



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2021

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/21/3272779

6 Uplands Way, Minster, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 3EF

- 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 D Ingram against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/505174/FULL, dated 26 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new pitched roof with front and rear dormers, single-storey front/side extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a pitched roof with front and rear dormers, single-storey front/side extension and porch at 6 Uplands Way, Minster, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 3EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/505174/FULL, dated 26 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Block and Location Plans; Existing Elevations; Existing Ground Floor and Roof Plans; Proposed Block Plan, Floor Plans and Section – D1/6-20; and Proposed Elevations – D1/6-20A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to the master bedroom and en-suite accommodation being first brought into use, the south-east facing dormer windows to these rooms shall be obscure glazed. The windows shall remain obscure glazed at all times throughout the life of the development.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. In my opinion, this does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached single-storey scale dwelling with some accommodation within the roof area. It is situated on a corner plot at the junction of Uplands Way and Bartletts Close. The area comprises residential properties that vary in style and appearance, although in the immediate vicinity of the site, these are mainly single -storey or 'chalet' style bungalows with dormer roofs.
5. Planning permission (reference 18/500945/FULL) was previously granted for extensions similar to the current appeal proposal, comprising a new roof with front and rear dormers and a single-storey side extension.
6. The appeal proposal is for development of the same description, but with additional extensions on the rear roof area by way of flat-roofed links between three hipped roof dormers. The combined roof additions would result in three bedrooms at first floor level, whilst the single-storey extension would provide a lounge on the ground-floor. I note that the Council has no objection to the ground-floor extension or the porch and I have no reason to disagree with its conclusion regarding these aspects of the development.
7. Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 (LP) require new development, including extensions to (amongst other things) be of high-quality design; be sympathetic in terms of scale, detail and appearance; and maintain or enhance the character of the streetscene. These policies are supplemented by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance – Designing an Extension. In addition, paragraph 130 of the Framework has similar requirements.
8. The Council objects to the proposed flat-roofed links between the dormers on the rear roof area. It considers that would be a significant and prominent feature that would be harmful to the appearance of the property and the streetscene. With regard to the latter, I acknowledge that they would be clearly visible when viewed from Bartletts Close.
9. The appellant's main argument in favour of the development is that the dormer links are required to ensure sufficient headroom within the first floor of the dwelling. He states that this was not fully considered when the previous plans were determined. In my opinion, this argument has considerable merit and I find that without the links proposed, space within the first floor would be restricted and much of it would be impractical to use.
10. Although the links would be clearly seen from Bartletts Close, they would be inset from the main dormer structures and would be lower in height. Cladding the dormers with tiles that match the main roof of the dwelling would also reduce their visual impact. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the streetscene. Therefore, it would not conflict with the relevant policies of the LP, as referred to above.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included these in my decision. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development; the list of approved plans; and the use of matching materials, I have imposed a condition requiring obscure glazing to be fitted to the main bedroom and en-suite windows on the south-east facing elevation. I consider this to be necessary to protect the privacy of the occupants of number 1 Bartletts Close.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR