



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: 12 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/20/3264858

2 Fleet Villas, Grosvenor Road, Kennington, Ashford, TN24 9PJ

- 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 Mrs Michelle Roberts against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01248/AS, dated 14 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension, front entrance porch, dormer windows and rooflights to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the host property, and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 2 Fleet Villas is set in the middle of a small row of properties which extend from Sherwood Close. However, vehicular access is from Grosvenor Road with Fleet Villas set behind the gardens and garages of 1 to 11 (odds) Sherwood Close. The appellant explains that the property was originally semi-detached, however an additional property was added to the side of 1 Fleet Villas. The resultant terrace has hipped ends which is also reflective of the roof form to the pair of semis to the other side (3 and 4 Fleet Villas).
4. The proposal would result in a number of alterations to the property. The Council has raised no objection to the front porch, and I have no reason to disagree. The side extension, which includes a gable ended roof form running off the existing ridge line, would extend the property up to the side boundary. The revised roof form would also facilitate a rear extension with accommodation in the roof created via a flat crown roof and dormers linking with the existing rear projection.
5. Ashford Local Plan policy HOU8 requires extensions to be of a suitable size, scale and materials to the existing dwelling. The proposal adds significant bulk to the property especially at the roof level. It would create an asymmetrical roof form to the terrace and significantly diminish the existing gap between the two groups of properties. In my opinion, the form of development is both out of

keeping with the host property, and visually intrusive in the street scene. Whilst Fleet Villas are somewhat distinct from Sherwood Close there are views along the row from the road. The proposals would result in an incongruous addition creating a loss of spaciousness. The remaining gap of approximately 1m between the built form of 2, and 3 Fleet Villas would not be discernible, and, given its scale and height the extension would be a prominent feature.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to a previous planning approval for a side extension to the property¹. Whilst this extended up to the boundary, in contrast to the appeal scheme it maintained the hipped roof form and did not include the additional roof/dormer alterations. It therefore was not of the same scale and massing; the visual of harm of the proposed scheme is derived from the combination of the width of the extension, roof form and rear dormer projection.
7. A side extension has been added to 4 Fleet Villas but again this maintains a hipped roof and is set down from the ridge line in a subservient form. There are examples of gable roofs in the vicinity including in Sherwood Close, and the appellant has referenced other extension schemes across the Borough. Nonetheless, I have considered this scheme on its own merits having regard to its context and in accordance with the development plan.
8. I have also had regard to the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 10. I accept, as noted by the appellant, that the document is somewhat dated. Nevertheless, it does provide guidance on the approach to extending a property and in general is reflective of the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes good design.
9. Overall, I find that the proposal would be of a scale and form which would be harmful to both the host property and the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to policies SP1, SP6, ENV3a and HOU8 of the Ashford Local Plan, which seek to secure development that is of a high quality of design and does not result in overall harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to the Human Rights Act and the rights of the appellant to enjoy her land. I understand the appellant's desire to extend her home, nevertheless, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh other planning considerations and I have no reason to conclude that they should do so here.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

¹ 06/00921/AS