



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/19/3231372

26 North Foreland Road, Broadstairs, Kent CT10 3NN

- 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 Marianne Elliott against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/19/0125, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single, single garage with pitched roof and gable ends.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I saw from my site visit that a garage has been constructed at the appeal site. The garage reflects the plans that were considered by the Council at planning application stage and I have determined the appeal on this basis

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reason

4. The appeal site accommodates a large two storey detached dwelling. The house is set back, positioned at an angle and at a slightly lower level than the road and is in close proximity to the boundary with No 28 North Foreland Road. The appeal property has garden space on all sides with mature planting and a small outbuilding sits back from the road along the boundary with No 28. The front boundary has a mix of mature landscaping and a tall wooden fence.
5. North Foreland Road is residential street which accommodates large detached dwellings that sit comfortably within large plots. There are a variety of dwelling sizes and styles which are set back and at a lower level than the pavement edge. The front boundary treatments also vary in style and material but generally are tall fences and walls with some landscaping.
6. Many of the dwellings have garages. They are generally positioned at a lower level than the road and those that are forward of the main building are

positioned in the corner of the plots to allow the front elevations of the dwelling to be visible from the road.

7. By way of contrast, the appeal proposal is located towards the centre of the plot with its side wall parallel to the wooden boundary fence and sits at the same level as the road. It is clearly visible from the street scene as the side wall and tall pitched roof protrude significantly above the wooden fence and it is not screened by any planting. The height, positioning and bulk of the garage screens the dwelling from the road. Whilst it is constructed from similar materials to the host dwelling, the development represents an unduly dominant and incongruous feature which is incompatible with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to several existing garages along North Foreland Road which sit forward of the dwellings they serve. In each instance the garages sit at a lower level than the appeal proposal and sit within the corner of the plots. The appellant also states that the garage at No 10 is a particularly important comparable. However, this garage is also at a lower level than the road and is positioned in the corner of the plot allowing the main front elevation of the dwelling to be visible.
9. In addition, the appellant has also referred to pre-application discussions with the Council in relation to the appeal proposals. Although positive pre-application discussions might have taken place, this does not bind my decision and I have determined this appeal on its own merits. The appellant has also stated that further planting of hedges will be provided to screen the proposal; however, I do not have any details before me.
10. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal is significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with adopted Policies D1 and D7 of the Thanet Local Plan (2006) which together seek to ensure high quality development that respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Neil Smith

INPSPECTOR

