



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2025

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/25/3362862

Little Greenfield, School Road, Appledore, Kent TN26 2BA

- 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 Neil Pike against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/2259.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a standalone garage and playroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. Two reasons for refusal were given by the council one related to the effect of the design of the proposed development and the other to the effect of the proposal on trees on the appeal site. From my reading of the documents submitted, these reasons relate to the same main issue: The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached house with some rural character, located on a good sized large plot with substantial space for off street parking, that is located outside of the built confines of the village of Appledore. The appeal dwelling sits at the end of a run of relatively closely set detached houses. To the open flank side of the appeal dwelling between the dwelling and the boundary with an open field there is a relatively generous side garden area. Across the road from the appeal dwelling are further open fields. It is located within a character area defined as the the Old Romney Shoreline Settlements Landscape Character Area (the LCA).
4. The proposal is for a two storey detached outbuilding that would have a double garage and storage area at ground floor level, with a playroom on the first floor. The proposal, at approximately 14.5 metres deep and 6.4 metres wide, with a height to its roof ridge of approximately 6.4 metres, some 0.5 metres below the roof ridge of the appeal dwelling and would appear of a similar height and scale.
5. The proposal would sit to the open flank side of the appeal dwelling, in the side garden area. Whilst the appeal dwelling is orientated across the plot, with its front facing the road, the proposal would be positioned with its long front elevation facing towards the appeal dwelling with a flank elevation facing the road. The proposal

would also be positioned substantially further forward on the appeal plot and towards the road than the appeal dwelling.

6. The design of the proposal adopts Kentish rural vernacular as its design vocabulary. However, the proposal draws on design features more associated with rural houses, such as the pitched half hipped roof form at first and roof level, with a large front dormer window and numerous other windows in the front and flank elevations. Consequently, the proposal would have the appearance of a house rather than an outbuilding. In combination with its size, this would result in there appearing to be two good sized detached houses on the appeal plot, rather than a house and outbuilding. The proposal would therefore not have the appearance of being secondary and subservient to the appeal dwelling, rather it would appear as a disproportionate, overscale and dominating addition.
7. In street views, the height of the proposal and its forward projection on the plot, well beyond the front of the appeal dwelling, would result in it having greater presence in street and wider views than the existing run of houses along this part of the road. These are set well back from the road in general alignment, including the appeal dwelling. This would also result in the proposal being very apparent, with an assertive rather than recessive presence in these views. As such the proposal would appear as unduly prominent and as visually intrusive within the context of this run of houses and the surrounding open countryside, which provide the local area context within the LCA.
8. As I find that the proposal does not demonstrate subservience to the appeal dwelling, is dominating in scale and visually intrusive, it fails to accord with the objective of the guidance in the Ashford Domestic Garden and Outbuildings in Urban and Rural Areas Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004), for the design of residential garages and outbuildings and the creation of attractive places.
9. Whilst a full tree report was not submitted with the original application, I am satisfied from the tree position's indicated on the submitted plans that such a report, if required by a suitably worded condition attached to an approval, could show that the development would be possible without any significant adverse effect on trees within the site. A suitably worded condition could also be attached that would require protection of trees on the site during construction. I am satisfied that such conditions would, therefore overcome the second reason for refusal given by the Council on their decision notice. However, attaching such conditions on an approval would not overcome the detrimental effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area detailed above.
10. The appellant's statement draws my attention to recent developments and planning permissions¹ for new detached dwellings that now form part of the neighbouring run of houses of which the appeal dwelling forms part. These are however permissions for a house with smaller outbuildings and not just for a large standalone outbuilding. These are therefore for differing types of development to the proposal, which also differ in design, context and orientation to the proposal and would have been considered on their own merits. I have, therefore, afforded these only limited weight in my considerations.

¹ Ref: Oak Tree Cottage, 18/00889/AS and 21/02151/AS

11. The appellant also draws my attention to a planning permission² for a large two storey detached garage/outbuilding that was approved in 2023 in the Council area. The approved plan provided only shows the design of the approved development and it is not clear from the appellant's statement if the photograph provided is of this same detached garage/outbuilding or of a different development. Suffice to say that the material relating to other approved development is partial and limited in detail and I am unable to consider whether this/these constitute exemplar/s for the appeal proposal. This/these would have been considered on the basis of individual merit at the time of approval, and I have done likewise in my consideration of the appeal proposal, which is a main principle of the planning system.
12. For these reasons I find that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would conflict with Policies SP1 and SP6 of the Ashford Local Plan to 2030 (2019). Collectively these seek development, including by extension, that is of high quality design, promotes the relationship of buildings with each other responds to character, distinctiveness and sense of place.

Conclusion

13. No significant public benefits of the proposal have been identified that would outweigh the harm that I have identified above. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR

² Ref: PA/2022/3017