



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/19/3228669

57 Colney Road, Dartford DA1 1TQ

- 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 Aaron Davies against the decision of Dartford District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/18/00851/FUL, dated 3 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer and 2 rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 55 Colney Road, with particular regard to enclosure and loss of light.

Reasons

The character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area

3. 57 Colney Road is a small and narrow late 19th Century palisaded mid terraced house, located in a part of the street made up of similar dwellings of the same age and size. To the rear there is an original two storey rear projection, that is common to other houses in the terrace.
4. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a stepped ridge roof and would be the full width of the host dwelling, extending solid walls to the boundary with adjoining properties. This part of the proposed extensions would extend into the rear garden, significantly beyond the existing two storey rear projection.
5. When the scale of the proposed floor extension is combined with the proposed extensive second floor rear dormer extension, the proposed development would result in significant additional bulk being added to the host dwelling that would have a dominating visual appearance. Despite the proposed slate clad roof profiles, the scale of the proposed extensions would fail to make them

appear as subservient to the existing building and would appear over scaled in relation to the host dwelling.

6. Due to the bulk and excessive scale in relation to the host building, the proposed extensions would be prominent in both public and private views of the rear of the property. Given the small size and narrowness of the host property, the extensions would appear disproportionate and overly dominant and incongruous in the context of the host building. The proposed extensions would fundamentally alter the character and appearance of the building and would, therefore, appear visually jarring in the context of the terrace within which it sits. This would result in harm to the character and appearance of both No 57 and the surrounding area.
7. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies DP2 and DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan 2017 (the local plan), which seek to ensure development is of high quality design that respects and enhances its locality and is not visually obtrusive.

The living conditions of the occupiers of 55 Colney Road

8. Within the context of the terraced properties, the proposed extensions would be in close proximity to neighbouring dwellings. Combined with the scale of the proposed ground floor extension and the additional bulk and height of the proposal at second floor level, this would result in an overbearing sense of enclosure on the occupiers of No 55. It would have a particularly detrimental impact in this regard when experienced from the rear rooms of the property and the rear garden area adjacent to the ground floor extension.
9. Notwithstanding that the rear of the appeal property appears to face south, due to its location on the boundary with No 55, its stepped ridge roof form and extent of its projection from the rear of the existing dwelling, the proposed ground floor extension would result in significant overshadowing and consequent loss of daylight and sunlight to the rear ground floor rooms of this neighbouring dwelling and the garden area adjacent to its rear door. The second floor element of the extension on top of the existing two storey rear projection would also result in overshadowing and a loss of sunlight and daylight to the first floor rear bedroom in the main body of this neighbouring dwelling.
10. The proposed development would result in an overbearing sense of enclosure as well as overshadowing resulting in loss of sunlight and daylight. This would cause undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers at No 55 contrary to Policies DP5 and DP7 of the Local Plan, insofar as these seek that developments avoid harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that would outweigh this conflict. Accordingly, for the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR