



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/22/3291672

7 Bishopstone Lane, Herne Bay, Kent, CT6 6RN.

- 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 Comey against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref CA/21/02827, dated 22 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as *demolition of existing roof and rear extension. New extensions to front and rear with new roof over whole building containing accommodation and an inset balcony to the front.*
-

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 street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 7 Bishopstone Lane is a detached bungalow. This side of the road is characterised by detached and attached pairs of bungalows. Number 7 is one of a group of three detached bungalows facing the road and farmland opposite.
4. The existing bungalow is a modest simple single storey gable roof building. Save for the flat roofed garage it is virtually identical to the neighbouring bungalow number 8.
5. The appellants propose, following demolition of an existing rear extension, the removal of the existing roof and then the construction of single storey extensions to the front and rear and two mono-pitched roofs front and rear abutting a flat roofed first floor extension located between the two new sloping roofs. Thereby, along with alterations to the existing ground plan allowing for the creation two bedrooms, shower room and balcony at first floor level.
6. Except for the inset balcony and the loss of the existing projecting gable roof the front elevation would serve to respect the existing built form of the existing

- dwelling. Its design would therefore not cause undue harm to the host dwelling or thereby the street scene, when viewed face on from the street.
7. However, the flat roofed first floor addition would, in conjunction with the two mono-pitched roofs cause significant harm to the architectural form and character of the host property. Further, the large box like addition, whether clad in grey composite cladding or slate would, by reason of its form and colour, be very visible when viewed between gaps in the neighbouring dwellings. It would appear incongruous and prominent in the street scene that currently comprises traditional pitched roofed bungalows.
 8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would, due to uncharacteristic bulky design, cause harm to both the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore not accord with the objectives of Policies DBE3 and DBE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan (Adopted July 2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the character, context and setting of a site.

Other matters

9. The appellants have drawn my attention to examples of similar developments in the area. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in this case.
10. The appellants also suggest that the proposal would be less intrusive on the street scene than the possible permitted development of an additional storey. However, as this would be subject to separate consideration and as there is limited evidence to suggest that the impacts described by the appellant would come to pass, this consideration has minimal weight in my decision.
11. Whilst I am sympathetic to the fact that the appeal proposal is a redesign, taking into account issues raised during the consideration of the original scheme design by the Council, I can only assess the current proposal on the basis of the design before me.
12. I have also had regard to the fact that it is intended that proposed development would be energy efficient and due to its location, it would be unlikely to impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations and, as such, I have given these matters very limited weight in my decision.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of third party objections I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR