
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/16/3160898

61 Squires Way, Wilmington DA2 7NN

- 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 Mr David Hayes against the decision of the Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/16/01198/FUL, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is first storey rear dormer extension and hip to gable roof alteration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first storey rear dormer extension and hip to gable roof extension at 61 Squires Way, Wilmington DA2 7NN in accordance with the terms of the application DA/16/01198/FUL, dated 26 July 2016, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, 1601 Rev. B8/16 and 1622.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 61 Squires Way is at the end of a row of similarly designed hipped roof properties and is immediately adjacent to a gable ended property. The properties immediately opposite to the appeal site also have gable ends.
4. The appeal property has an existing front hipped roof projecting element though, notwithstanding the Council's first reason for refusal which refers to a

gable end to the front of the property, this is not shown to be changed in the application drawings, as depicted in the proposed south west side elevation.

5. The existing property has a front dormer window which unbalances the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties (including 63 Squires Way). Whilst this adjoining property has a hipped roof and the proposal would further unbalance the appearance of this pair of properties, given the location of the site immediately adjacent to another property with a gable end, I do not consider that it would result in the proposed gable roof extension appearing as incongruous within the streetscene.
6. I have also given consideration to the prominent location of the site, including in views from Chestnut Grove. Nevertheless, given my findings above, this does alter my conclusions on this aspect of the proposal.
7. I understand the Council's aim to seek to maintain the similar hipped roof forms of semi-detached properties. However, given the location of the appeal site immediately adjacent to another property with a gable ended roof, I do not consider the streetscene to be unacceptably harmed by the appeal proposal in this instance.
8. The proposed rear dormer window would extend an existing rear dormer window. Whilst the combined dormer window would be large in size, given its location at the rear of the property, meaning that it would not be visible in the streetscene, and taking account of other rear dormer windows which I observed at other nearby properties, I do not consider that it would result in significant harm to the appearance of the existing property or to the wider area.
9. The proposed development would therefore not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with the relevant design aims of saved policies B1 and H14 of the Dartford Local Plan (April 1995) and emerging policies DP2 and DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Document (December 2015).
10. The hip to gable roof extension would lead to some limited loss of day light to the ground floor side windows of the neighbouring property (59 Squires Way). Nevertheless, given the separation distance between the two properties and the slightly raised position of No.59 in comparison to the appeal site, I do not consider that this loss of light from the additional building proposed would be so significant as to result in unacceptable harm to the neighbouring living conditions.
11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR