
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2021

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/W/21/3267498

Arkendale, 14 Turners Gardens, Sevenoaks TN13 1QE

- 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 & Mrs C Scott against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02353/HOUSE, dated 16 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey detached annexe with garage space and landscape works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The street scene in Turners Gardens predominantly consists of detached 2 storey houses that are set back from the road. The appeal property is one of a number of dwellings that are accessed via a narrow driveway from the turning head at the end of Turners Gardens. The land level rises towards the south, and so Nos 11 and 12 Turners Gardens are situated on a higher land level than the appeal site.
4. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of a detached building to the front of the dwelling, which would comprise a 2-bedroom annexe and single garage. The building would measure 9.8 metres wide by 7 metres deep and it would be positioned adjacent to the south-eastern boundary. It would have a mansard-style roof and rooflights to the front and rear, which would facilitate accommodation on 2 floors.
5. The street scene includes a number of single storey detached garages sited to the front of the houses. The garages are set down significantly in height from the dwellings, which lessens their dominance. Furthermore, the form of the garages, consisting of dual-pitched roofs and apex ridgeline, limits their scale and bulk. By contrast, the proposed building would have a mansard-style roof with a flat section on top, which would be a bulkier form. The building would also be tall as it would project above the eaves line of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, its footprint would be of considerable size and greater than the

general size of front garages that I saw in the area. Taken together, these factors result in a building that would dominate the front of the dwelling and appear unduly prominent and out of keeping in the street scene.

6. I appreciate that the front garden of the appeal property is large compared to other dwellings in the area, however this would not justify a building of the scale proposed. Whilst the proposal would be set into the ground, the excessive scale and prominence of the building would be perceptible in the public domain. The extent of screening provided by boundary vegetation would be limited, and whilst this could be supplemented it would be a natural feature that could not be relied on in perpetuity to screen the development.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore be contrary to Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan 2015, and guidance in the Sevenoaks Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document and the Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment Supplementary Planning Document, which seek high quality design, including appropriate form and layout.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR