



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/17/3185699

77 Augustine Road, Private Street North West, Minster-on-Sea ME12 2NB

- 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 Adam & Nicola Ryan against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/503301/FULL, dated 23 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension with roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension with roof lights at 77 Augustine Road, Private Street North West, Minster-on-Sea ME12 2NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/503301/FULL, dated 23 June 2017, 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 approved plans: Site Location Plan 1:1250, Existing Plans and Elevations Drawing no. 17/2823/1 and Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing no. 17/2823/2A.
 - 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) No additional windows, doors, voids or other openings shall be inserted, placed or formed in the side flank facing walls of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property at No. 77 Augustine Road (No. 77) is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey side extension and a detached pitched roof double garage at the side. The property is set back from the private road

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

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/17/3185699

at the front within an area with a mixed well-established residential character. There are a range of detached and semi-detached properties that provide a diverse mix of house types and variety in the design, density and appearance of the dwellings in the area.

4. The proposal would entail the construction of a first floor extension over the existing single storey side extension that would be set back from the front elevation of the property by about 3.5m. It would extend out up to the side common boundary with the adjacent detached property at No. 79 and would be stepped down below the ridge of the main house with a double dual pitched hipped roof. The proposal would also involve the construction of a new covered porched area at the front and a single storey pitched roof extension with roof lights projecting out from the rear of the appeal property.
5. Paragraph 5.0 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Designing an Extension – a Guide for Householders 1993 (SPG) specifies a minimum set-in requirement of least 2m for a first floor side extension from the side boundary in order to give visual separation from adjoining properties and preserve the areas character and sense of openness. In this case, the proposed side extension would be set-in about 0.2m from the side boundary and would be separated from the single storey pitched roof garage at the adjacent property at No. 79 by a pedestrian access running between the properties.
6. Whilst the proposed side extension would be located in a prominent position, it would be seen in the context of the scale and two storey form of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties and the current varied architectural styles in the surrounding area. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed side extension, set back and stepped down, would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the relationship with the adjacent property would allow reasonable space to prevent any significant terracing effect.
7. The modest overall increase of the first floor side projection at No. 77 together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property and would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Despite a technical breach of Council's SPG on first floor side extensions, given the site specific circumstances, I conclude that the development would be consistent with Policies DM14 and DM16 of the Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 and the Council's SPG. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure development and extensions are of an appropriate design and quality that respond positively to the character of the original building and surrounding area and maintains the character of the street scene.

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

2

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/17/3185699

Conditions

9. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 206, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area and safeguard the amenities of the nearby residents, I have also imposed conditions requiring matching external materials and no additional windows, doors, voids or other openings on the side flank facing walls of the development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR