

## Officer Report

Application No.	25/2202/FH
Site Address	GREENFIELDS, MISLING LANE, STELLING MINNIS, CANTERBURY, CT4 6DE
Officer Name	Laura Cook
Proposal	Two storey side extension following demolition of existing garage.

### Recommendation

Report Number	RD-439206
Recommended Decision	Recommended to be Refused
Recommendation Date	21 January 2026

### Report

#### Site

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached property on the northern side of Misling Lane. The property is finished in facing brick on the ground floor with hung tile details on the first floor, and brown upvc windows.

To the front of the site, there is hardstanding to accommodate off street parking, with a garage to the rear of the site,

Boundary treatment around the site consists of 1.8m close boarded wooden fencing. Significant planting to all boundaries, specifically to the front and side, adjacent to the highway. The immediate street scene is made up of a small cluster of residential properties on large plots, within a countryside setting.. The space between built form emphasises the rural character of the area.

The site is located within the Kent Downs National Landscape Area and Special Landscape Area (SLA) and the area displays a strong rural character.

#### Constraints

Kent Downs National Landscape  
Site of Special Scientific Interest – Impact Risk Zones  
Archaeological Notification Area  
Special Landscape Area

#### Relevant Site History

No relevant site history.

#### Proposal

Planning Permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension following demolition of existing garage.

### **Consultation Responses**

Consultation responses are available in full on the planning file.

Elmsted Parish Council— No objections, but wonders whether the materials used could be sympathetic to the other buildings in the area.

### **Representations**

1 representations have been received, this is support of the application. The main points from the correspondence are:

- No objection to the proposed location or footprint.
- Concerns regarding the unknown external aesthetic.
- Clarification on the potential impact of the existing aged septic tank system and its capacity.

### **Relevant Policies**

Places and Policies Local Plan 2020

HB1 (Quality Place Through Design)

HB8 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings)

NE3 (Protecting the District's Landscapes and Countryside)

T2 (Parking Standards)

Core Strategy Review 2022

NPPF

NPPG

Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000, Section 85

### **Appraisal**

Design and Visual Appearance

The proposal would incorporate a large two-storey side extension, following the demolition of the existing garage. It would span almost the same width and depth as the existing dwelling and as such would almost double the footprint and scale of the building. The proposal would fail to comply with Policy HB8 of the PPLP insofar that it would significantly exceed half the width of the original dwelling. Its scale and bulk would compete visually with the host property, resulting in a large and dominant addition that would overwhelm the proportions of the original building.

The overall mass, design and prominence of the extension would overwhelm the existing dwelling, and the continuation of the full-height ridge line and front building line, would also unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair.

Despite boundary landscaping, the extension would remain highly visible from public vantage points. Its substantial size and bulk would appear intrusive and out of keeping with the rural context. The disproportionate massing would erode the sense of space and openness within the plot, harming both rural character and the Kent Downs National Landscape.

As noted, the site lies within the Kent Downs National Landscape and Special Landscape Area, where development must conserve and enhance landscape character. The Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023 strengthens this duty. The proposal also includes significant changes in external materials—off-white render and horizontal weatherboarding—that do not relate to the existing dwelling. With

no material details provided, including the form or colour of the weatherboarding, it cannot be demonstrated that the finishes would not harm the character of the dwelling, the street scene, or the wider protected landscape.

For these reasons, the proposal would result in significant harm to the host dwelling and the visual amenity of the Kent Downs National Landscape.

The scale, bulk, design and unresolved material treatment are unacceptable and contrary to Policies HB1, HB8 and NE3 of the PPLP.

#### Residential Amenity

The proposal would not harm the residential amenity of surrounding neighbouring properties.

Therefore, the application is considered to preserve neighbouring amenity and would conform with the criteria of policies HB1 and HB8 of the PPLP.

#### Highways and Parking

The proposed development would result in one additional bedroom at the dwelling (resulting in a 4-bed dwelling). There is sufficient off-street parking at the site (in excess of 2 spaces) to comply with Policy T2 of the PPLP and the development is acceptable in this regard.

#### Other Matters

Given the nature of development, it is not considered that it would result in any harmful impact on SSSI or to buried heritage assets. It is not considered that any mitigation measures would be required in this case.

Concerns have been raised in relation to the existing septic tank and its capacity, Given this is an extension to an existing dwelling, it is not considered that it would result in any significant impact upon the septic tank above and beyond the existing circumstances

#### **Human Rights**

I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view, the Assessment section above and the recommendation represents an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) [and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties)] and the wider public interest.

#### **Duty to Cooperate**

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), December 2024 the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by offering a pre-application advice service and, where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome and as appropriate, updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

#### **Public Sector Equality Duty**

In determining this application, regard has been had to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set down in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular with regard to the need to:

-Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;

-Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and  
-Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. It is considered that the application proposals would not undermine objectives of the Duty.

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. We seek to work with applicants/agents in a positive and creative way by:

- Offering a pre-application advice service;
- Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome; and
- As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance the application was acceptable as submitted.

### **Recommendation**

Taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and rural character contrary to development plan policy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for refusal.

### **Recommended Refusal Reasons (1)**

1

The proposed extension, by virtue of its excessive size, scale and bulk, would visually compete with and fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling, resulting in a dominant and unsympathetic addition that would not respect the character or proportions of the dwelling and would unbalance the pair of semi detached dwellings. The scale, form and appearance of the development would cause significant visual harm to the countryside and would detract from the scenic quality and natural beauty of the Kent Downs National Landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HB1, HB8 and NE3 of the adopted Places and Policies Local Plan (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Suggested Informatives (1)**

1

Your attention is drawn to the fact that this refusal of planning permission is on the basis of submitted documents:

BA-25-25-01-RevP.01 Existing & proposed plans, elevations, block & Location Plan - Received 04.12.2025



Planning Statement - Received 04.12.2025