



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by P Wookey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/19/3233210

19 Rose Walk, Hawkinge, Kent CT18 7NW

- 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 Sue Middleton against the decision of Shepway District Council.
 - The application Ref Y19/0059/FH, received on 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Loft conversion & Dormer window to front of the house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

The description of the proposed development given in the Council's Decision Notice is shown as 'installation of a dormer window to the front slope, x2 rooflights to the rear roof slope and an associated loft conversion'. This more accurately describes the development proposed but differs to the Council's Planning Officer's report which refers to the dormer on the rear roof slope and rooflights on the front roof slope. I have based my decision on the plans submitted with the original application and the Council's Decision Notice which concurs with description of the development proposed in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the wider area, with particular regard to the setting of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is No 19 Rose Walk (No 19), a two-storey terraced dwelling located within the settlement boundary of Hawkinge and within the Kent Downs AONB.
4. The development proposed would convert the loft of No 19 and construct a dormer extension on the front roof slope and two rooflights on the rear extension. The flat roofed dormer extension is shown on the plan¹ as extending

¹ Proposed South View

over a large area of the front roof slope and would be slightly below the height of the existing roofline.

5. The Council's Policy BE8 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review (2006) (SDLPR) makes it clear that loft conversions requiring dormer extensions which are larger in proportion to the existing roof will not be permitted.
6. In this case the bulk and scale of the proposed dormer extension which would extend over most of the dwellings roof space would significantly alter the proportions of the host property. The dormer extension's proposed flat roof, which is almost the same height as the existing roofline would result in the host property appearing to have a three-storey height. This would make the host property appear top-heavy and incongruous in the street scene. The result would be to unbalance the appearance of the host property which would have a significant detrimental visual effect on the character and appearance of the wider area, which are mainly two-storey dwellings.
7. No 19 is located in a residential housing estate in the settlement of Hawkinge, which is located within the Kent Downs AONB. Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework) states that AONB's have the highest status of protection in relation to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty.
8. The development proposed would extend an existing dwelling and there are no exceptional circumstances that would demonstrate that the development would be in the public interest. The appellant has stated that the proposed dormer extension would provide improvements to living conditions for the family. There are no alternatives to provide for the development proposed and the resulting unacceptable visual impact could not be moderated in any way. As a result, the development proposed would not conserve or enhance the AONB which is afforded the highest status of protection in the Framework.
9. I conclude that the development proposed would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the surrounding area and the AONB and would be contrary to Policies BE1 and BE8 of the SDLPR and to the emerging policies HB1, HB8 and NE3 of the Places and Policies Local Plan, Submission Draft (2018) which is at an advanced stage of preparation and to which I attach moderate weight, and to the Framework. When read together the policies seek to ensure high quality design and to preserve and protect the intrinsic beauty of the AONB.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to other dormer extensions, but as no details have been submitted as evidence and as circumstances may differ, I have based my decision on the merits of the development proposed.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Wookey

INSPECTOR