The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2019

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 13 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/19/3235617
4 Haysel, Sittingbourne ME10 4QE

- 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 and Mrs Pope against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/502037/FULL, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2019.
- The development proposed is first floor extension with dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The prevailing majority of residential properties in Haysel have retained their original single storey flat roofed front extensions, car ports and garages. In combination with a consistent palette of materials this positively contributes to its uniform and suburban character and appearance. I observed that despite some alterations to the roofs of properties within the locality, in the form of roof lights and solar panels, none of them benefitted from dormer windows or similar roof alterations to those before me.

4. Despite the use of matching materials and although the proposal would not increase the overall roof height or footprint of the existing dwelling, it would substantially alter its form and appearance, removing the existing flat roof by continuing the existing slope of the roof and introducing a wide and squat dormer window with a hipped roof form.

5. The property is sited in a conspicuous position on entering the street and the eye would be unacceptably drawn to the its overly dominant scale and markedly different form to the existing dwelling and those that surround it. It would be an unduly prominent addition that in such a context would be entirely out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would not be an appropriate standard of design and would harmfully diminish the contribution that the host property makes to the appearance of the streetscene.

6. For these reasons, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies DM14 and DM16 of the Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan and associated guidance[1] which, when taken as a whole and amongst other things, require alterations and extensions to be of an appropriate design quality, well sited and of a scale and design that is sympathetic and appropriate to the location and maintains or enhances the character of the streetscene.

Other Matters

7. It is not determinative that the appellant has drawn my attention to an identical extension that was approved at 39 Pond Drive[2] which is close to the appeal site. On the evidence before me that permission was never implemented and is no longer extant. Further, it also appears to have been considered under a different development plan which I have no details of.

8. I have also had regard to the appellants requirements for additional living accommodation but the limited benefits from this would not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and area that I have identified. Thus none of these other considerations, on their own or in combination, alter my view.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR

[1] Swale Borough Council: Designing an Extension A Guide for Householders 2011.
[2] SW/04/0320.