



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: 17th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/21/3288616

22 Dane Court Gardens, Broadstairs, Kent, CT10 2SB.

- 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 and Mrs Kronic against the decision of Thanet District Council
 - The application Ref FH/TH/21/0834, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as *front, side and first floor extensions to existing detached bungalow dwelling*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a relatively small, well mannered, hipped roofed detached bungalow located on a residential estate, Dane Court Gardens. The estate is characterised by a variety of older style detached bungalows and chalet bungalows.
4. Number 22 is situated in a small cul-de-sac of nine properties. However, number 23 the neighbouring property, which has been significantly enlarged and altered, is located on a corner plot where the cul-de-sac links to the main estate road. It therefore backs on to the appeal site. Due to its large footprint and location, it has a narrow rear garden area.
5. Number 23 is large and of a contrasting design to the properties in the cul-de-sac. Nevertheless, because of its corner location it does not detract from the overall character of the properties in the cul-de-sac itself.
6. The appellants propose extensions to the front and side elevations, alteration to the existing roof scape, including the insertion of front and rear dormers to form a two bedrooms and bathroom at first floor level. Given the size of the plot and the set back of the dwelling from the road I consider that in terms of the proposed ground plan the dwelling as extended would sit comfortably on the plot.

7. The existing detached garage, to the rear of the site would be demolished with a new garage being incorporated in the side extension. The relocation of the garage closer to the road would reduce the impact of vehicle movements on the occupants of number 23 and is therefore to be welcomed.
8. In order to accommodate the two bedrooms and bathroom in the roof space the designer proposes removing the existing hipped roof, raising the ridge line and forming a new roof with barn hips along with the insertion of dormers in the front and rear roof slopes. A new pitched roof would be built over the garage with a lower ridge line.
9. Due to the increase in height of the roof, although not significantly higher than that at number 23, together with the proposed dormers and the barn hip roof design the bungalow as extended would appear bulky and unattractive and thereby prominent in the street scene in comparison to the existing property.
10. On balance therefore I do not consider the extension as designed would meet the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy QD02 of the Thanet District Council Local Plan (Adopted July 2020) and Policy BSP9 of Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 (Referendum Version August 2020), as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the need for new development to respect and enhance the character of the area.

Other matters

11. In reaching my determination I have had regard to the fact that officers recommended the proposal for approval. I have also had regard to other nearby proposals for first floor accommodation. Nevertheless, as I am required to do, I have considered this appeal on the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the support for the proposal I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR