



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/24/3355058

23 Barton Hill Drive, Minster-on-Sea, Kent ME12 3NE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sue Wilson against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/502813/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application form indicates that the development, in part, has already taken place. I was able to see walls that have been constructed at the time of my visit.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

5. There is some variation to the front building line of properties along the southern side of Darlington Drive, however the dwellings are set back from the public highway behind front gardens/spaces. The proposal would bring built development forward of the host dwelling and in close proximity to the Darlington Drive footpath. This forward projection of built development would be out of keeping with the pattern of development along Darlington Drive and would, therefore, be a development out of character within this street scene. Furthermore, the extension, having a forward projection from the host dwelling, would be a prominent feature within the Darlington Drive street scene. This would have a negative visual impact upon the appearance of the host property, as well as that of the street scene.
6. I acknowledge that the proposal would be single storey in height representing a subservient addition to the host dwelling and it would be constructed of matching materials to harmonise with the host property. In views along Darlington Drive the

roof of the proposed development would be visible above the fence that runs along the boundary of the site and the public footpath. However, the side elevation of the development would be clear in views along Darlington Drive when viewed from Barton Hall Drive.

7. On the opposite side of Darlington Drive to that of the appeal property the dwelling hosts a garden structure that is positioned close to the side boundary adjacent Darlington Drive. That structure is visible over the side boundary of that dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the proposed extension to the appeal property would have an eaves height that would match the existing eaves of the host dwelling and have a pitched roof projecting above the eaves. This would be a taller and more visible structure than that of the garden structure opposite. As such, the garden structure opposite offers little weight in favour of the proposed development.
8. There would be no impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Whilst this is a benefit of the proposed development, this does not overcome the harm that I have identified above or justify the proposed development.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. As such, the proposed development would conflict with Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Designing an extension – A guide for householders. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high-quality design, to be in keeping with the character of the area and to reinforce local distinctiveness.
10. There is some debate as to whether or not the principle elevation should be considered to be that of the elevation fronting onto Darlington Drive, where the entrance to the property is, or the elevation fronting Barton Hill Drive that reflects the address of the property. Irrespective of this debated matter, I have found that the proposal would not be acceptable given its visual harm to both the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the Darlington Drive street scene.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR