



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2024

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/23/3330661

Flat 6, 1 Penshurst Road, Ramsgate, Kent CT11 8EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon Cowdery against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref is FH/TH/23/0927.
 - The development proposed is a balcony and kitchen area within the current roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Government published a recently revised National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") and all references in this decision relate to the revised document. I am satisfied that the parties will not be prejudiced by the changes to the national policy context as there are no material changes relevant to the substance of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The area of the appeal site consists mostly of roads laid out in a grid-like pattern and fronted predominantly by long rows of period style terraces displaying a repetitive pattern of windows and projecting bays to their facades. These characteristics create a distinctive street scene with a strong sense of consistency and unity.
5. The appeal property forms part of a tall and substantially sized period style terrace with a tall main core and a narrower subservient wing with a lower roof level projecting out towards Thanet Road. Set in the façade of its main core is a repetitive pattern of forward projecting bays, relatively narrow window openings that are generally taller on lower floors, modest roof dormers and large chimney stacks.
6. The subservient wing is a distinctive feature of the appeal terrace in the street scene with angled walls and relatively narrow vertically aligned window openings. It is set in a prominent position and addresses the corner of the junction by providing a transition of roof heights between the tall host terrace and the lower height buildings fronting Thanet Road. As such, it contributes

positively to the hierarchy of the terrace's architectural order and to the established character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed extension would replicate the narrower width and angled form of the appeal terrace's existing wing and hipped roof form. However, it would occupy an elevated and highly visible position on the terrace in street level views where its taller roof line, set only marginally below that of the existing terrace, and considerably taller eaves and outer walls, would significantly increase the height and massing of the existing wing. This would have the effect of eroding its subservient scale and relationship with the main core of the terrace, and the transition of roof heights in the street scene.
8. Furthermore, the size of the window to the balcony in the proposed extension would be inconsistent with the sizes, proportions and hierarchy of window openings in the appeal terrace and those in the area. As such, it would disrupt the repetitive pattern of window openings in the appeal terrace's period style façade and would draw the eye to the scale and massing of the proposed extension, exacerbating its visual harm.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposed extension would disrupt the hierarchy and consistent architectural order of the appeal terrace, and harmfully erode its positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan, Adopted July 2020 ("the TLP"), which seeks to ensure that development represents high quality design and respects the character of the area, with particular attention to scale, massing and rhythm.
10. The proposal would also be contrary to Framework Paragraph 135, insofar as it states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other matters

11. The proposal would improve the accommodation within the appeal property to the benefit of the occupiers' living conditions. However, the Planning Practice Guidance¹ states that the planning system is mainly concerned with the use of land in the public interest. Accordingly, I attach limited weight to the benefits of the appeal proposal to the occupiers' living conditions, insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with TLP Policy QD02 and the development plan as a whole. The material considerations are not of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with that plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306