



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2022

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/22/3299933

21 Broadlands Avenue, New Romney, Kent TN28 8JE

- 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 Jamie Guppy against the decision of Folkestone & Hythe District Council
 - The application 22/0131/FH, dated 17 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The application property is located on a corner of Broadlands Avenue where it extends into a cul de sac in either direction. It comprises a modern two storey detached property which has been extended at ground floor level. The frontage is enclosed by a hedge whereas along the side boundary fronting the north/south part of Broadlands Avenue, there is a 1.8metre fence with brick piers, which is set behind a grass verge.
4. The proposal involves a two storey side extension extending for most of the depth of the main property. It would have a dual pitched roof with ridges set below the main roof and be constructed of matching brickwork and tile hanging. Although not referred to on the application form, the floorplans indicate that accommodation would provide a degree of independent living from the main property although accessed within that property. The plans also show that the existing hardstanding would be widened.
5. The Council raises no objections to the form of accommodation indicating that if used as an annexe it would be consistent with Policy HB8 of the Folkestone & Hythe District Place & Policies Local Plan (LP) 2020. I agree with that assessment and also see no objections to the widening of the hardstanding.
6. With regard to design, the Council also considers that the proposed form and size would make it appear as a subordinate addition to the main dwelling,

consistent with policy criteria within Policy HB8 of the LP. Having considered that issue on site I would agree with that assessment. However, the Council is concerned that the character of the area shows dwellings set back on corner plots whereas the proposed extension would abut the back edge of the footway and would appear bulky and prominent as a result.

7. Having walked around the area, there is no fixed building line as such and no regular pattern to siting or alignment of corner properties, particularly in this section of the Avenue where the road is slightly curved in alignment. I also observed the variety of different house types, including bungalows, so that the unifying character is mainly materials rather than regular built form.
8. In relation to the appeal property, I note that the side boundary is set back behind the grass verge and that there would be an increasing gap between that boundary and the flank wall of the extension because of the splayed nature of the boundary itself relative to the existing flank wall of the property. I also noted that the property to the rear, No 19 Broadlands Avenue, has substantial structures in its rear garden and adjacent to the side boundary, in the form of a double width double garage and large shed. These structures, albeit at single storey only, would help to mitigate the visual impact of the side extension in the street scene.
9. For a combination of the above reasons and the fact that the extension would appear as a subservient addition, as the Council has noted, I find that the principle of a two storey side extension on this siting would be acceptable within the streetscene. However, I do agree with the Council that the proposed flank wall, which apart from a small section of tile hanging on the return flank, would be devoid of any architectural articulation and would have no fenestration. As a result, it would appear bland and obtrusive, and notwithstanding my earlier comments, I consider that bearing in mind its prominence in the streetscene, it would cause visual harm. On this issue alone therefore, I find that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. In respect of amenity, highway and archaeological issues, I note the Council raises no objections and see no reason to disagree with those assessments.
11. For the above reasons the proposal would not comply with Policy HB8 of the LP in that the lack of appropriate detailing on the flank elevation would have a detrimental effect on the streetscene.
12. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR