
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/21/3279252
125 Church Road, Swanscombe, DA10 0HE

- 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 Robert Victory against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/20/01633/FUL, dated 29 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Side Extension at First Floor level together with a loft conversion. The loft conversion entails raising the ridge line by 300mm approximately'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has stated within the ground of appeal that he would be willing to omit the alterations to the front bay. However, I do not have any amended plans before me. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal based on the original submission.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a terrace dwelling, located on the end of a short row of dwellings of a similar design and appearance. A particular feature of the terrace is the two storey bay on the front elevation of each dwelling with a hipped roof structure above.
5. The proposal would raise the height of the existing two storey bay, effectively incorporating it into the loft conversion. The vertical nature of the proposal combined with the introduction of glazing above eaves height and the lack of any set back into the roof slope would result it appearing as a highly prominent and bulky feature both in relation to the host dwelling and the remainder of the terrace. In my view, the extension would appear out of scale and character with the host dwelling and would considerably unbalance and detract from the

wider terrace, resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal would also involve a large flat roof rear dormer. Whilst the dormer would be set up slightly from the eaves, it would extend virtually across the entire width of the property, including the proposed side extension. The dormer would also extend up to the ridge, which would be raised, taking the dormer higher than the original roof height. The dormer would be a bulky addition that would dominate the rear roof slope and consequently would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. This would be contrary to Policy DP7 of the DP which seeks to ensure that proposals are of a satisfactory design and are not visually obtrusive.
7. Furthermore, views of the side elevation of the dwelling, including the rear dormer and raised ridge would be glimpsed through the gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling, 117 Church Road. The raised roof would also be apparent at street level resulting in further unbalance to the original terrace. The unbalance to the terrace would be particularly apparent given that it comprises a short row of only three dwellings. Overall, I find that the additions to the property would be harmful to character and appearance of the area.
8. I have had regard to the appellants comments regarding the positioning of the shared flue however, this does not lessen my concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposal. I also note that there are some variations in ridge height along Church Road although some of these appear to be part of the original design. I have not been provided with precise details of any of the later additions and in any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan 2017 (DP) which seeks to ensure that proposals are of a satisfactory design and are not visually obtrusive. Whilst the Council has also referred to Policy CP2 of the DP in their decision notice, I have not been provided with a copy of this policy and I am therefore unable to have regard to it.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR