



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2022

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/22/3292595

21 Dumpton Park Drive, Broadstairs CT10 1RQ

- 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 & Mrs Brown against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/21/1397, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension above existing garage, to dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension above existing garage, to dwelling house in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref FH/TH/21/1397, dated 2 September 2021, 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: 001; 002; 003; 004; 005; 006; 007B and 009B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey detached house located on the eastern side of Dumpton Park Drive. Dating from the late C20, the property has been substantially remodelled since, including rendered elevations and a large flat roofed entrance area and side garage which sit forward of the main front elevation. As originally constructed, the property was one of six similar designs on the eastern side of the road, with the appeal property being the northernmost of the six. Properties are generally set well back from the road frontage but the character changes on the western side of the road with more

traditionally designed properties of grander scale and varying from two to three storeys in height.

4. The Council refers to a previous permission granted at the property for a similar first floor side extension (ref FH/TH/21/0213) which was set down slightly from the ridge and also set in from the side and front elevation. This was considered to be acceptable as it would break up the massing of the proposed extension and prevent any cramped appearance arising. In relation to the revised scheme, the Council raises several design related concerns which I will deal with in turn.
5. With regard to the proposed design itself, whilst I acknowledge the general desirability of an extension appearing as subservient to the main property, usually by means of small setbacks, the architectural composition of the property has already been significantly altered by the side garage and entrance area. The proposed extension would not be excessive in width compared to the original property and would not extend beyond the width of the garage or original front elevation. With matching materials in terms of the roof and continuation of the rendered finish, I find that the proposed extension would result in a more balanced and cohesive composition from a design point of view, than that which currently exists, with the flat roofed elements still being set forward of the main elevation and extension and providing articulation to that elevation. In this instance therefore, I do not consider that setbacks are critical to the acceptability of the extension.
6. Turning to the impact in the street scene, the Council appears concerned that the rhythm of built form originally provided by the six similarly designed properties would be disrupted by the proposed extension, which is not the case with other extensions approved, most of which have been set back from the front elevations. However, in my view any rhythm which may have existed has long since gone by the multiplicity of design approaches that has been adopted. The appeal property and its neighbour No 23 for example have both been remodelled with a rendered finish and the latter has had a contemporary flat roofed side extension added. No 29 Dumpton Park Drive has had a two storey side extension with a pitched roof added whilst No 31 has also been substantially altered with a two storey flat roofed side extension and a large glazed balcony forward of the front elevation at first floor level. Given these changes I do not consider that the proposed extension would appear out of place or adversely affect the character of the immediate area to any significant degree.
7. The Council is also concerned that the extension would appear cramped and at odds with the spacious character of properties within the area. However, I note that the side garage and first floor extension to No 23 is already in close proximity to the side boundary of the appeal property. I also note that there would continue to be a gap at first floor level between the appeal property and No 19. Notwithstanding these comments, in my view the open character of the area derives mainly from the wide road and the relatively large and open front gardens on either side. Moreover, the spacing between properties is actually quite limited. On the eastern side, as a result of extensions previously approved and referred to above, and particularly on the western side with larger properties in close proximity to each other with full height flank walls.

8. Drawing the above together, I find that the extension would relate well to the existing property, would not appear cramped in the street scene and overall would not detract from the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy QD02 of the Thanet District Council Local Plan 2020 in that it would be well designed and respect the character of the area, particularly in relation to scale, massing rhythm and use of materials.
9. I note that the Council raises no objections in respect of any impact to living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties and see no reason to disagree with that assessment.
10. Conditions for the development to be built in accordance with the approved plans and for matching materials, are necessary in the interests of certainty and visual amenity.
11. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed and planning permission granted.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR