



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/16/3152443

Water Meadow, Primrose Lane, South of Motorway, Bredgar ME9 8EH

- 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 & Mrs White against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/500337/FULL, dated 16 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with part single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension with part single storey extension at Water Meadow, Primrose Lane, South of Motorway, Bredgar ME9 8EH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/500337/FULL, dated 16 January 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BDS-1369-01 Revision A, BDS-1369-02, BDS-1369-03, BDS-1369-04, BDS-1369-05, BDS-1369-06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Before any above ground construction works takes place details of the external doors and windows to be used on the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area being within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on the west side of Primrose Lane a short distance back from the street. It is an imposing two storey detached property with a single storey side extension on the northern side providing a garage and
-

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/16/3152443

- utility room. The property has three pitched and gabled outriggers on the rear elevation; the outer two extending further into the rear garden than the central one.
4. The proposal would extend the most northerly of the three outriggers at two storeys and add a single storey rear extension across the width of the two northern outriggers. This would include replacing and extending the existing utility room part of the existing single storey extension.
 5. The property to the north, Wheelwrights, is set at a slightly lower level than Water Meadow, but is located so that it restricts oblique views of the side and rear of Water Meadow from the street, particularly of the ground floor. Currently the single storey extension has a partial pitched and partial flat roof and the proposed rear extension would have a pitched roof from the rear. This means that the junction between the two roof forms would be resolved by use of a parapet. This would be a slightly awkward junction but, because it would be set towards the rear and partially obscured by Wheelwrights from one direction and the appeal property from the other, this would not be intrusive into the street scene.
 6. While the single storey rear extension would extend across the width of the northern two outriggers and the side extension, the historic form of the three gables on the rear elevation would still be clearly seen and the proposal would be seen as a later addition. Subject to matching materials, which could be secured by condition including of doors and windows which I will discuss below, the proposal would be in keeping with the overall design approach of the existing property.
 7. The garden of Water Meadow extends some distance to the rear and narrows approximately one-third along its length from the appeal property on both sides. There are reasonably tall boundary treatments on either side. This restricts views of the rear elevation and means that the proposal would only have a neutral effect on the wider landscape of the AONB, conserving its scenic beauty, where great weight is to be afforded to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in line with paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
 8. Therefore, the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area being within the AONB. As such it would comply with Policies E1, E9, E19 and E24 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2008 which require development to protect and enhance the natural and built environments, be of a scale, design and appearance that would be appropriate to the location, protect the quality, character and amenity value of the AONB, would provide development that is appropriate to its context in respect of scale, height and massing, would be of a high quality design, and would preserve landscape features. It would also comply with paragraphs 58 and 115 of the Framework in that it would respond to local character and conserve landscape and scenic beauty.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/16/3152443

10. While the exterior materials for the walls and roof should match those of the existing building, there are currently different styles and materials for the windows. In order to ensure that the windows and patio doors are of an appropriate design in keeping the existing property and the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition requiring details of the external joinery to be used to be submitted and approved.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR