



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/22/3301771

32 Eden Road, Seasalter CT5 4AP

- 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 Ms. Amber & Claire Huddleston-Stevens against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref CA/21/03023, dated 15 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory, garage and outbuilding, and erection of single and double storey side and rear extension with external staircase. Cladding and alterations to windows and doors to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached 2 bedroom bungalow with a detached garage and outbuilding that sits adjacent to another pair of semidetached bungalows. These, along with the appeal property and its semi-detached pair are located on triangular plots towards the end of a no-through unmade private road.
4. The streetscape of Eden Road is made up of a variety of detached and semi-detached bungalows and some houses on relatively small plots, many of which appear to have been the subject of extensive alteration and/or extension. In these regards the street is representative of the character and appearance of the wider area.
5. The proposal would replace an existing single storey outbuilding and garage, situated to the side of the appeal dwelling, which, whilst adjoined to each other, are detached from the appeal dwelling. An existing pathway sits between the appeal dwelling and the garage and outbuilding. This allows pedestrian access to the rear garden from the front garden and driveway.

6. The single storey element of the proposal would be attached to the flank elevation of the appeal dwelling. This would sit further forward than the existing garage and outbuilding, but still set back from its front elevation. To the rear of this, a larger double storey part of the proposed extension would have living accommodation in its roof area, accessed from an external staircase from the rear garden and screened by a metal/timber screen.
7. Both the single and double storey elements of the proposed extension would sit away from the boundary with the neighbouring semi-detached bungalow at 34 Eden Road (No.34). In plan, the proposed extension would have a stepped arrangement, which would reflect the triangular shape of the appeal plot and that of the neighbouring plot at No.34. this would also allow for an access pathway to the rear garden of the appeal dwelling that would be adjacent to the property boundary with No.34.
8. Both the single and double storey part of the proposed extension would have pitched roofs with gable flank ends. However, given the limited height of the roofs over the single storey element of the proposed extension, the two storey element would appear significantly taller and would be slightly but perceptibly taller than the appeal dwelling.
9. By utilising a stepped plan arrangement for the proposal and using pitched roofs, the single storey element appears as a subservient addition to the proposal and, due to the proposed new matching timber cladding, would appear to be fully integrated with the main dwelling. However, due to its scale, height and proximity to No.34, the rear two storey element of the proposed extension would not result in the appeal dwelling and the proposal appearing as a coherent whole. Rather, this part of the proposal would appear as an overly dominant and incongruous addition that would appear to be separate from the appeal dwelling.
10. Further, due to the positioning of the two storey element of the proposal and its scale and bulk, this part of the proposal would appear to infill the separating space between the appeal property and No.34, and would not reflect the scale, form and layout of adjacent buildings or others in the local area. It would, therefore, be visually intrusive and appear over scaled and visually dominant and discordant in the street scene, when viewed from both Eden Road and the surrounding gardens.
11. The proposed cladding of the appeal dwelling and the proposed extension in dark finished timber would not reflect the existing finishes used in the existing appeal dwelling or its semidetached pair. However, given the differences in windows, finishes and cladding used on this semi-detached pair and the variety of finishes, materials and architectural expressions used in the local area, this alone would not result in the appeal property appearing to be out of keeping with its neighbours.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that, when considered as a whole, the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area. This would conflict with policies DBE 3 and DBE 6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan (2017) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of

design, are compatible with the character of the original building and integrate between different parts of the building to create a coherent whole, contribute to local context and integrate with the local area.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR