



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/D/21/3266790

11 Millfield Road, West Kingsdown, TN15 6BX

- 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 Hall against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03230/HOUSE, dated 9 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey extension and first floor extension over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear single storey extension and first floor extension over garage at 11 Millfield Road, West Kingsdown TN15 6BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/03230/HOUSE, dated 9 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 11MR/20/Plans V1, Existing block plan, Proposed block plan, Proposed first floor plan V1, and Site Location Plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the settlement of West Kingsdown. It comprises a two-storey detached house within a cluster of five others of an almost identical design on this part of the Millfield Road. They consist of a mainly two-storey form with cat slide style roof over an integral garage. The wider street scene is characterised by a mixture of dwelling types and styles. To the rear, within a cul-de-sac, there are two similarly designed properties; one which has a first-floor extension above the garage and the other a dormer style window, as shown in the Appellant's statement of case.

4. The proposal seeks two key features; firstly a single storey rear extension with a mono-pitch roof off the rear elevation. The Council's reason for refusal and officer report does not identify any issue with this rear extension and I see no reason to disagree with that assessment.
5. The second element sought is a first-floor extension over the garage at the appeal property. The Officer's report indicates that the cluster of dwellings of Nos 11, 9 and 7 have a clear pattern of design and the gaps at first floor level provide an element of relief from the built form which contributes to the character of the area. Moreover, the Council's *Residential Extensions SPD* indicates that a 1 metre gap is normally desirable.
6. In this case, there is already a gap between the detached dwellings at Nos 9 and 11 and this would remain. Whilst not expressed on the drawings, the submitted block plans reinforce my observations at the site inspection that there is a noticeable gap between Nos 9 and 11 at ground floor level. The proposal does not seek to close or infringe on this gap. The gap, whilst narrowed at first floor level, would nonetheless remain between the dwellings and not result in any significant loss of the gap that the Council considers is an important part of the character of the area.
7. As such, I find that the proposal as a whole would accord with Policy SP1 of the *Core Strategy 2011* and EN1 of the *Allocations and Development Management Plan 2015*, as supported by the Residential Extensions SPD. Amongst other aims, these policies seek to ensure that all new development should be designed to a high quality and respond to the distinctive local character of the area.

Conditions

8. Conditions requiring the use of matching materials and to be built in accordance with the submitted drawings are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the proposal contributes positively to the character of the area.

Overall Conclusion

9. I find that the appeal accords with the adopted development plan, and there are no material considerations indicating a decision otherwise than in accordance with it.
10. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR