The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 August 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/22/3291734
37 Woodlands Park, Bexley DA5 2EN

- 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 and Mrs Samoila against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
- The application Ref DA/21/00671/FUL, dated 28 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2021.
- The proposed development is raising height of and alterations to roof from hip end to gable end for provision of dormer windows with Juliette balcony in rear elevation in connection with providing additional rooms in the roof space and a first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice as this has also been used by the appellant for their appeal statement.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a large detached 2 storey brick house with a large rear garden backing onto woods. It is located in an area of similar substantial 2 storey houses, with the occasional large bungalow, which generally share a similar architectural expression, including hipped roof forms. It is noted, however that some nearby properties, including the neighbouring detached house at 39 Woodland Park have underdone significant alteration and extension. The design of these has, however, retained the hipped roof form that contributes to the coherent character of the area.

5. The proposal is for a roof level extension that would raise the roof height, change the roof from a hipped roof to a half hipped gable end. The rear of the proposed roof would have a pair of dormer windows with Juliette balconies. At first floor level a flat roofed first floor extension would sit above the existing

ground floor dining room. This would extend halfway across the width of the appeal dwelling.

6. Given that the terminal heights of houses in the immediate local area vary greatly due to the positioning of houses in relation to hilly topography, the proposed increase in height would not in itself detract from the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. Likewise, given the substantial size of the appeal dwelling, the dormer windows and first floor extension are not of a scale that would appear to dominate the substantial appeal dwelling, and would only be visible from the rear of the property.

7. The main front roof slope would be extended as a single roof slope on its existing angle. However, the proposed change of roof form to a half hipped gable ended form would not be in keeping with the character of the appeal dwelling, where the current hipped roof form contributes to the quality of its existing architectural expression and character. As the appeal dwelling is located on the outside of a curve in the street, the proposed half hipped gable ended roof form would be unduly prominent and visually obtrusive in immediate and longer views of the appeal property from along the street.

8. In these extensive views, the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling appearing as unsympathetic to and would stand in contrast with the unanimity of the hipped roof forms found in the local area. This would detract from the appearance of the streetscene and the established character of the local area identified above.

9. The appellant has brought to my attention other roof level extensions and alterations in the local area. These are of differing design to that proposed and would have been considered on their own individual merits. I have, done likewise with the proposal and have, therefore, given these examples minimal weight in my considerations.

10. For the above reasons the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would be contrary to policies DP2 and DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan (2017) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek development that is of a high standard of design and integrates with the local area.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR