



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

**by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/25/3366781**

**17 Oast Meadow, Willesborough, Kent TN24 0AS.**

- 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 Adam Gurney against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is PA/2025/0330.
  - The development proposed is removal of garage to build two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

### Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
  - the effect of the proposed extension on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 15 Oast Meadow (No 15) in terms of the potential for the development to result in overlooking leading to a loss of privacy.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property, 17 Oast Meadow (No17) two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The semi-detached pair have a simple gable roof. No 19 the other half of the pair has a large flat roof box dormer set into the front roof slope.
4. No 17 is located on a corner plot at a bend in the road such that the neighbouring dwelling No15 is built at almost 90 degrees to No17. As a result of the positioning of the houses they both have substantial side gardens.
5. The appellant proposes the construction of a two-storey side extension following the demolition of the existing flat roofed single storey detached garage.
6. The depth of the proposed extension would, as examples of other similar extensions be identical to that of the main house. The ridge and eaves line of the roof would therefore also match that of the semi-detached pair. However, the extension would be neither as wide as No 17 nor, like the extension at 32 Oast

Meadow, significantly narrower. As a result of its width, it would in this case serve to visually unbalance the semi-detached pair.

7. Although the face brickwork of the front and rear walls would match the host property the design does not incorporate an inset rendered panel to gable wall or any modulation to reflect either the design of the existing gable wall or the finish of No17 or that of neighbouring dwellings. The lack of this detail would result in the gable wall appearing both bland and prominent.
8. Furthermore, the proposed fenestration to the extension has not been designed to match that of the existing house. This would thereby detract from the appearance of the property as extended.
9. For the above reasons I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and the semi-detached pair. Furthermore, as No17 is prominent in the street scene, it would as extended fail to relate to the surrounding development or contribute positively to the character of the wider area.
10. To allow the development as design would be contrary to the objectives of Policies SP6 and HOU8 of the Ashford Local Plan 2030 (Adopted February 2019), the advice set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10 'Domestic Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas (SPG)', and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), as they relate to, amongst other things, the requirement for development to be of a high design quality that does not result in significant harm to the overall character and appearance of the area.

#### *Living conditions*

11. The proposed side extension would reduce the gap to the boundary with No15 to only about 3.0 metres at the rear. As there are two windows proposed in the rear elevation of the extension, they would lead to overlooking of the rear garden of No15 and thereby a loss of privacy.
12. However, if I were minded to allow the appeal I could require, by condition the bathroom window to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7 metres to avoid overlooking and therefore a loss of privacy.
13. However, the window to the proposed new bedroom is the only one serving that habitable room and therefore obscure glazing and fixing shut the window to avoid overlooking would not be appropriate in this case. To do so would cause harm to the living conditions of the future occupiers of that room, in terms of light, ventilation and outlook.
14. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed extension, by virtue of its siting and design, would cause a material loss of privacy to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, No 15, contrary to the aims LP Policy HOU8, SPG Note 10 and the Framework as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

#### **Conclusions**

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Philip Willmer*

INSPECTOR