



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/21/3279288

Magnolia, Sissinghurst Road, Biddenden TN27 8EQ

- 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 Charlie Hare against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00805/AS, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a detached garage plus replacement of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For clarity, I have used the description of development given on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form.
3. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 21 July 2021. All references to the Framework in this decision relate to the updated document.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located to the southern side of Sissinghurst Road (A262). The surrounding area is typified by established linear development set back from the main highway behind hedged and fenced garden spaces. Some of the dwellings along this section of the A262 also have parking and turning areas to the front, including 'Magnolia' which is a semi-detached chalet-type bungalow which has a front boundary that is lined with evergreen trees and a fence.
6. The proposal is to construct a single-storey rear extension and a detached barn-type garage with a pitched slate roof adjacent to the front boundary that would face towards the host dwelling and be secured by roller-style shutters. There would be a new timber fence and gate.

7. The appellant has brought to my attention a number of dwellings near to the host dwelling that have detached garages to the front, including those seen at Mountfield House and Orchard House. However, I cannot be certain if those developments were permitted under the same development plan as the proposal before me or not. Therefore, I have considered the proposed development on its own planning merits.
8. I noticed at my site visit that the rear extension is under construction and that the front lawn of the host property has been cleared in preparation for the garage structure.
9. However, notwithstanding the detached garages on the opposite side of the road, I noticed at my site visit that the built form on the southern side of the A262 is typified by open-plan style gardens and parking/turning areas. These buffer-type elements help to create a sense of spaciousness in the built environment found along the A262. Where garages exist they are predominantly modest structures to the side of the host property, such as that seen at the neighbouring 'Bepeda'. In comparison, while the proposed garage would be built in slate and timber, it would nonetheless be a pitched roof structure of some bulk and mass that would be sited directly adjacent to the front boundary of the host dwelling.
10. As such, although the appellant contends that the garage would be barely visible in the wider area, I find to the contrary; it would be highly prominent in both directions along the A262. Moreover, while the existing trees to the front boundary would offer some small modicum of shielding, I cannot be certain that they would survive in perpetuity even if a condition were to be imposed.
11. Therefore, when considered as a whole and in the planning judgement, I conclude that the proposal would be at odds with the nearby built form and erode the spaciousness of the immediate surrounding area. It follows then that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
12. Consequently, I find that the proposal is contrary to Policies SP6 and ENV3a of the Ashford Borough Council Ashford Local Plan 2030, as supported by Note 9 of the Ashford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance and Paragraph 130 (c) of the Framework which says, amongst other things, that development should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR