

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23 MAY 2024**PART 5**

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 5Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

- **Item 5.1 – Hill Crest, Dully Hill, Doddington**

APPEAL ALLOWED**DELEGATED REFUSAL****Observations**

The Inspector noted that the proposed extension would exceed the limitations set out in the Council's house extensions SPG relating to dwellings in the countryside. Despite this, the Inspector considered that due to the limited views of the site and the subdued appearance of the resultant dwelling that the proposal would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Kent Downs AONB and would not result in an adverse impact upon the host dwelling. On this basis the appeal was allowed.

- **Item 5.2 – Moggys Cabin Throwley Road Throwley Faversham**

APPEAL ALLOWED**DELEGATED REFUSAL****Observations**

This appeal related to a proposed extension to a dwelling which had previously replaced a much smaller property in the Kent Downs AONB. The Inspector considered that the starting point for assessing extensions to dwellings in the countryside, such as this, should be the dwelling as existing, rather than taking into account the increase in built form which had already taken place. On this basis the Inspector took the view that the extension would be within the limitations set out in the Council's SPG relating to dwellings in the countryside and would be of an appropriate scale and massing. Due to the design of the extension and the subservient nature of the extension the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the landscape and scenic beauty of the Kent Downs AONB and allowed the appeal.

- **Item 5.3 – Queens Hall Car Park Forbes Road Faversham**

APPEAL DISMISSED**DELEGATED REFUSAL****Observations**

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed mast would fail to preserve or

enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area or preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings. The Inspector also agreed that the applicant had provided insufficient evidence that alternative and less harmful options had been explored. It was concluded that the harm identified to the significance of the heritage assets was not outweighed by the need for the installation to be sited as proposed.

- **Item 5.4 – 4 Oast Cottages Breach Lane Upchurch**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed side extension would be an overly large and dominant feature on the property that fails to respect the scale and mass of the existing dwelling. It was concluded that the development would detract from the character and appearance of the property, wider terrace and surrounding countryside.

- **Item 5.5 – Eastfields Old House Lane Hartlip**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector concurred that the proposed side and rear extensions would result in a sprawling layout, inappropriate in a countryside location. He did consider that the extension and conversion of the garage conversion and front porch extension to be acceptable, however due to the identified harm from the side and rear extensions, the appeal was dismissed on the basis that these aspects of the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider countryside.