



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/W/25/3374064

Land Adjacent to 16 Lucks Way, Marden, Kent TN12 9QW

- 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 Mrs Desislava Dimova against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/502333/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a new build 2 bed detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal site address shown in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's Decision Notice, as it more accurately identifies the land to which the appeal relates. I note that the same description is used in the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site, currently utilised for off-street parking and a vehicle turning head, occupies a prominent position on a curve within a residential street. Lucks Way is characterised by predominantly terraced and semi-detached dwellings of a broadly uniform design, scale and form. The dwellings are set back a similar distance from the highway, behind open frontages, which creates a pleasant sense of consistency and contributes positively to the character of the street scene.
5. The proposed two-storey detached dwelling would project beyond the front elevations of the dwellings within the adjacent row and be positioned in close proximity to the highway. It would be noticeably taller than the adjacent dwellings and would incorporate a roof form of a markedly different pitch, together with a dormer addition.
6. By reason of its siting, scale and massing, the proposal would appear visually intrusive and unduly prominent within the street scene and would disrupt the established layout and pattern of built form within Lucks Way. Moreover, the position of the proposed dwelling, on the outside curvature of the road, would accentuate the presence of the dwelling in the street scene. The use of materials to reflect those used in the area, together with the detached form and separation from

the neighbouring property would not mitigate the harm identified, given the prominence of the site.

7. The front (north-facing) elevation of the dwelling, which would occupy a visually prominent position in the street scene, by virtue of its predominantly blank facade with very limited fenestration or articulation would introduce an unrelieved, inactive frontage that would appear stark and unwelcoming. While I noticed during my site visit that blank side elevations do exist elsewhere within the street, these are generally secondary elevations that do not occupy such a forward-facing or prominent position within the street.
8. In addition, the form and articulation of the roof of the dwelling, together with the visual prominence of the dormer from the street scene, would fail to reflect the prevailing roofscapes within Lucks Way, which are largely characterised by uniform pitched roofs without prominent roof alterations. As a result, these features would draw undue attention to the building and would further reinforce its incongruous appearance within the context. Although the appellant highlights the recessed siting of the dormer within the roofscape, this would not materially reduce its visual dominance from the public realm.
9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies LPRSP15 and LPRHOU2 of the Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan Review 2021-2038 (2024) and Policy BE1 of the Marden Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2031, which require high-quality design and respect for local character.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would contribute to the supply of housing in the area and reflect the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to significantly boost the supply of housing. However, given the small scale of the proposal such benefits would be modest and therefore the weight to be attributed to them is limited.
11. Even if the proposal would accord with various development plan policies, including those in relation to the location of new development, housing mix, internal space standards and the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, the absence of harm or conflict with other relevant development plan policies is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. Material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, have not been shown to carry sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR