
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/23/3314908

10 Hind Close, Dymchurch, Kent TN29 0LG

- 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 Ms Jacolyn Tankaria against the decision of Folkestone & Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1433/FH, dated 11 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a rear two storey 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 a two-storey extension across the whole width of the rear elevation of No 10, an end-terrace property in Hind Close. Unusually, the Close provides access to the rear of the terrace comprising Nos 2-10 (even numbers) with their frontages facing onto a pedestrian walkway. The rear elevations of these properties, set behind rear boundary fences and relatively short rear gardens, are consequently prominent in the street scene.
4. The rear elevation of No 10 is set back slightly from that of its neighbour No 8 and the proposed extension, 1.8 m deep, would bring the elevation forward to be flush with that of the adjacent property. This would not necessarily be problematic in itself, however the roof form of the extension would be duo-pitched at right angles to the main roof and would have a ridgeline at the same height as that of the main house.
5. As a consequence, the extension would not appear subservient to the main dwelling in design terms and would appear overdominant in the street scene. At present Nos 2-10 comprise a coherent, slightly staggered terrace with simple pitched roofs; the proposal would result in an awkward and unduly bulky roof form at one end, unbalancing the whole. It is appreciated that No 7 opposite has a prominent two-storey gabled forward projection but that house is detached, not in a terrace, and the ridgeline of the projection is lower than that of the main house, somewhat lessening its impact.

6. 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 scale, proportions, massing and form, and require alterations and extensions to buildings to reflect the scale, proportions and roof line of the original building and not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

Conclusion

7. Whilst the proposal would provide improved living accommodation and the materials to be used would match those of the existing house, these factors are outweighed by the unduly bulky 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