



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: 7TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/21/3279235

7 Chester Road, Westgate-on-Sea, Margate, Kent, CT8 8AR.

- 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 Sharon Fisher against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FT/TH/21/0340, dated 4 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 7 Chester Road, Westgate-on-Sea, Margate, Kent, CT8 8AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref FT/TH/21/0340, dated 4 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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, drawings: 214.01 and 214.03.01.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and whether it would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Westgate-on-Sea South Conservation Area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring property number 5, in terms of an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

Reasons

First main issue

3. The appeal property, 7 Chester Road, is a semi-detached three-storey dwelling, located in the Westgate-on-Sea South Conservation Area. The semi-detached pair are similar in form and detail and sit at a higher level than the neighbouring properties to the north.
4. The appellant proposes a first floor gable end pitched roof extension, incorporating two rooflights together with a single window in the west elevation. The ridge line of the extension would be set well below the existing the plate level of the host property.
5. The principal public view of the rear of the property would be from the A28 which is elevated above Chester Road. Accordingly, any alterations to the rear of this dwelling or its neighbours on the west side of the road would be prominent.
6. The walls of the extension would be constructed with render panels between expressed timber framing to match that adopted elsewhere in the design of the semi-detached pair.
7. In my judgement, given the extensions relationship to the semi-detached pair, its height, simple three-dimensional form, choice of materials and detailing it would appear as a well-manner addition to the host property. Further, it would appear as a typical vernacular outshot addition to a semi-detached pair of houses such as these here.
8. I appreciate that an area of existing face brick work would be concealed by the proposed extension and two original window openings would be lost. However, I am not persuaded that these features of the original design are alone so significant in the context of the character and appearance of the conservation area that the change would cause demonstrable harm to it.
9. Given the overall height and form of the extension, in the context of the existing three-storey dwelling I consider that despite its prominence it would nevertheless appear as a subservient apposite addition.
10. I agree that it would change the appearance of the existing house and the semi-detached pair. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it would appear as both an appropriate and sympathetic addition here.
11. For these reasons I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed development would not cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and would serve to preserve the character of the Westgate-on-Sea South Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore accord with the aims of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Policies HE02 and QD02 of the Thanet District Council Local Plan (Adopted July 2020) (LP) as they relate to the quality of development and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Second main issue

12. Number 5 Chester Road is located to the south of number 7. It has a relatively long, west facing rear garden and from the windows at first and second floor level open views over the A28 to the west and south.
13. The proposed first floor addition would be built virtually up to the boundary to number 5. However, from what I saw on site and given the orientation of the house, depth of the rear garden, its location and the existing single storey outshot I do not consider that the proposed addition would result in a such a significant loss of outlook or sense of enclosure as to cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 5.
14. Accordingly, I do not consider that the extension would result in any additional pressure than may already exist to prune or remove the existing mature tree on the southern boundary of number 5 in the future.
15. I conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residential occupiers at number 5 Chester Road. The proposal would therefore accord with the objectives of the Framework and LP Policy QD03.

Other Matters

16. I note that the Council considers the first floor extension to number 23 Chester Road to be detrimental to the host dwelling. Whatever the circumstances surrounding that development I do not consider that it is sufficient reason to refuse the proposed development here, which I have found to accord with the Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Framework and the Local Plan.

Conditions

17. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
18. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR