
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2022

by Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/22/3307701

35 Sandpiper Road, Whitstable, Kent CT5 4DP

- 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 Philip Baston against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref CA/22/01108, dated 23 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as '*first floor loft conversion and single storey side extension*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building, No. 35 Sandpaper Road, is a single storey semi-detached dwelling located in Whitstable. The street scene is characterised by dwellings of varying size, including semi-detached bungalows and houses. Most dwellings are of a similar architectural style, however there are some variations in their design details. Whilst there are some examples of rear dormers in the area, there are very few alterations to the front roof slopes of dwellings.
4. The appeal scheme seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension together with alterations to roof to allow accommodation in roof space including a dormer to front elevation. However, this would introduce an alien feature within this part of the street scene. The incongruous roof dormer within the front roof slope would therefore be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the street scene and be out of keeping with its character and appearance.
5. I note the Appellant's point that there are a few limited examples elsewhere in the area where front facing dormers are found. It is not clear how these examples arose, but in any case it is clear that they are the exception where found in very limited cases. Moreover, I have assessed the appeal proposal on the basis of the scheme before me and found that it would be unacceptable on its own merits.

6. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DBE3 and DBE6 of the *Canterbury District Local Plan 2017*, which, amongst other aims, seek to permit alterations and extensions to buildings which are not detrimental to the character of the locality and streetscape.
7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Parker

INSPECTOR