



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 SEPTEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/21/3285561

Danehurst, Kingsdown Hill, Kingsdown, Deal, Kent CT14 8EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Steven Garrett against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01130, dated 13 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a second floor extension over existing first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of the construction of additional storeys subject to limitations and conditions. Paragraph AA.2(3)(a) requires that before beginning the development, the developer must apply to the Council for prior approval in relation to certain matters which include the external appearance of the dwelling.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed second floor extension is permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO, having regard to the external appearance of the dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a traditionally designed two storey dwelling. It fronts onto Kingsdown Hill and is set back slightly behind the highway. Given its proximity from the highway, it is readily visible within the street scene.
5. Neighbouring properties in the locality comprise a mix of single storey and two storey dwellings. Some of these also have second floor accommodation, however, these are within the roof space and when viewed from the street, these properties visually read as two storey dwellings.
6. The proposed development would add an additional storey to the existing dwelling. The eaves height would be raised and a roof would also sit above this

second story. While the numerical increase in height may be moderate in comparison to the existing building, the proposed design would cause the appeal building to appear as a fully expressed three-storey building. This would in effect cause the appeal dwelling to visually appear taller with a substantially greater mass at second floor level.

7. While land levels vary within the locality, this increase in height would result in the appeal property protruding significantly above the adjacent and locally prevailing building heights. This would cause the appeal building to be an unsympathetic and disruptive feature, harmfully damaging the existing quality of the street scene. The introduction of tile hanging, in contrast to the light render finish would not be objectionable by itself, however, it would draw additional attention to this increased massing further exacerbating the visual harm set out above.
8. Although landscaping has been suggested to screen the front of the property, this would take time to establish and there is no mechanism before me to ensure landscaping would be retained or survive in perpetuity.
9. As a result, the proposed development would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would not accord with Paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(ii) of the GDPO.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the development is not permitted under the terms of the GDPO. Consequently, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR