



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/22/3307108

43 Clare Drive, Herne Bay, Kent CT6 7QU

- 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 Broadbent against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref CA/22/01384, dated 24 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension with flat roof and roof light. Alongside a loft conversion with flat roof dormers to the front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, the Appeal Form describes the proposal as “single-storey rear extension together with dormers to the front and rear and insertion of window to first floor side elevation” and was also used on the Council’s decision notice. This description more accurately describes the proposal and I have therefore dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a single storey semi-detached bungalow at 43 Clare Drive (No 43). The properties along this part of Clare Drive are predominantly bungalows of similar architectural style and form. No 43 is one of several semi-detached bungalows with a distinctive design, finished in brick with a plain tiled pitched roof.
5. The proposed development would include a flat-roofed dormer that would occupy a substantial section of the host dwelling’s existing front roof slope. Its width and height, combined with its central positioning on the roof slope, would make it a dominant feature that would be out of proportion with the modestly sized roof slope. It would be seen from Clare Drive from where its overall bulk and the height would be highly visible. Consequently, it would appear as an overly large and incongruous addition to this modest dwelling.

6. Furthermore, the insertion of a front dormer of the size proposed would appear particularly intrusive alongside the plain tiled roof slope of the adjoining bungalow.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to two properties on Clare Drive that have front dormers, which I observed during my site visit. However, these other front dormers are not characteristic of the area and so are themselves incongruous. Their presence is therefore not a justification for permitting the scheme before me, which I have determined on its own merit.
8. It is clear from the Council's decision notice that its concerns relate to the front dormer extension. Given that the Council finds the proposed rear dormer, rear extension and side facing window to be acceptable, and on the basis of the evidence before me, I have no reason to find differently. However, the acceptability of these elements of the proposal do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
9. For the reasons given, the proposed front dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies DBE3 and DBE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan (2017). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure proposals for development are of high quality design and compatible with the character of the original building in terms of scale, bulk and mass, and not detrimental to the character of the locality and streetscape. In addition, the proposal would fail to accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the points made by the appellant about the Council's handling of the case. However, these points have not affected my decision, which is based on the planning merits of the development.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR