

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2021

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/D/21/3267685

95 Taylor Close, Tonbridge, Kent TN9 2FE

- 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 Gary O'Hare against the decision of Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. TM/20/02035/FL, dated 16 September 2020 was refused by notice dated 6 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is the end property in a modern terrace development on the southern side of the road. Because of its corner position adjoining a service access, the side gable of the house is particularly prominent in the approach from the junction with Deakin Leas.
 4. The appeal scheme seeks to add a two storey extension with a garage on the ground floor and a bedroom with en-suite above. The extension would step back slightly from the existing front wall and extend about 5m across the side garden before returning to join and follow the angled flank boundary of the site, then again returning to line in with the existing rear wall of the house.
 5. The tapered design combined with more than half of its depth constructed actually on the side boundary of the plot would in my view be correctly perceived as an incongruous overdevelopment of No. 95. The convoluted roof design necessary to accommodate the tapered shape of the extension would have a particularly poor appearance.
 6. The extension would be seen as an unsympathetic addition to a house and wider terrace that were built to a good quality and coherent design. Because of its bulk and contrived appearance, the addition would draw the eye and have a jarring effect on the host dwelling and street scene. The harm caused would be exacerbated by this prominent location.
-

7. The grounds of appeal suggest firstly that the lack of detail in the relevant policies allows some leeway in a design solution and secondly that the extension would follow the standard design principles for an extension to be subordinate by being set down and set back from the host dwelling. However, in my view neither of these factors can sufficiently compensate for a scheme that derives rather more from the objective of achieving a garage and as much living space as possible on the site than from the necessary consideration of ensuring that development maintains the quality of the public realm.
8. I acknowledge that because the area of land is rarely used due to its unusual shape and lack of sunlight, the appellant considers that it would be far more beneficial to use this area to build an extension. I am also aware that this is a revised scheme that seeks to improve the first proposal. However, my assessment remains that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
9. This would be in conflict with the Council's policies including Saved Policy P4/12 (1) of the Borough's 1998 Local Plan; Policy CP24 1 of the 2007 Core Strategy; Policy SQ1 of the Managing Development and the Environment DPD 2010 and Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
10. For these reasons I dismiss the appeal.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR