



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **S F Barnes MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/25/3372361

3 Meehan Road, Greatstone, New Romney, Kent TN28 8SQ

- 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 H Stuart against the decision of Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1004/FH.
 - The development proposed was originally described on the application form as: New single car garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. This part of Meehan Road comprises detached properties within individual garden plots. The appeal site and its immediate adjoining neighbours are part of a row of properties that have a largely consistent building line, and which are generally well set-back from the highway. Where present locally, garages either sit alongside or are integrated with houses. Although there is some variation in the precise setback of properties further along this road, particularly where the road curves, these are generally set behind spacious, uncluttered front gardens. This results in a coherent, open character to the streetscene at this part of Meehan Road.
4. Although modest in height relative to the main building and using matching materials, the proposal would be sited in what is an open, grassed area of the front garden. It would be set forward of the front elevation to the main house. This atypical positioning would fail to respect the established local pattern where, as described above, garages generally sit to the side of properties. Given its siting and scale, it would form an obtrusive addition within the garden, harming the streetscene.
5. An existing fence would provide some screening in certain views. However, the roof of the proposal would still be exposed above the fence in views from the street. This would remain the case even were that fence to be slightly extended in height, as has been suggested. Although new trees and shrub planting could provide a degree of screening, the proposal would remain highly visible at the open frontage. As such, a soft landscaping scheme would not overcome the harm

I have identified. In any case, landscaping cannot be relied on in perpetuity to provide the same level of screening.

6. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with relevant provisions of Policies HB1 and HB8 of the Folkestone & Hythe District Places and Policies Local Plan (adopted 2022) (Local Plan). In summary, these policies seek to ensure that proposals make a positive contribution through their design to surroundings while respecting existing buildings, particularly through layout and scale, and to avoid a detrimental impact on the streetscene.
7. I acknowledge the appellant's comments in respect of the relevance of Policy HB8 of the Local Plan. However, as this refers to alterations and extensions to buildings and makes specific reference to garages, I have considered it in my assessment of the appeal.

Other Matters

8. The evidence refers to structures within front gardens in the surrounding area. I have very limited detail before me that would enable me to draw comparisons between them and the appeal proposal, including their planning context. In any case, they do not form a significant feature of the character and appearance of the area. I have therefore considered this appeal on its own individual circumstances.
9. I also note that the site is not within a conservation area or near to any listed buildings. However, this has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.
10. I accept that some consideration has been given to alternative siting for the garage. Only limited details of such options are before me. In any case, an appeal should not be used to evolve a scheme. I have assessed the proposal based on the plans before me.
11. I appreciate that neighbours raised no objection and that the Town Council were supportive. However, these have been neutral factors in my consideration.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and I have not identified any material considerations which outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S F Barnes

INSPECTOR