



The Planning  
Inspectorate

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2011

by **M C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 26 August 2011

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/11/2155717**

**10 Kingfisher Close, Iwade, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME9 8LY**

- 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 Keith G Adams against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: SW/11/0376, dated 28 March 2011, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2011.
  - The development proposed is to 'extend driveway across the front of the property'.
- 

### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### Main issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a bungalow within a Close of modern housing development. There is an existing driveway and an area of lawn to the front of the property with small shrubs and flower beds.
4. The existing soft landscaped area provides variety, interest and greenery and presents an attractive setting for the house and wider area. I consider that replacing it with an expanse of paving would create a more urbanised feel and undermine the original design and landscape concept of the Close. Even though a narrow border and two small bay-shaped flower beds would be retained, the paved area would appear starker and harsher than the existing arrangement; and would undermine the area's pleasant character. This effect would be exacerbated by the front garden's prominent position on the curve of the road.
5. The appellant refers to other properties in the Close having been paved for car parking but I have little knowledge of the planning circumstances of these cases. From my own observations, most of the properties in the vicinity appeared to have retained some expanse of soft landscaping to their frontages. In any case, my decision is based on the merits of the case before me and on its site specific circumstances.

6. Overall, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies E1 and E19 of the Swale Borough Local Plan (2008) which both aim to protect and enhance the character of the built environment and achieve high quality design. It would not comply with paragraph 7 of the Council's document entitled 'Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders'. This states, amongst other things, that a front garden given over to car parking is likely to be unacceptable as it creates a poor appearance in the street scene.
7. For the reasons given above, and taking all other relevant matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M C J Nunn*

INSPECTOR