
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2023

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/23/3317690

25 St Mary's Road, New Romney, Kent TN28 8JG

- 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 Paul & Yvonne Barrett against the decision of Folkestone & Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1888/FH, dated 4 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

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 street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for an extension to accommodate a w/c and shower room on the front elevation of No 25, a semi-detached property on the western side of St Mary's Road. The single storey extension, about 2.37 m wide and 3.15 m deep, would have a fully hipped duo-pitched roof and high level obscure glazed window facing towards the road with a further small obscure glazed window to the side. The extension would be sited to one side of the house where the front door is now, this would be relocated to the side elevation where there is a large open lean-to car port.
4. Currently, No 25 and the adjacent No 23 comprise a symmetrical pair of conventional semi-detached houses set back behind deep front gardens, very similar to an adjacent pair Nos 19 and 21. Unlike the matching attractive front extensions to four other semi-detached houses back along the road, Nos 5-11, or a small permitted development porch, the proposal would introduce an awkward front projection to one side of the front elevation. Its narrow width compared to its depth and sparse fenestration with no window on one side, a high-level oblong and obscure window to the front, and a small window facing the drive, would combine to produce an oddly designed feature which would be visually intrusive in relation to the front elevation of the pair of properties and incongruous in the street scene as a whole.
5. The extension would therefore significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene in conflict with Policies HB1 and HB8 of the Folkestone &

Hythe District Places and Policies Local Plan 2020. These require proposals to make a positive contribution to their location and surroundings, respecting existing buildings with regard to layout, scale, proportions, massing and form, and require alterations and extensions to buildings to reflect the scale and proportions of the original building and not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

6. The proposal is clearly modelled on a front extension of very similar design at No 39, another semi-detached house in a group of four further along the road. This was granted planning permission in 2006¹. However, this only illustrates the unsatisfactory, visually discordant nature of an extension of this design. An unfortunate decision made seventeen years ago is insufficient justification for another poorly designed extension along this section of road.

Conclusion

7. Whilst the proposal would provide a useful downstairs w/c and shower room and the materials to be used would match those of the existing house, these factors are outweighed by the poorly designed form of the extension which would appear incongruous in the street scene and would conflict with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference Y06/0997/SH