



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by **L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/21/3266907

Tarida, The Glen, Minster-On-Sea ME12 2LD

- 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 M Bellis against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/504748/FULL, dated 8 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is "Erection of two storey side extension, external alterations, creation of front balcony and front driveway"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed "Erection of two storey side extension, external alterations, creation of front balcony and front driveway" at Tarida, The Glen, Minster-On-Sea ME12 2LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/504748/FULL, dated 8 October 2020, 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: 04748_MH01, 04748_MH02 revision B, and 04748_MH03 revision A.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development proposed from the Council's decision notice as this is clearer than that provided in the application form. The appellant has relied upon this description in their appeal form, confirming it describes the development they are seeking planning permission for.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to scale and design.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a detached 'chalet bungalow' with a steep pitched roof, front and rear facing gables and long flat roofed dormers on each side elevation. It is of similar style to the neighbouring property, at the end of an

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/21/3266907

unmade cul-de-sac characterised by large detached houses of mixed designs. The proposed extension would mirror the existing form of the appeal building, creating twin gable ends of matching roof slopes, with matching eaves and ridge heights. The front elevation of the proposed extension would be set back slightly from that of the existing house.

5. The narrow arrangement of the existing dwelling means the proposal would appear as a substantial extension, increasing its built form by approximately a third. It would not be subservient to the existing dwelling, but its overall scale and design would complement the existing building without appearing cramped within its plot. In this location, at the end of a cul-de-sac of different styles of large buildings, the proposal would not appear out of place, obtrusive or harmful to the street scene. Despite its large size, the proposed extension would mimic the style of the existing dwelling and create a building of coherent design, similar in scale to neighbouring properties.
6. The proposal would not therefore cause any harm to the character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Policies CP 4, DM 14 and DM 16 of 'Bearing Fruits 2031', The Swale Borough Local Plan (2017). These policies require, amongst other things, proposals to be of a design which is appropriate and sympathetic to its surroundings in respect of scale, height and massing, and to respond positively to the style and character of the building being extended, maintaining the character of the street scene.
7. Policy DM 14 requires all development to accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance, which includes 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders' (undated) ('the SPG'). The SPG does not form part of the Council's development plan, despite being referred to by Policy DM 14, and provides general guidance for applicants to consider. It does not require all extensions to be subservient to the main dwelling, but explains that over-large extensions can destroy the appearance of the house and have a serious effect upon the area as a whole. I have found the proposal would be of a scale and design that would be sympathetic and appropriate to its location and would therefore broadly accord with the development plan as a whole.

Conditions

8. It is necessary to attach a condition requiring the commencement of development within the relevant timeframe and a condition identifying the approved plans in the interests of clarity. The Council have requested a condition requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension to match those of the existing dwelling, and I consider this reasonable and necessary to ensure the finished appearance of the proposal is appropriate for the area.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L. Douglas

INSPECTOR