

---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

**by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 27 September 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/16/3155395**  
**69 Sandwich Road, Ash CT3 2AH**

- 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 Alison Smith against the decision of Dover District Council.
  - The application Ref DOV/16/00434, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single storey extension. Two storey rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The site was the subject of a previous application (LPA Ref 08/01117). Nonetheless, I note the differences between the two schemes, especially in terms of roof design and the depth of the extension, and I have taken these into account. In particular I have considered the individual circumstances of this current proposal in light of current national policy and guidance.
3. I note that the appellant's title has been given as Mrs Alison Smith on the planning application form, however is referred to as Ms Alison Smith upon the appeal form.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues raised in respect of the appeal are the effect of the proposal on: -
  - (a) The character and appearance of the area; and,
  - (b) The living conditions of the adjacent occupiers at No 71 Sandwich Road, particularly in respect to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *The character and appearance of the area*

5. The extension would be a two storey rear addition. It would be taller and wider than the host dwelling. I note that it has been designed to reflect the appearance of the original dwelling, incorporating gables. Nevertheless, as a result of its greater height and width it would not respect the size and scale of
-

the host property. Consequently it would be an excessive and dominant addition to the original dwelling. Furthermore, the projection of the extension above the roof ridge and to the side would be noticeable from Sandwich Road. It would be clearly visible to the occupiers of surrounding properties. Overall, it would not reflect the height and proportions of the host dwelling and would be a discordant addition out of keeping with the design and appearance of the appeal property.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek, amongst other things, for planning to secure high quality design and to take account of the different roles and character of different areas.

*The living conditions of the adjacent occupiers at No 71 Sandwich Road*

7. The Council's concern is focused on the outlook of No 71 Sandwich Road. The extension would be positioned in close proximity to the boundary with No 71. The officer's report identifies that there is a side window in the side elevation of No 71. This relates to a kitchen and the appellant submits that this would not be a 'habitable room' and that it is secondary. Nevertheless I noted that the kitchen is a sizeable room. It is also, in my view, a place where occupiers would reasonably expect to spend time.
8. The appeal proposal would place a significant amount of built development along and in close proximity to the common boundary. As a result outlook from No 71 would be of a large expanse of built development that would be immediately visible in views from this room. It would overwhelm the living environment of the occupiers and, in my opinion, significantly reduce the enjoyment of this living space.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at No 71 Sandwich Road. The proposal would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the Framework that seek, amongst other things, for planning to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings and that the design of the built environment contributes positively to making places better for people.

**Conclusions**

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the fact that the Parish Council did not object to the scheme, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nicola Davies*

INSPECTOR