
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/W/22/3308199

Broadlands, North Pole Road, Barming, Kent ME16 9HG

- 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 C Walsh against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council (the Council).
 - The application ref. 22/503398/FULL, dated 8 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. An application for costs was made by Mr C Walsh against the decision of the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking to the front in a neighbourhood that is predominantly residential in nature. The property is currently being re-developed; amongst other things at my site visit I observed a ground floor rear extension and rear dormer window at roof level that are under construction. These have already substantially increased the size of the house and altered its appearance.
 5. The new first floor addition would be clearly visible from the back gardens of surrounding houses. It would include a projecting gable element with dual pitched roof, and a hipped section topped with flat roof, both of which would adjoin the the rear dormer window.
 6. To my mind the extension would fail to harmonise with the other additions to the property; the overall arrangement would appear jarring, overwhelming the current building with projections to the rear at ground, first and roof level of varying depth and style, together with a mixture of roof forms and window shapes and sizes. Cumulatively the scheme would lack architectural subtlety, resulting in an obtrusive appearance within the context of the house and surrounds.
-

7. I acknowledge those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development; the site is not in a Conservation Area or an established flood risk zone, the appeal building is not Listed, and there would be no adverse harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.
8. I also note the appellant's contention that the first floor rear extension already benefits from planning permission under a separate application (Council ref: 21/504652/FULL). However, the Council has explained that the proposals before me are different to that approved, as the roof of the development would join onto the face of the rear box dormer instead of intersecting into the rear roof slope of the main dwelling. I am satisfied with this analysis, having been provided with no compelling evidence to the contrary.
9. I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area. It would be contrary to Policies SP17, DM1, DM30 and DM32 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

10. Given the above and in respect of all matters advanced, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR