



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/24/3345800

46 Herbert Road, Willesborough, Ashford, KENT TN24 0DL

- 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 P Reid against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/0545.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. There is a continuity to the street scene within this row of properties. All but one retain frontage bay windows at ground floor. This uniformity to both the character and appearance of the row gives a distinctiveness to the appearance of the properties. This retains a strong sense of place within this part of the street scene.
4. The proposed front extension would create a substantial feature at the front of the property that would be clearly visible within the street scene. Given its design and overall size it would be a visually out of keeping addition to the host dwelling and that of the wider street scene. Consequently, the proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling and would be a harmful development within this street scene.
5. I have been provided photographs of ground floor front extensions that have taken place at Nos. No.34 and 97 Herbert Road. I acknowledge that No.34 Herbert Road hosts a similar extension to that proposed. That property forms part of the row of properties that I have identified a continuity to their bay windowed frontages. The planning permission at No.34 was granted some time ago at a time when a different development plan was in place. No. 97 Herbert Road also hosts a ground floor front extension. That property, however, is located further along the street where I saw there to be a different character and appearance to that locality. The proposed development can and should be considered on its own merits having regard to the current development plan

and supplementary planning guidance (SPD) that is in place. The examples cited hold little weight in favour of the proposal.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies SP6 and HOU8 of the Ashford Local Plan 2019 and SPG Note 10 'Domestic Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas' 2004. These policies and SPD seek, amongst other matters, development to achieve high quality design and not to result in significant harm to the overall character and appearance of the area, taking into account the surrounding built form and/or street scene.
7. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of highway safety. Whilst these are merits of the proposal, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above or justify the proposed development.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR