



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/W/24/3356057

8A Preston Parade, Seasalter, Kent CT5 4AA

- 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 R Daverson against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application ref. is CA/24/00466.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing dwelling and replacement with new 4 bedroomed dwelling with integral parking, connected pool house and garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a one-and-a-half storey house with dual pitched roof, the gables of which face to the front and rear. The front gable has doors to a balcony over a single storey front extension. The site is near to the end of a sea front road that contains detached dwellings of various styles, sizes and materials.
4. Original dwellings along the road tend to be modest bungalows, examples of which remain either side of the site. Recently redeveloped plots near the site contain two-to three-storey houses, the latter with flat roofs. Fewer such houses are found on the rest of the road, but planning permissions exist for more.
5. The area is therefore mixed in character, with a greater concentration of larger dwellings to the same end of the road as the site. Whilst some of the earlier three-storey flat-roofed houses were permitted under a different development plan, they nonetheless now form part of that mixed character.
6. The proposed three-storey flat roofed house would be modern in appearance, fill a substantial proportion of its plot width and be taller than most along the sea front road. Its relationship to its immediate neighbours would be awkward and fail to account for their scale, in terms both of height and massing.
7. Similar changes in scale nearby are ameliorated by the smaller houses having taller ridges or wider plots and by the larger houses being set lower down into the ground or being constructed with lower eaves near the shared boundary. In these cases, larger houses have been successfully integrated.

8. The higher roof of 6A Preston Parade curves down to meet the tall ridge of no. 7, whose plot width is also comparable to that of its taller neighbour. Whilst of similar roof form to the proposal, no. 5 is set lower than no. 4, the ridge of whose original roof matched its second floor and is now comparable to its roof.
9. Neighbouring ridge heights are comparable to the flat roof of no. 11 within similar plot widths, no. 11a effecting a transition to a bungalow at no. 12 with low eaves. Three-storey flat-roofed houses permitted at no. 24 and built at no. 32 have widths and scales comparable to their neighbours, the latter also set lower.
10. These contrast with the proposal, which would both contain and appear to contain considerably greater volume, and be of much greater height than its neighbours, both of which present narrow, shallow-pitched gables to the street, the ridges of which would be less than half the height of the proposed roof.
11. Setting the upper storeys in goes some way towards reducing massing, but the overall scale in relation to the neighbours remains too great. It is common ground that the character of the area is changing and, whilst the proposed development seeks to continue that, account must still be taken of immediate context.
12. The proposed swimming pool building would be over three metres in height and built along roughly 12 metres of the boundary with the rear garden of 8 Preston Parade. Concerns as to its effect on light to and outlook from that relatively narrow garden are a further symptom of the overall scale being too great.
13. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and the appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to comply with Policy DBE3 of the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017, which, amongst other things, requires development to reinforce and contribute to its local context.

Other Matters

14. I recognise that many of the concerns raised by interested persons relate to technical matters of construction and compliance with Building Regulations, the Party Wall etc Act, estate company guidance or covenants.
15. I note also that the built line at ground floor level would not differ significantly, access arrangements would be similar, that further parking would be possible in garages and that the proposal is not for a house in multiple occupation.
16. Developments were taking place during my site visit, and I noted several others to which my attention had been drawn, which appeared not to have had significant effects on the road, utilities, embankment or flooding.
17. I have attached only modest weight to these considerations.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR