



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMIn

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/20/3250605

57 New Street, Ash, Canterbury, CT3 2BL

- 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 and Mrs Paul Naden against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00095, dated 29 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing garage and erect a 2 story building comprising garage and ancillary domestic accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form describes the proposal as 'demolition of existing garage and new build replacement garage, accommodation for family pet and attic studio'. The council has amended this to 'erection of a two storey attached garage (existing garage to be demolished)'. In my opinion neither descriptions convey clearly the physical form of what is proposed. I have adopted the description 'demolish existing garage and erect a 2 story building comprising garage and ancillary domestic accommodation'. Should the appeal be allowed, this description would not compromise the appellant's aims for the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the case are the effect of the proposals on the existing house in terms of scale and design, and its relationship and effect on nearby development and the street scene.

Reasons

4. Number 57 New Street sits at the junction with Mill Field, on a larger curtilage than most of the houses in the immediate vicinity. The curtilage has a wide frontage to New Street, but has limited depth. The existing garage, to be demolished, has access onto Mill Field, close to the junction with New Street. On the opposite side of New Street is a row of single storey houses, of which No.50 is a listed (Grade II) thatched cottage. The immediately adjoining dwellings in Mill Field are a pair of bungalows under gabled roofs. Opposite the

appeal site, on the other side of Mill Field, is a detached house (No.1a). This is of 2 storeys with a main gabled roof, but it has a rear wing that is single storey but with accommodation in the roof. This roof is in the form of a hipped-gable, with 2 dormers under hipped roofs. Immediately at the rear of No.1a there is a double garage, having a half-hip roof; below the hip is a casement window giving light into the roof space. The remainder of Mill Field is developed with modern 2-storey houses, most of which have roofs in the half-hipped form.

5. The proposed two-storey appeal building partly occupies the site of the existing garage, but is considerably larger and runs back to a position close to the rear south corner of the house. The front elevation, facing towards New Street, has a wide garage door and a personal entrance door next to a glass screen on the ground floor with the first floor contained within a half-hipped roof, the eaves of which run back from the top of the ground floor. Set within this roof, on this elevation, are 2 dormer windows, under hipped roofs. The access, as existing, rises up from Mill Field, into the manoeuvring area that extends across half of the front elevation of the house. The elevation that faces onto Mill Field has a blank wall at ground level with casement windows at first floor set centrally under the hip of the main roof.
6. For the appellant it is explained that the proposed building is domestic in scale, and has a footprint smaller than that of the house at No.1a Mill Field with modest eaves height. The brick wall and half-hip roof is similar in form to the garage at 1a and the other 2-storey houses in Mill Field. The half-hip gable fronting Mill Field would reflect the gable of No.1a opposite. The dormer windows would also reflect those at No.1a, including the use of plain tiles. The existing garage is of unfortunate appearance, and the street scene would be improved by the appeal proposal.
7. I can see the basis of the design approach to the appeal building, following the much used half-hip form of roof used in the immediate surroundings on Mill Field. However, its presentation to the street scene is much more substantial than the garage building at No.1a, which in any event is set well back, reducing its prominence by being largely screened by boundary hedges. Furthermore, the appeal proposal has the bulk of a major extension at the side of No.57, even though it is separated by a linked pedestrian gateway. It would not be in keeping with the design and form of the existing house which is full 2-storey with a fully hipped roof.
8. The proposed building would be prominent on the corner of New Street and Mill Field, and its unbalanced features of large garage door, the personal entrance and the dormer windows, are visually unsatisfactory. Equally so is the nature of the large roof which makes the whole main elevation ungainly and top heavy. The rear elevation, that would be seen obliquely from Mill Field would be conspicuous. The side elevation of the building would be set relatively close to the footway of Mill Field, and the fact that the ground level rises somewhat would make it more prominent. Whilst the existing garage could be of better appearance, it has not the prominence of the proposal.
9. As a result of these considerations, I conclude that the proposed building would sit awkwardly with the existing house in terms of scale and design, and its relationship and effect on nearby development and the street scene would be unsatisfactory. I see that the appellant contends that the proposal could not be changed without sacrificing the accommodation that is sought. Be that as it

may, the private benefit of the proposal does not outweigh the public harm that I have described. This would be contrary to the policies of section 12 the National Planning Policy Framework 'Achieving well-designed places', particularly paragraphs 124, 127 and 130.

Other matters

10. I have to have regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed cottage at 50 New Street, in accordance with Section 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I take the view that the discordant appearance of the proposal in the street scene would be unfortunate in the setting of No.50 New Street, but not to the extent of amounting to 'less than substantial harm'.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons that I have given in paragraph 9, I conclude that the appeal proposal, in terms of scale and design, would not relate well to the existing house and that it would have a harmful effect on the general appearance of nearby development and be an unsatisfactory intrusion on the streetscape. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR