



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/Z2260/D/22/3301994

23 Old Green Road, St. Peters, Broadstairs CT10 3BP

- 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 Dr Jane CoomberSewell against the decision of Thanet District Council
 - The application FH/TH/22/0613, dated 30 April 2022 , was refused by notice dated 27 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of car port to front.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development as it appeared on the application form was somewhat convoluted and I have therefore shortened it in line with the description which appeared on the Council's decision notice.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached bungalow located on the western side of Old Green Road. There are bungalows along the whole of the western side of the road and predominantly on the eastern side as well, apart from a few larger two storey detached properties. Within the front garden area there are two large trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order¹ which also includes other frontage trees on that side of the road.
5. The purpose of the carport is to protect the appellant's motorhome from tree sap from the nearby trees, and at the time of my site visit I observed that the motorhome was covered in a protective tarpaulin. The carport would be located in the front garden, parallel with the road and with approximate dimensions of 3.5 metres high x 6 metres long x 3.5 metres wide. It would have a flat roof, be open at either end and constructed of plywood and felt.

¹ Urban District of Broadstairs and St. Peters TPO No 1 1956

6. The appellant argues that the carport would not be a building as such; more a 'tunnel' which would have clear views through either end when the motorhome was not there. Its siting parallel with the road would also make it less conspicuous. It would be constructed to a high quality and an appropriate stain could be agreed.
7. However, even allowing for the open ended nature of the carport, its substantial size in the front garden with a height significantly above the eaves of the bungalow, would in my view make it an unduly large and obtrusive structure. There are no other such structures in the road at present and the character of the front gardens is generally that of an open nature with low hedges or walls. Notwithstanding its proposed flat roof which the appellant argues would be similar to front porches, the scale of the structure would be wholly different and in a freestanding location unrelated to the main building. There would therefore be little meaningful comparison to nearby porches. I also do not consider the scale and bulk of the proposed structure could be visually compared with a neighbouring fence. For these reasons I agree with the Council that the carport would represent an obtrusive and incongruous feature in the front garden area and would cause visual harm as a result. I do not consider that could be satisfactorily mitigated by an agreed choice of a wood stain.
8. I appreciate that the motorhome would still remain on the site irrespective of whether this appeal is dismissed or not, and that the tarpaulin is not particularly pleasing. However, the vehicle by its very nature is of a temporary nature and personal circumstances can change over time, whereas a permanent structure does not.
9. No evidence is before me to suggest there would be any harm to the protected trees as a result of the proposed carport and from my site observations, I consider that a structure could be designed so as not to adversely impact any root systems.
10. For the above reasons the carport would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy SP35 and QD02 of the 2020 Thanet District Council Local Plan, and Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St. Peter's Neighbourhood Plan, in that it would not be well designed, would not relate well to surrounding development and would not reinforce local character.
11. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR