



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/19/3227180

4 Lower Sands, Dymchurch TN29 0NE

- 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 Janet Hamilton against the decision of Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref Y19/0055/FH, dated 15 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as 'extension to loft room'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and streetscene.

Reasons

3. Shepway District Local Plan Review (SDLPR) Policy BE8 states, among other things, that permission will not be granted for loft conversions requiring dormer extensions which are large in proportion to the existing roof, as these can completely alter the proportion of the building, presenting a top-heavy and flat-roofed appearance. It is also stated that permission will not be given for flat-roofed extensions, unless the proposed extension would not be generally visible from a public place and would serve only as an adjunct to the main building, or the provision of a flat roof is the only practicable means of providing an extension.
4. The appeal concerns a detached bungalow where there is a rear dormer. This is particularly modest in size and scale, only covering a fairly small part of the existing roof. Hip to gable alterations would be built at each end of the roof. The existing flat roof dormer would be substantially enlarged to abut one side of the extended roof, with the distance from the top of its flat roof to the ridge of the host dwelling being fairly modest. The gap to the other side would be larger but despite this it would occupy an unduly high proportion of the enlarged rear roof slope. The overly large and dominant addition would unacceptably alter the proportion of the building, resulting in a top heavy flat-roofed appearance.

5. Moreover, because of the position of the dwelling, the detrimental effect arising from the unacceptably dominant and box-like profile to the northern side would be readily apparent from the street in Lower Sands. The extension would therefore be visible from a public place and because of its undue dominance and excessive bulk and massing it would not appear as an adjunct. I have not been provided with any evidence to show that the provision of a flat roof is the only practicable means of providing an extension.
6. The dormer addition would be substantially larger than the existing feature which therefore does not add any meaningful weight in favour of the appeal despite having a flat roof. My attention has not been drawn to any specific dormer extensions in the locality. I saw examples of such development at my site visit but these tend to be of a relatively modest size by comparison to that now proposed and would not justify accepting a proposal having such a detrimental visual impact.
7. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and streetscene. For these reasons there would be conflict with SDLPR Policy BE8, as well as Policies BE1 and SD1 which, among other things, seek a high standard of design. These are the most relevant of the policies referred to in the Council's decision notice.
8. Taking account of all other matters raised, because of the harm that would result the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR