



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by **H Lock BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: **31 January 2018**

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/17/3187449

35 Springvale, Iwade, Kent, ME9 8RX

- 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 Gary Scott against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 17/503674/FULL, dated 7 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is second storey addition to side elevation. Ground floor extension across rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for second storey addition to side elevation and ground floor extension across rear elevation, at 35 Springvale, Iwade, Kent, ME9 8RX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 17/503674/FULL, dated 7 July 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DC/268; DC/269; DC/270; and DC/271.
 - 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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors, voids or other openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the flank facing walls of the development hereby permitted.
 - 5) The flat roof area of the single storey rear extension shall not be used as a balcony, sitting out or similar amenity area, or roof garden.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/17/3187449

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house in a residential area, and at this point in the street scene there is a degree of uniformity to dwellings as a result of their design and materials. Many properties have garages or driveways to their side, and this provides some separation and sense of space between buildings. However, there are some examples of narrower gaps, and some have garages that are linked. The appeal property and the neighbouring house, 37 Springvale, benefit from additional gaps between their shared boundary and their garages.
4. The existing garage at the appeal property is set back behind the front elevation of the house, and the proposed extension would share the same position, with a lower roof ridge height than the main house. This would accord with the guidance set out in the Council's 'Guide for Household¹' (the Guide), that an extension should be set back by at least one or two brick lengths and the roof should be set back by the same amount.
5. The Guide also seeks a gap of 2m between a first-floor extension and the side boundary, with the aim that houses should not be physically or visually linked in order to preserve the character of the area and sense of openness. In this case, the proposed gap to the side boundary at first-floor level would be less than 1 metre wide, and a similar space exists between the boundary and neighbouring garage. I acknowledge that this is below the spacing sought in the Council's guidance, but as the gaps between buildings are not uniform in the street scene, I find that this spacing would be sufficient to ensure that the sense of space would be preserved.
6. The Council's officer report advises that the extension in itself would not be harmful to the street scene, but that harm would arise from the terracing effect. However, whilst I am determining this appeal on its own merits, in the event that No.37 were to be extended, a clear separation between the properties would remain. The staggered siting of the appeal property relative to No.37 would further ensure that terracing between buildings would not arise.
7. The Council raises no objection to the rear extensions and I share its assessment.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in its impact on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene, and would accord with the design aims of Policy DM 16 of the Swale Borough Local Plan², which amongst other criteria requires extensions to be of an appropriate design and quality which responds positively to the style and character of the building being extended, to be appropriately scaled, and to maintain or enhance the character of the street scene. It would also accord with the aims of the Guide.

Conditions

9. In addition to the statutory time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is also appropriate to control materials to match the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area. With some

¹ Planning and Development Guidelines No.5: Designing an Extension, A Guide for Household^{ers}

² Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/17/3187449

modification to wording I have also attached the recommended conditions of the Council in the interests of the privacy of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

10. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and part of its environmental strand is to contribute to protecting and enhancing the built environment. A core planning principle of the Framework is to always seek to secure high quality design, and for the reasons given above the proposal would comply with this principle and would be sustainable development supported through the Framework. As a consequence, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR