
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/D/19/3227496

11 Queensmount, Five Ashes, Mayfield, East Sussex, TN20 6LH.

- 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 Patrick Inman against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref WD/2018/2418/F, dated 7 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is front dormer in loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The dwelling the subject of this appeal, 11 Queensmount, is the middle property in a short terrace of three, two-storey houses. The surrounding properties comprise a mix of semi-detached and terraced houses and flats. The houses are brick built, to a vernacular design, with steep pitched tiled roofs. Number 11 has a single storey rear addition and a flat roof dormer in its rear roof slope.
4. The appellant proposes the erection of a hipped roof dormer to the front roof slope to serve the proposed en-suite bathroom within the loft space conversion.
5. I noted that, albeit located on the opposite side of the road, neighbouring properties located either side of the entrance to Mountreed each have small hipped roof dormer windows in their front roof slopes. Accordingly, in my judgement, and given that a dormer here would also serve to break up the visual mass of the existing roof slope, a small vernacular style dormer to reflect those in the roofs opposite would not be unacceptable.
6. However, although the window would line through with those in the bedroom and kitchen below, it would not sit centrally in the dormer. Accordingly, given the symmetry of fenestration and the character and form of the dormers

opposite, the proposed dormer would, as designed, appear as inappropriate and unsympathetic form of development.

7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development, as designed, would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, saved Policies EN6, EN27 and HG10 of the Wealden Local Plan (Adopted December 1998), Policy BED1 of the Wealden Local Plan-*Draft Proposed Submission June 2018*, coupled with the guidance in the Wealden Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (November 2008), as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the need for new development to respect the character of the area.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR