

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 25 MAY 2023

PART 5

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 5

Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

- **Item 5.1 – Rides House Warden Road Eastchurch**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the council that the development would be distant from services and facilities and would not deliver sustainable development.

- **Item 5.2 – Dickens Inn Fourth Ave Eastchurch**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector considered the location to be suitable for tourist accommodation, being within a defined holiday park area. However the Inspector considered that the barn-like appearance and scale of the development would be prominent and unrepresentative of its surroundings, and harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

- **Item 5.3 – Cripps Farm Plough Road Minster**

APPEAL DISMISSED /COSTS REFUSED

COMMITTEE REFUSAL

Observations

A good decision relating to an application refused by the planning committee in accordance with the officer recommendation. Although planning permission had previously been granted for a garage within the rear garden of Cripps Farm, the garage had been built 7 metres further back and into open countryside to the rear. The Inspector found that the garage as built had encroached into the open countryside in a harmful manner. An application for costs against the council was also refused.

- **Item 5.4 – Manor Farm Key Street Sittingbourne**

APPEAL ALLOWED

AGAINST OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

Observations

The Inspector allowed this appeal (for advertisement consent) on the basis that the sign would not undermine views across the local landscape, nor would it appear overly prominent within the context of its setting. The Inspector also took into consideration that consent was sought for a period of 6 months only.

- **Item 5.5 – Toft Wray Lower Norton Lane Teynham**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposal would result in a building significantly larger in volume, bulk, and mass than the existing dwelling. As a result, its increased prominence across open countryside would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector acknowledged that the site was not in a designated landscape, and the architectural detailing and facing materials were considered acceptable but these matters did not outweigh the harm. The appellants argument that the existing dwelling could be extended under permitted development rights which they considered would be more harmful than the proposal was given limited weight.

- **Item 5.6 – Halfacre House Lynsted Lane Lynsted**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

The Inspector disagreed with the Council that the extended annex accommodation could operate as a self-contained dwelling based on the facilities within the existing annex, the fact that it shared a driveway and garden with the main house, and due to the appellant stating that the annex would not be used independently. On that basis the Inspector considered that a condition could be imposed to ensure that the accommodation is used only as ancillary to the principal dwelling. The Inspector also disagreed with the Council that the proposal represented poor design and considered the development to visually connect with the overall appearance of the existing structure without dominating it and was appropriately sited.