



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/19/3243522

8 Arundel Road, Dartford DA1 5EH

- 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 Miss Hannah Chambers against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/19/01171/FUL dated 14 August 2019 was refused by notice dated 26 September 2019.
 - The development is originally described as loft extension and creation of a porch and cloak room at entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for provision of a dormer window in front elevation in connection with providing additional rooms in the roof space and erection of a porch and cloak room at entrance at 8 Arundel Road, Dartford DA1 5EH, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: DA/19/01171/FUL, dated 14 August 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 plans: 31319-200 (Site and Location Plan), 31319-100, 31319-101, 31319-200 (proposed floor and roof plan) and 31319-201 Rev. A

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of the development I have used in the decision above reflects that used in the Council's Decision Notice and the appeal forms as that is a more accurate description compared to that originally used in the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey dwelling which is one of four in a set of back to back dwellings. The set of houses the appeal dwelling is a part of has a gable ended roof and due to the arrangement of the dwellings, the appeal property does not have a rear roof slope. The front elevation of the appeal property faces a large parking area and it is separated from the road by No 6. As such it does not contribute significantly to the street scene. Roof dormers are present in the surrounding area, and although most of these are positioned on the rear roof slopes, they are highly visible from the public realm.
6. The dormer would be visible from the road. However, although the proposed dormer would sit on the front roof slope, it would not appear incongruous due to its distance from the road and the inconspicuous nature of the front elevation when viewed in the street scene. Also, in the context of other highly visible dormers within the local vicinity, the proposed development would not appear discordant. The proposed dormer would be set down from the ridge, setback from the eaves and set in from the sides. These design features would allow the proposed dormer to appear subordinate within the roof.
7. The proposed extension of the cloak room to create a porch and toilet would be a small addition to the ground floor. It would harmonise well with the existing dwelling by using matching materials. Further, various styles and sizes of porches were witnessed within the surrounding area.
8. Based on the reasoning above, the proposed development would not result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the proposed dormer does not accord with the explanatory text to Policy DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan, Adopted July 2017, (Development Plan), where it states that dormer extensions are unlikely to be appropriate on front roof slopes, it does accord with the overall clear expectations as set out within the Policy which requires development to not be visually obtrusive. I also do not find conflict with Policy DP2 of the Development Plan which seeks to ensure good design.

Conditions

9. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried out 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