



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/22/3310060

45A Norfield Road, Wilmington, Kent DA2 7NY

- 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 David Kingston against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/22/00552/FUL, dated 9 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a "single storey rear extension and extension to roof with rear dormer and two rooflights to front roofslope".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and (ii) whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to natural light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow that is located at the end of a residential cul-de-sac. The neighbouring properties comprise a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows of similar age and appearance. Whilst many of these dwellings have been altered and extended over the years, the vast majority retain the original hipped roof form at the front. This gives the area a high degree of unity and visual coherence, and ensures that the verdant backdrop provided by the neighbouring woodland remains a dominate feature in the street scene.
4. The property was constructed following the grant of planning permission at appeal in 2007. It occupies a narrow site to the side of 45 Norfield Road that is set below street level. As a consequence only the roof of the property is readily visible from the street and it is a diminutive feature next to the recently extended No.45.
5. The proposal comprises the erection of a flat-roofed single-storey rear addition that would wrap around the side of the property together with the enlargement and re-configuration of the roof to enable the formation of a pair of bedrooms

and bathroom on an upper floor. The enlarged roof would include an almost full-width box dormer to the rear. This, combined with the flat-roofed ground floor addition would result in a very boxy form of development at the rear that would be entirely at odds with the appearance of the host property and the majority of the neighbouring bungalows. The front roof slope would include a pair of small dormers. These would be visible from the road and would be highly prominent, incongruous and alien features in this local context, given that dormers on front roof slopes are rare, and where they exist nearby. Are notably conspicuous features.

6. Due to its bulk, massing and design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such it fails to comply with Policies DP2 and DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan (2017) which, amongst other matters, require good design that responds to and retains local character, with consideration given to how the height, mass, scale and siting of proposals relate to neighbouring buildings and the wider locality.
7. The appellant has referred to extensions and alterations to properties in the area. These schemes highlight the significant harm to the appearance of the area that can result from dormer additions on, and first floor extensions to, bungalows. In any case, each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed additions and alterations would result in a dwelling with 2 bedrooms on the upper level, a large ground floor living/kitchen area and a bedroom at the front at ground floor level. All of these main rooms would benefit from good levels of natural light and outlook. The proposal would also include a small bedroom on the ground floor with a side-facing window. Natural light to, and outlook from, this room would be limited due to the close vicinity of No.45, which is on higher ground.
9. However, as this room would form a fourth bedroom in a dwelling that in all other respects would provide good quality residential accommodation, I am satisfied that the proposal as a whole would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. For these reasons the proposal accords with the aforementioned policies in so far as they relate to this matter.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that the proposal would make the property into a family dwelling and would have economic benefits during the construction period. In addition, it would not result in unacceptable harm in respect of the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. I am also aware that there has been some local support for the proposal. However, these matters do not outweigh the clear harm identified in respect of the first main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole INSPECTOR