



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/21/3284203

3 Cannongate Gardens, Hythe CT21 5PU

- 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 Lewis Winton-Norman against the decision of Folkestone & Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1043/FH, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development is for the proposed construction of an additional storey alongside a rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed construction of an additional storey alongside a rear extension at 3 Cannongate Gardens, Hythe CT21 5PU in accordance with the terms of the application, ref: 21/1622/FH, dated 29 July 2021, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: E_001, E_002, P_002, P_003, P_004, P_005, P_006, SS_001
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached bungalow situated towards the summit of a steep hill on the peripherals of Hythe. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature with no prevailing architectural style; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size, design and detailing.
 4. The proposed extension would introduce a distinctly modern addition to the dwelling, with a simple flat roof design, and using white render and timber cladding to the elevations. The height of the development would be similar to those bungalows to either side. I note that the site is not located in a conservation area and there are no listed buildings nearby.
-

5. I am aware that prior approval for the enlargement of the dwellinghouse by construction of one additional storey has been granted by the Council. This would add an extension of greater height, mass and bulk to the property than that proposed by this appeal.
6. It would moreover introduce misaligned fenestration to the principal elevations. Although a disbenefit in visual terms, significant amounts of glazing would be likely to lighten a development's appearance to some degree. On balance, given the viable fallback position I consider that the misaligned fenestration is not sufficiently harmful as to warrant dismissal of the appeal on this ground.
7. The set back from the road and the local topography would prevent the scheme from being seen prominently. Any views would be brief or oblique from the close vicinity. In long-distance panoramas across the wider landscape, when set against the backcloth of other residences, I consider that the addition would not appear unduly dominant or imposing.
8. These factors, together with the context provided by the variety of designs of buildings within the street, would ensure that the proposal, and resulting dwelling as a whole, would not stand out as a jarring or obtrusive feature of the streetscene. It would harmonise with the surrounds and respect the spatial quality of the locale.
9. 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.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. It would accord 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.

Conditions

11. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. Additionally materials are required to match the existing building in order to ensure that the external appearance of the proposal is satisfactory.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR