



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2022

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/W/21/3288095

Headley, 85 Lingfield Road, Edenbridge, TN8 5DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Best against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02505/REM, dated 28 July 2021, sought approval of details pursuant to conditions Nos 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 of a planning permission Ref 20/02024/OUT, granted on 10 September 2020.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 15 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and construction of new dwelling.
 - The details for which approval is sought are access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Outline planning permission was granted by the Council for a replacement dwelling on this site in 2020 with all matters reserved. There is no objection on the Council's part to the landscaping or access details proposed in this instance, and I see no reason to find otherwise.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The street scene in Lingfield Road is varied in character, with several different designs of housing present in the street. The predominant house type is two storeys in height. However, there are also examples of bungalows and some houses with additional rooms in the roof, as is proposed here, with terraced, semi-detached and detached houses interspersed along the street.
5. Within this context, the proposed house would be taller than the houses on the neighbouring plots, particularly those on the plots at Nos 87 and 89. It would be a dominant feature in the street scene, with a wide gable-fronted projection across much of the front elevation that would be both taller and wider than the similar feature to No 87. The proposed house would be overbearing in relation to No 87 which steps down in height towards the shared boundary with the

appeal site. In this regard, the proposed development would appear incongruous within the street scene.

6. The height of the house would be similar to other houses in the nearby street scene, including two pairs of semi-detached houses on the opposite side of Lingfield Road. However, those houses don't have the wide forward projections that the appeal proposal would have, and have hipped or part-hipped roofs, where the proposed house would have gabled sides to its roof. They are therefore less dominant in the street scene than the proposed house would be.
7. Even allowing for the variety in size and appearance of houses in the Lingfield Road street scene, the proposed house because of its overall size would be an uncharacteristic and incongruous feature that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies SP1 of the Sevenoaks Core Strategy and EN1 of the Sevenoaks Allocation and Development Management Plan. Taken together these policies require that development should respond to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is situated, and that the form of the proposed development respond to the scale and height of the area.

Other Matters

8. The Council notes that it does not have a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. However, the proposal is for a replacement dwelling with no increase in housing proposed and therefore there are no benefits identified with it to be weighed in the overall balance that lead me to find otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR