
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/20/3250733

131 Mickleburgh Hill, Herne Bay, Kent, CT6 6JZ.

- 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 A. Scorgie against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref CA/20/00217, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a garage and workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 131 Mickleburgh Hill, is a detached bungalow located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Mickleburgh Hill and Reculver Road. Number 131 is set well back on the plot from both roads giving it a substantial open front and side garden area.
4. The appellant proposes a detached garage/workshop to be sited in the front/side garden. The proposed building would be a substantial structure some 8.4 x 6.0 metres in plan with a half-gabled steep pitched roof. The building would project in front of the main façade of the dwelling and be located some distance from the side elevation of the bungalow, close and parallel to Reculver Road.
5. In itself the building would be well mannered in the context of the scale and form of the host property. However, overall it would appear as a substantial building detached from the host property and thereby very prominent in the street scene.
6. On balance therefore, given its size and location, I conclude in respect of the main issue, that the proposed outbuilding would appear as a prominent and obtrusive form of development that would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene. To allow the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policies DBE3, and DBE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan (Adopted July 2017) and the National Planning

Policy Framework as they relate to the quality of development in terms of the character, setting and context of the site.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR