



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

**by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 2<sup>ND</sup> March 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z22260/D/21/3288697**

**92 Westfield Road, Margate, Kent, CT9 5NX.**

- 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 Mark Tunbridge against the decision of Thanet District Council.
  - The application Ref FH/TH/21/1187, dated 21 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
  - The development proposed is for a two-storey side extension and first floor rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property, 92 Westfield Road, is a two-storey, detached, double fronted dwelling. It is located on a large and prominent corner plot.
4. The appellant proposes a two-storey side extension along with a first floor rear extension.
5. The proposed side extension would be built flush with the existing main street façade of the host property, without any set back. Consequently, although the ridge line of the proposed extension would be set lower than that of the existing dwelling, the extension would not appear as a subservient addition. Accordingly, the proposed side extension would detract from the established symmetry of the host property, causing harm to its character and appearance.
6. Furthermore, in order to achieve the lower ridge line, the pitch of the roof of the extension would be set at a shallower angle than that of the host property. This would make for a contrived and awkward junction between the two roofs.
7. The roof of the rear extension would essentially be a flat roof with a false pitched fascia. Although, to some extent, the pitched fascia would soften the line of the flat roof it would nevertheless make for a very utilitarian and bulky roof line that in turn would detract from the three-dimensional form of the roof

of the host property. Thereby causing further harm to the architectural integrity of the host property.

8. In addition, the side and rear first floor extensions would bring the building, as extended at that level much closer to its boundary to George V Avenue. The effect of which would be to significantly reduce the spacious setting of the dwelling here. Thereby, resulting in an imposing and prominent form of development, that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment.
9. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would be harmful to the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment. To allow it would be contrary to the objectives of Policy QD02 of the Thanet District Council Local Plan (Adopted July 2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to amongst other things the quality of design and the requirement for development to respect and enhance the character of the area.

### **Conclusions**

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Philip Willmer*

INSPECTOR