
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/22/3313137

Trimmingham, Kingsdown Hill, Kingsdown, Kent CT14 8EA

- 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 Graham Rogers against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01247, dated 22 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2022.
 - The proposed development is for the erection of a detached garage, new vehicular access and soft landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council refers to policies of the New Dover District Local Plan. This is currently at the examination stage and has not yet been adopted by the Council as part of its development plan. Accordingly, I can only give such policies limited weight in the decision-making process.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development having regard to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, detached house with off-street parking on the driveway to the front. The local neighbourhood is predominantly residential in nature.
5. Trimmingham is set in a row of other houses that display a degree of uniformity in terms of their relationship to the road, with the driveways and front elevations to each building being broadly visible from the public domain, which adds to the spacious context in which the appeal dwelling is viewed.
6. The proposed garage would be sited forward of the host property and would be clearly evident from the highway. The scheme would erode the spacious character of the locale due to its size and siting forward of the established building line on Kingsdown Hill. The impact would be harmful to the relationship between residences and adjoining spaces, and thus the character and appearance of the area in what is a prominent location.

7. I recognise that the local area comprises an eclectic mixture of dwellings, varying in size, age, design, external finish and boundary treatments. However, this does would outweigh the harm identified above. I also appreciate that there may be other instances of detached garages in the front gardens of dwellings in the local area, and that the property known as the The Warren has a projecting single storey garage feature. Nevertheless, development at other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. I am aware that the development could be screened with hedging, however to my mind any such planting would need to be of a height, extent and density that of itself would look unusual or out of place within the context of this pleasant residential street.
9. On this basis I am drawn to conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would 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. Having regard to all matters raised and based on my reasoning above, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR