



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2015

by **K E Down MA (Oxon) MSc MRTPI MBS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 October 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/15/3129150

8 Wadham Place, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 4LZ

- 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 Mrs Therese Langley against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/502444/FULL, dated 13 March 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2015.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of garage to annex with single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of garage to annex with single storey rear extension at 8 Wadham Place, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 4LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/502444/FULL, dated 13 March 2015, 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: 1009.E01 and 1009.P01 rev. 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.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed garage conversion on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Wadham Place.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a modest two storey house with a single storey attached garage. It is situated at the end of a cul-de-sac and, unlike a number of its neighbours, currently has two off-street parking spaces; one in front of the garage and one beyond the end of the highway carriageway, in front of the dwelling but separated from it by a small front garden.
-

www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/15/3129150

4. The Council raises no objection to the garage conversion or the rear extension in themselves and I agree that they would both be acceptable in terms of scale and design. However, the Council considers that the two off-street parking spaces would harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
5. These spaces already exist and there is no evidence to suggest that a third space would be created on the front garden or that the Council considers a third space necessary. Since these spaces are already present and appear to provide adequate parking for the appeal dwelling, the loss of the garage would not be likely to increase parking on the frontage and hence there would be no effect on the character or appearance of the street scene. Moreover, additional parking has already been created on front gardens at a number of nearby properties, including at the dwelling opposite the appeal site which is very similar to the appeal dwelling.
6. It is therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposed garage conversion would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene of Wadham Place. In consequence, there would be no conflict with Policies E1 and E24 of the Swale Borough Local Plan, 2008, which taken together expect alterations and extension to, amongst other things, respond positively to the site and locality such that they maintain or enhance the character of the street scene. Neither do I find any conflict with the Council's supplementary planning guidance entitled "Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders" because there is no evidence that the development would result in an increase in street parking or the creation of an additional off-street parking space in front of the dwelling.
7. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, the Council suggests conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and to be built using materials that match the external surfaces of the existing building. I consider both of these are necessary, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area respectively.
8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR