



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/U2235/D/23/3320194

Horseshoe House, Dean Street, East Farleigh, Kent ME15 0PU

- 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 Colin Dale against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/505677/FULL dated 29 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2023.
 - The proposed development is for a double storey rear extension, single storey rear extension, facade alterations, loft conversion, front porch and car port.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U2235/D/23/3324347

Horseshoe House, Dean Street, East Farleigh, Kent ME15 0PU

- 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 Colin Dale against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/501710/FULL dated 6 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2023.
 - The proposed development is for the erection of a part two storey/part single storey rear extension, two storey front extension and new front porch, installation of solar panels on the roof to the rear elevation and erection of a detached two bay car port with attached storage.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two storey/part single storey rear extension, two storey front extension and new front porch, installation of solar panels on the roof to the rear elevation and erection of a detached two bay car port with attached storage. at Horseshoe House, Dean Street, East Farleigh, Kent ME15 0PU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/501710/FUL, dated 6 April 2023, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matter

3. As set out above there are two appeals, both at the same site albeit that the schemes differ in scale and design at the front and rear. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits, but to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two developments together in my reasoning below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in respect of both appeals is the effect of the development having regard the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a detached, two-storey house on Dean Street with off-street parking on the driveway to the front. The local neighbourhood is predominantly residential in nature with wider open countryside and woodland beyond.
6. It would be evident from Dean Street and in views along Pleasant Valley Road that the ridge height of the new front element of Appeal A would continue the ridge line of the existing property, and the side elevation at first floor and the roof slope above would be flush with the host dwelling.
7. Being flush with the side elevation, the ridge line and roof slope, the addition would lack subservience. The imposing appearance of the extension would be in contrast to the existing dwelling, and compete with its overall scale. It would represent a bulky addition to the detriment of the character of the building.
8. Similarly at the back, the large first floor addition would once more lack subservience with the principal building, dominating the roof of the property. It would be clearly visible from the private amenity spaces of surrounding dwellings, having an intrusive effect by virtue of its scale and extent across the rear of the building.
9. I recognise that the building is not locally or otherwise listed, there is no uniformity to dwellings in the vicinity, there would be no material harm to the living conditions of the occupants of adjacent properties, and no objections have been raised by the Parish Council or local residents. However, these matters do not outweigh the detriment I have outlined above. Overall, Appeal A would result in a boxy form of development of deep plan nature, with minimal articulation that would fail to respect or reflect the original design features of the existing dwelling.
10. Conversely, to my mind Appeal B would be of a more sympathetic appearance. The projecting extension to the front would retain the catslide roof feature and allow for much of the roofslope and front elevation of the principal building to remain visible behind, thus maintaining a sense of subordination. At the back the new element would be set within the body of the rear elevation and the pitched roofs would be below the main ridgeline, with a valley gutter that would serve to break up the mass of the addition. Taken in the round, I am satisfied that the extensions would integrate with the house without being imposing or resulting in a contrived design solution.
11. I note that the Council does not object to the carport, the porch or the solar panels in either of the schemes, and I have no reason to disagree.
12. In Appeal A, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. This would contravene Policies SP17, DM1, DM30 and DM32 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2009, which together seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

13. In Appeal B, the scheme would assimilate with the existing house and there would be no adverse impacts on character and appearance. The development would accord with the aforementioned policies.

Conditions (Appeal B)

14. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those on the existing dwelling would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed, and Appeal B should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 221769 09 D01, 221769 09 D02, 221769 09 D06, 221769 09 D07, 221769 09 D08, 221769 09 D09, 221769 09 D10.
- 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling.