
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 23rd May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/17/3170317

Forelands, Queensdown Road, Kingsdown CT14 8EF

- 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 Daniel Best against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref DOV/16/00915, dated 29 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor dormer extension at Forelands, Queensdown Road, Kingsdown, CT14 8EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DOV/16/00915, dated 29 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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 or as shown on the approved plans.
 - 3) The window on the proposed side elevation shown on drawing 4666/A3/04A and labelled 'New 1st floor side facing window to dressing room' shall be fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4666/A3/03A, 4666/A3/04A, 4666/A3/05A and 4666/A3/06B.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal seeks the erection of a dormer style roof extension within the front roof slope of Forelands; which is a semi-detached bungalow located within a residential setting. I saw from my site inspection that the street scene is characterised by an eclectic mix of building styles and forms, with no one style
-

prevalent. In particular, I saw that dormers and other roof alterations are a widespread feature of the street scene and the proposal would only add to this. In this respect, the principle of inserting a dormer into the front roof slope in this location is sound in this case.

4. In terms of the design, the Council has concerns over it being a dominant feature on the front roof slope which they consider would appear as an obtrusive and poorly-related addition. However, the extension would be set back from the eaves and the edge of the roof, and set below main ridge height. In practice, rather than dominating the roof slope, the extension would appear as a subservient addition to it. As such, I do not find that its scale and design would result in material harm to the appearance of the building. What is more, given the prevalence of such features within the wider street scene I do not find that the proposed roof extension would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development within the street scene.
5. The Council has not provided any development plan policies they consider relevant. In the absence of these being before me, I have considered the proposal against the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) as a material consideration in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA), as amended.
6. Accordingly, the proposal would accord with the Policies of the Framework, which, amongst others, include that planning decision should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes at Paragraph 60 and that planning should always seek to secure high quality design at Paragraph 17.

Other Matters

7. A number of concerns have been raised in terms of overlooking arising from the proposal. In this respect, given the distances involved and the fact that the windows would overlook the highway to the front of the building, I do not consider that the proposal would result in a materially harmful loss of privacy. The Officer Report suggests the use of an obscured glazing condition in relation to the side dressing room window, and given its location this would be reasonable in order to reduce the sense of overlooking for neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

8. Conditions requiring the use of matching materials and that the proposal is carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary and reasonable in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. Such conditions would accord with the guidance set out in Paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters into account including concerns raised by interested parties, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR