



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by **Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/16/3154898

Slips Cottage, Painters Forstal Road, Ospringe, Kent ME13 0EW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Malcolm Whale against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/501870/FULL, dated 3 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear infill and conservatory extension and rooflights, first floor extension & separate workshop extension to garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Reasons

3. Slips Cottage is one of a pair of traditional cottages with dormer windows to both the front and the rear roof slopes. The host dwelling has previously been extended by a pitched roof single storey extension to the rear, off-set from the common boundary with the adjoining property. I observed on site that this pair of cottages are small scale and are of a local vernacular style and materials.
 4. The Council has indicated that planning permission is in place for an infill extension to enlarge the kitchen and to extend the garage. These would comprise additions to previous extensions to the rear of the host dwelling. The Council is concerned that by including a first floor roof and conservatory extension, collectively these later additions are excessive and would be disproportionate to the original dwelling.
 5. The appellant asserts that the extensions are small in scale and subservient to the original dwelling. The appellant maintains that the proposed conservatory would be small and the design, including a hipped roof and matching materials, would be in-keeping with the other extensions added to the dwelling. It is also suggested that the conservatory would not be much larger than what could be achieved under permitted development.
-

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/16/3154898

6. Whilst the pitch of the roof and gable elevation of the proposed roof extension may be designed to replicate those already at the appeal property, the proposal before me would add considerable bulk to the roofscape, despite the ridge not exceeding that of the original dwelling. It would be a large projecting feature and a substantial addition that would significantly change the appearance of the host property's rear roof slope.
7. Overall, the proposed first floor roof and conservatory extensions would increase the amount of development being added to this host property. Whilst the conservatory extension would be of modest size in itself, the existing extension to the dwelling, in addition to the garage erected in close proximity to the dwelling, and approved extensions to these structures, when taken together would be a significant enlargement of this modest cottage. These cumulative additions would change the appearance of the cottage and harmfully alter its small scale nature and the simple character. This conflicts with the guidance of Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Design of Extension – A Guide for Householders' which indicates that the extension of a small cottage in the countryside to create a large house will normally be resisted in order to maintain the attractive character of rural areas.
8. Despite the extensions not being readily visible from Painters Forstal Road or Hanslett's Lane and the presence of boundary trees and vegetation to the rear that screens the site to some extent, glimpsed views of the roof extension can be achieved from the adjacent countryside. Collectively the extensions would, in addition, be readily apparent to the occupiers of the adjacent property.
9. The appellant suggests that there are examples of planning permissions for extensions granted which are considered not to be in keeping with the original building characteristics but are suggested to be subservient to the original building. I have insufficient information before me to be able to determine the planning circumstances of these developments and the similarities, if any, to the proposed development. The appeal before me relates to a different site and therefore can and should be considered in its own right.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling. The proposal conflicts with Policies E1, E19 and E24 of the Swale Borough Local Plan which seek extensions to existing buildings to respond positively by reflecting the positive characteristic and features of the site and to be of a high quality design and of a scale appropriate to the location, amongst other matters. The proposal would also be contrary to the Council's SPG that advises that in the countryside the extension of a small cottage to create a large house will normally be resisted to maintain the attractive character of rural areas.

Conclusions

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

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR