 Allards is an end of terrace house in a group of very similar terraces of houses, situated at the end of a residential close. No 22 and the nearby terraced properties display a generally uniform appearance with few obvious alterations or extensions visible from the central green space at the front, other than some enclosure of front porches and limited examples of side extensions that have reduced the overall uniformity of the street scene to some degree.
4. While the front garden is small, the extension would be very modest in scale with a forward projection of around 2 metres and would be subservient to No 22 and the wider terrace. Moreover, it would be situated in a corner location at the rear of the green space and would not be prominent in the street scene. The design and materials proposed would generally respect and not detract

from the character and appearance of the locality. While the extension would further reduce the uniformity of the terraces, the effect would be limited commensurate with its scale. Furthermore, the extension would have no significant effect on the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

5. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policies OSS4 and EN3 of the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, which together and among other things seek to ensure that development would respect the site and surroundings including through design quality.

Other Matters

6. There is no significant evidence that the circumstances relating to this appeal would be particularly likely to be repeated, or indeed that the cumulative effect of further similar developments would necessarily be harmful to the appearance of the area. Furthermore, like this appeal, any subsequent application must be considered on its own merits. Therefore, the concerns about precedent do not carry significant weight.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit, a plans condition is necessary in the interests of certainty and a matching materials condition is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the locality.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the development would accord with the development plan taken as a whole and the appeal is allowed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR