



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15th November 2022

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/W/22/3300130

Turkey Farm, St Mary Lane, Bexhill TN39 5JE

- 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 Ms Emma Farrow against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref.RR/2021/2658/P, dated 29 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer, erection or rear infill extension and associated internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed rear dormer structure on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached residential dwelling consisting mainly of ground floor accommodation with some rooms at upper floor level within the roof structure. The site is situated outside the development boundary of Bexhill. It has a rural setting and is accessed via a track which also serves a handful of other buildings. It has planning permission for the addition of a front porch structure. This appeared to be in the course of construction at the time of my site visit.
4. The proposed development sought in this appeal is to infill a small area at the rear/side of the property and to construct a dormer structure along the rear elevation upper floor level. At the rear on the upper floor as existing there is a single gable end which faces rearwards and serves a bathroom. The infill extension would square off the rear elevation and would be in line with the existing rear and side elevations.
5. The proposed rear dormer would have a crown-style flat roof with hips. It would have three rear facing windows and some rooflights in the flat roof area. All of the materials are proposed to match the existing property.
6. The length of the proposed dormer would be broadly similar to the length of the rear elevation. This would be a substantial length and would have almost no articulation. It would not step back from the main rear wall (as extended) and would present as a large unattractive area of brickwork with little visual

interest. It would dominate the rear of the property and result in a top heavy and incongruous appearance to the host dwelling.

7. The resulting roof profiles would not sit comfortably together and would result in an unsympathetic overall design which would harm and obscure the original character of the modest dwelling. The design would not contribute positively to the character of the host dwelling or the wider area.
8. I have borne in mind that public views of the rear elevation and the wider dwelling are currently very limited. However, this may not always be the case in the future and, in addition, national policy seeks to protect the intrinsic qualities of the countryside for its own sake. Views of the resulting development would harm the visual qualities of the surrounding countryside.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would be contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies OSS4(iii) and EN3 of the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2014) and policy DHG9 of the Rother Development and Site Allocations Local Plan (adopted 2019).

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR