




---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

**Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 10 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/19/3236298**

**8 Salmon Crescent, Minster-On-Sea ME12 2SP**

- 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 Bennett against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 19/502744/FULL, dated 28 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
  - The proposed development is a two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 8 Salmon Crescent, Minster-On-Sea ME12 2SP, in accordance with the application, Ref 19/502744/FULL, dated 28 May 2019, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 8122, Block Plan dated 24 May 2019 and 12219.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey property on the northern side of Salmon Crescent, a residential area characterised in part by the sense of spaciousness between buildings. The appeal property forms one end of a terrace of three houses which are adjoined at ground-floor level. No. 10, a detached dwelling situated on the adjoining site to the west, is positioned at an angle away from the appeal property and has its garage closest to No 8. The
-

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/19/3236298

---

existing garage on site is set back from the side boundary with No. 10 by around 1.2m.

5. The extension would be above and behind the existing garage and so would not be any closer to No 10 than the existing garage. At its closest, the proposed extension would be situated approximately 2m away from the side elevation of the garage of No. 10. However, due to the angled siting of No. 10 relative to the appeal property, the distance between the extension and the garage at No 10 would increase towards the road frontage, with a distance of around 5m between the southwestern corner of the appeal dwelling and the southeastern corner of No. 10 at ground floor level. There would be a greater distance between the two properties at first-floor level above No. 10's garage. Due to the substantial distance between the building at No. 10 and the proposed two storey side extension at first-floor level, a significant gap would be retained between both properties and hence the proposal would not appear visually linked to No. 10 at first-floor level or result in a loss of openness. As such, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the spacious quality of the surrounding area.
6. The 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) states that first floor extensions should be at least 2m from the shared boundary in order to avoid a "terracing" effect and retain a sense of openness. Although the extension would not meet this standard, due to the angled relationship between No 10 and the appeal property I consider the development would retain the spaciousness between the properties and so it would accord with the overall aims and objectives of the guidance.
7. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DM14 and DM16 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan (2017), which state that development must enhance the built environment and the character of the streetscene. It would also comply with paragraph 5.0 of the Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders SPG, which states that two-storey side extensions should not result in the loss of openness between properties.

#### **Conditions**

8. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. I have also required that the materials used should match those of the existing building, so as to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

#### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

*C Brennan*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/19/3236298

---

**Inspector's Decision**

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

*Andrew Owen*

INSPECTOR