



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/19/3242653

9 Sinclair Way, Darenth DA2 7JS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Keith Cocking against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/19/00984/FUL dated 13 July 2019 was refused by notice dated 11 September 2019.
 - The proposed development is a loft conversion
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion at 9 Sinclair way, Darenth DA2 7JS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: DA/19/00984/FUL, dated 13 July 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 18/1009/2

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates a mid-terraced two-storey dwelling with the rear elevation visible from Bennett Way. The terrace it is a part of is unaltered at roof level which provides a sense of uniformity here. However, there are modest flat roof dormers visible on dwellings on Sinclair Way when approaching the appeal site from the south. Larger rear dormers with flat and hipped roofs on dwellings along Wood Lane are also visible from Sinclair Way

due to a gap between Nos. 55 and 57. As such, in the wider context, dormers are not uncommon. The fenestration arrangement on the existing appeal dwelling varies with different sizes and placement of windows giving no strong sense of consistency.

5. The proposed dormer would have two pitched roofs, joined with a flat roof element in between. The pitched roof elements would complement the host dwelling's roof whilst the flat roof element would be sympathetic to the standard boxed design dormers witnessed nearby. Although the design is not usual, it blends two elements of roof designs witnessed within the local area and would appear pleasantly unique. Furthermore the pitched roof aspects would have the effect of visually breaking up the visual mass of the development and in this respect, it would differ from the other bulkier dormers nearby. The dormer would disrupt the uniformity of the host terrace when seen from Bennett Way, but the pleasant design of the development means that disruption would not be unacceptably harmful.
6. Despite being close to the ridge of the property, the proposed dormer would be setback from the eaves a considerable distance and set in from the sides and this would render it subordinate to the host dwelling and the wider terrace. The proposed dormer windows would mirror each other well and in general would appear aligned with the first-floor windows of the host dwelling. Similarly, the low-key nature of the proposed skylights to the front, would not detract from the front elevation.
7. Based on the reasoning above, the development would not have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. I therefore do not find conflict with Policies DP7 and DP2 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan, Adopted July 2017, which seek to ensure development is not visually obtrusive and promotes good design respectively.

Other Matters

8. The Council refers to a previously dismissed appeal at the same site (Ref: APP/T2215/D/18/3207433). I have not been provided with a copy of this. However, from the details given in the Council's officers report, it appears that proposal differed in that it was larger, and flat roofed. It is therefore not directly comparable to the scheme before me.

Conditions

9. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried in accordance with the approved plans and within three years of the date of this decision. Furthermore, in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure matching materials are used.

Recommendation and Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR