

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11 JANUARY 2024**PART 5**

Report of the Head of Planning

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

- **Item 5.1 – 2 Cherry Drive, Luddenham, Faversham**

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

The Inspector disagreed with the Council's view that the extensions to this property would give rise to an adverse visual impact on the property itself, its immediate surroundings and to the rural character and appearance of the area. The Inspector took a somewhat unusual approach in assessing this scheme as they considered that as the existing extension blended in well with the property, that the point to assess the impact of the current proposal against was the dwelling as existing, rather than taking into account previous extensions, despite policy DM11 in the Local Plan requiring any previous additions to be taken into account. The Inspector also acknowledged that the proposal was of a greater scale than what is normally allowed for as set out in the Council's SPG. However, the Inspector concluded that the proposal represented good design, was appropriate in mass, scale and appearance to the location and would sit comfortably with the appeal property and its neighbour, its immediate surroundings and the rural character and appearance of the area. The appeal was therefore allowed on this basis.

- **Item 5.2 – Sunnybank Cottage, Deerton Street, Teynham**

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

The Inspector disagreed with the Council's view that the extensions to this property would give rise to an adverse visual impact on the property itself and its immediate surroundings causing harm to the rural character and appearance of the area. The Inspector acknowledged that the scheme would lead to a total floorspace increase of 190% compared to the original floorspace of the property, which is well in excess of the 60% increase recommended in the SPG. However, the Inspector took the view that the appropriately designed two storey side extension would effectively hide both the poorly designed existing rear extension and the proposed ground floor wrap around extension and still allow an appreciation of the original pair of cottages upon this site. In addition, the Inspector concluded that there was additional parking further to the rear of the site which would allow for vehicles to be parked off the highway. The Inspector therefore allowed the appeal for these reasons.

- **Item 5.3 – Ebenezer Chapel, Halstow Lane, Upchurch**

APPEAL DISMISSED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the use of land for open storage/builder's yard would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside, as well as resulting in harmful noise effects to the living conditions of neighbours. The Inspector also shared the Council's view that the proposal would impact the usability of the Public Footpaths that cross the site, and the appeal was dismissed for these reasons.

- **Item 5.4 – Webbenditch Cottage Bobbing**

APPEAL ALLOWED

DELEGATED REFUSAL

Observations

The Inspector disagreed with the Council's view that the siting and scale of the proposed annexe would introduce built form that would erode and harm the undeveloped and rural character of the area. Commenting that the size of the annexe would be significantly smaller than, and subordinate in scale to, the host property. Furthermore the Inspector considered that the siting of the annexe was acceptable and that low density and sporadic clusters of built form are consistent with the wider character of the area.