
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/D/22/3304563

27 South Street, Barming ME16 9EX

- 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 Julian Peppet against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application ref. 22/502139/FULL, dated 26 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new 'Mansard' roof construction with new bedroom and en-suite within new space over existing first floor and first floor existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to two-storey, terrace dwelling adjoined by other properties of differing size, form and detailing. It is located in a street scene that is predominantly residential in nature.
 4. I saw at my site visit that houses in the area have predominantly pitched roofs, and contain small dormer windows or skylights facing the public domain. Within this context, alterations to the roof of the appeal property in principle need not appear incongruous.
 5. However, the new mansard-style scheme would be a substantial and discordant feature when viewed against the traditional pitched roofs of the adjacent properties. Furthermore, the steeper pitch would protrude forward of the roof slope of 25 South Street. This would be prominent, particularly when approaching the locality from the north, and introduce an awkward, disjointed relationship that would not be cohesive with the existing dwelling and its neighbour, creating visual confusion and detracting from the appearance of the existing properties.
 6. I acknowledge that the locality comprises houses of varying scale and design. Moreover, I am aware that the development would not project over the original footprint of the building and would provide enlarged accommodation for the appellant and his family. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.
-

7. I also appreciate that there are other mansard roof forms in the region; however the example given in the Reginald Road photo in the grounds of appeal shows a detached building, and as such this is not comparable to the appeal scheme before me.
8. I consider that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies SP17, DM30 and DM32 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan October 2017 and the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2009), which collectively seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR