

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2022

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/D/22/3291537

11 Barchester Way, Tonbridge, TN10 4HP

- 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 Mrs Jackie Blizzard against the decision of Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref TM/21/02130/FL, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension to form extended garage and new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house fronting the road in a large estate of housing dating from the 1960s. The Council's Character Areas Supplementary Planning Document identifies the character of this area being houses set back from the road on an irregular building line, with varying plot sizes and a verdant, spacious character.
 4. I saw at my site visit that the area accords to that character. 11 Barchester Way is set in a small group of houses set slightly further back from the road than other houses further to the north and the south. There is a spacious character to the front of the houses. The proposal would see a single storey extension to the front of the house, projecting 5.6m from the existing front elevation and be 5.44m wide. This would provide a new area of garaging for the house.
 5. I acknowledge that there are forward projections to houses in the area, most notably at Nos. 7 & 9 to the north west and Nos. 17 & 23 to the south east. However, these are notably less deep than the extension proposed in this appeal. Although the proposed extension to No. 11 would have the same building line relative to the pavement as No. 7, that house is positioned closer to the pavement; hence, the depth of its front extensions is not so great as
-

that proposed at No, 11; it is the absolute size and width of the proposed extension that is objectionable in this instance, as the projection forward is of such an extent that it would appear disproportionate and out of scale with the size and design of the existing house. This would be widely visible in the area due to long views along Barchester Way, which would be intrusive to the spacious character of the street.

6. I appreciate that the appellant wishes to improve the ability to keep cars under cover. However, I must balance this personal wish against the wider public considerations of the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The general thrust of saved Policy P4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Local Plan 2010, Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007, and Policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Management Development and the Environment Development Plan Document 2010 is to seek a high standard of design in all new development that accords with its locality. It is my conclusion that the harm to the area is of a magnitude that outweighs the personal benefits arising to the appellant. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR