



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H2265/D/24/3344607

6 Jerome Road, Larkfield, Aylesford, Kent ME20 6UR

- 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 Ian Dunster against the decision of Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 23/01913/FL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey detached property located on a corner plot on a housing development in Larkfield. It is situated on the north side of Jerome Road opposite Bronte Close and on the corner of Jerome Road and Christie Drive.
4. The dwelling has previously been extended by a two storey side extension with a single storey garage to its west side.
5. The proposed development would replace the single storey garage with a wider and deeper structure of two storeys. The roof ridge would be the same height as the existing dwelling, as would the eaves. The existing dwelling has a modest single storey front element with an overhanging roof supported by front pillars.
6. The proposed front elevation of the extension would be set back from the front addition but would be flush with the main front wall of the house. At the rear the proposed rear elevation of the extension would be flush with the main rear wall.

7. The proposal would have no internal connection with the main house. It would have its own front door, a ground floor kitchen/lounge/dining area, a WC and a hall, and at first floor level it would have two bedrooms and a bathroom accessed via its own staircase.
8. The housing in the area includes bungalows and detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings. It is clear that the streetscape has been purposefully laid out and designed to be relatively open and have a sense of spaciousness. The front elevation of dwellings tend to be visible and unobscured by high fences or hedges. Dwellings tend to have on-site parking. There are some local changes in topography with Bronte Close rising up to slightly higher ground. There are glimpses of the green ridges of higher land in the wider landscape. I consider that the openness of the housing development is a positive contributor to the sense of place and residential character and I am mindful of the fact that the dwelling has already been extended by a two storey side addition.
9. The appeal proposal would cut down a proportion of the wider views on the estate. Travelling south out of Christie Drive the proposal would protrude into the view, larger than the single storey garage currently on site. From Jerome Road, the location on a corner plot and in a slightly elevated position makes the house prominent and its resulting elongated form with a long uniform roof ridge would draw the eye. The existing landscaped area on the appeal site would be reduced. Openness would be lost which I consider would be detrimental to the area. I am mindful of the fact that materials matching the existing dwelling could be used in the extension, nevertheless, this would not overcome the additional net bulk and mass of the property which would be inappropriate in this location.
10. I have borne in mind that the additional living accommodation would serve to house a family member and grandchildren who do not currently have a home of their own. I have considerable sympathy for these circumstances, however, they do not overcome the harm to character and appearance of the area which I have identified above.
11. I have noted the delay involved in obtaining the planning application decision from the Council but nevertheless I have to confine my considerations to the planning merits of the proposal, and I have done so.
12. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy (adopted 2007) and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Conclusion

13. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR