The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2021

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/W/21/3271485
Rosecroft, Selling Road, Old Wives Lees, Canterbury Kent CT4 8BH

- 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 Richard Lickman against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20/00648/AS, dated 36 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2021.
- The development proposed is the erection of a two storey rear extension (retrospective).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the host property, and character and appearance of the area including the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. Rosecroft is a semi-detached property in a row of properties to the west of Selling Road. It and the other half of the semi, Whittingtons, both have a two storey side extension with a fully hipped roof which gives them a distinctive form. The new rear extension to Rosecroft projects off the back of this extension and adjoins a previous two storey flat roof rear extension.

4. Ashford Borough Local Plan 2030 policy HOU8 states that extensions should be suitable in size, scale and materials to the existing dwelling. In relation to properties located within the AONB it goes on to indicate that they will be required to address the specific sensitivities that are prevalent in these areas and that particular consideration will be given to the scale and wider impact in these locations.

5. By infilling the corner and linking together the previous extensions the scale and depth of the proposal is proportionate to the existing property. However, the eaves line does not align with either extension. In my view the notably higher eaves line creates a non-subordinate relationship with the main dwelling and draws attention to the flat roof extension. The upper part of the extension and roofscape of the property are visible in views along Selling Road across the

frontage of the neighbouring properties. Whilst existing vegetation filters views, the extension is visually prominent and has an incongruous appearance.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other flat roof features in the vicinity and explains that prior to the side extension, the property had a single storey flat roofed extension to the side. However, this is no longer part of the character of the property, and moreover it is not the flat roof itself, rather how it integrates with the existing property and its prominence, which results in an unsympathetic addition to the property.

7. I accept, that as set out by the appellant, a pitched roof could add considerable bulk to the roof, nonetheless I do not find that the extension as built provides a coherent design solution, and it is visually intrusive in the street scene. As such, I find that the design and form of the extension is harmful to the host property and the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies HOU8 and ENV3b of the Ashford Borough Local Plan 2030 and the general guidance in the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10 entitled " Domestic Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas"

Other Matters

8. I have had regard to the appellant's situation and that they had progressed with the extension following building control approval. Nonetheless, this does not override the need for planning permission or affect my conclusion in terms of the non-compliance with policy and the harm that derives from the resultant development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters I find that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR