



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/21/3287044

1a Palmbeach Avenue, Hythe, Kent CT21 6NH

- 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 Stuart Jeffrey against the decision of Folkestone & Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1392/FH, dated 28 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2021.
 - The development is a proposed first floor roof extension and erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development having regard to the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached chalet bungalow with off-street parking to the front, in a predominantly residential neighbourhood on the outskirts of Hythe. It is located in a prominent position near the junction between Palmbeach Avenue and Dymchurch Road.
 4. I saw at my site visit that there are myriad roof shapes and first floor extensions in the vicinity, of varying size, design and detailing. Within this context, to my mind the principle of extending the appeal dwelling with a first floor side element could be acceptable and need not appear incongruous.
 5. However, I consider that the large and boxy extension the subject of this appeal would not be an appropriate solution. It would result in an element that would dominate the upper floor of the property, and fail to reflect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling. It would be clearly visible from the wider streetscene, having a jarring effect by virtue of its scale and extent across the first floor of the dwelling, and in design terms would lack architectural subtlety.
 6. I am aware that there have been no objections to the proposal from local residents; however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified. As outlined above, I also note the numerous additions to other houses in the locality; nevertheless many of these properties are two-storey and semi-detached and of a significantly different character, size and form to the appeal dwelling. I have therefore dealt with the proposal on its merits.
-

7. I note that the Council does not object to the single storey rear addition to the house, and I have no reason to disagree. It would be of an acceptable design and appearance, with no adverse impacts on the public domain.
8. I conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be conflict with Policies HB1 and HB8 of the Folkestone & Hythe Places and Policies Local Plan (September 2020), which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR