
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/D/22/3308241

29 Harvesters Way, Weaving, Kent ME14 5SH

- 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 & Mrs Dean & Becky Lucas against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application ref. 22/502488/FULL, dated 18 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2022.
 - The proposed development is a two storey side and rear infill extension in conjunction with demolition of conservatory and replacement with a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 29 Harvesters Way is a two-storey, semi-detached residence with off-street parking to the front and a double detached garage to the side. It is situated in a neighbourhood that is predominantly residential in nature.
4. The two-storey flank element of the scheme would extend to the side and rear; it would be set back from the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling, and the ridge line would be below that of the host property.
5. Although the proposed addition would therefore have elements of subservience, the splayed design linking the house with the double garage would represent an awkward, disjointed arrangement. The pitch of the new roof would project at an oblique angle from the side wall of the host property, and by not matching the front-to-back pitches of the house and garage, would create visual confusion and detract from the appearance of the existing dwelling.
6. At my site visit I saw that 31 Harvesters Way has a two-storey side extension, which was approved by the Council in the mid 1980s. From the public domain a roof form of similar nature to the principal house is visible, and I consider that it has integrated successfully when viewed in the context of the house and immediate vicinity. Consequently, it is not comparable to the appeal scheme before me.

7. I appreciate that there are no adverse impacts on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring houses, that the proposal would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling, there have been no objections from local residents or the Parish Council, and the internal layout would be enlarged to meet the needs of the appellants' family. However, none of these points would outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
8. I consider that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan October 2017 and the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2009), which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR