



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2023

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/22/3309715

45 Pegwell Road, Ramsgate, Kent CT11 0NP

- 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 & Mrs N Mitchell against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application, FH/TH/22/0901, dated 28 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of 2No dormer windows to side elevations together with alterations to roof including insertion of window to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issue

2. The development was described as an attic extension on the application form. However, the description of development as it appears on the Council's decision notice more accurately reflects what is proposed and I have therefore adopted that description in this decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 45 Pegwell Road comprises a two storey detached house located on the northern side of the road, close to its junction with Abbey Grove. It has a low pitched roof with a gable fronting the road, as does its neighbour No 47.
5. The proposal involves the provision of bedroom accommodation in the roof area which would be achieved by raising the roof height with a steeper pitch and the insertion of two side dormer windows. The Council advises that the increase in ridge height would be 2.5metres.
6. The appellant points to the number of different building styles and roof forms within the immediate area and that a number of properties have been altered. However, although I acknowledge that the roof forms of some properties in the same row of houses to the west are different, in that the gable ends are at right angles to the road, the predominant character of nearby properties is of low pitched roofs and buildings of similar height as a result. That character

continues into Abbey Grove to the rear as well as to either side of the adjacent junction before the character changes with three storey flat developments to the east. The new development opposite at Courtstairs Manor is of a larger scale but set well back from the road behind a high wall and tree line and is therefore not seen in the same context.

7. Within the immediate area, the proposed roof alterations would be visually dominant in the street scene when compared to its neighbours. In that respect, and notwithstanding the road frontage trees, it would be apparent from both directions, but particularly so when travelling in a westerly direction where the property is particularly prominent because the road falls in that direction and because of the open nature of the junction with Abbey Grove. It would also be glimpsed from Abbey Grove itself where the increase in height would be apparent in the gap between No 47 Pegwell Road and No 3 Abbey Grove. The visual impact and change in roof form would be compounded by the increase in height where the roof would project significantly above its immediate neighbours. In my view, that impact would not be mitigated by cladding the dormers in the same colour as the main roof tile as the appellant suggests. I therefore agree with the Council that it would dominate the street scene and introduce an incongruous roof element out of keeping with the local character. There would be visual harm as a result.
8. Although I acknowledge the alterations to various properties and different building styles which the appellant has drawn my attention to, some of these are some distance away where the character is different and not as cohesive as the immediately surrounding area which is characterised by low pitched roofs and similar building heights as I have referred to.
9. I am sympathetic to the family needs of the appellant and the desire for additional accommodation, but personal needs change over time whereas permanent development does not. In this instance I give greater weight to the visual harm arising.
10. I also acknowledge that the proposal would afford an opportunity for greater insulation and to introduce solar panels. However, such improvements are not dependent upon the particular design proposed. Finally, whilst I acknowledge there were no local objections, that in itself does not make the development acceptable and does not cause me to change my findings for the reasons set out.
11. Having regard to the above, I find that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the immediate area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy QD02 of the Thanet District Local Plan 2020, in that it would not be compatible with neighbouring buildings and would not respect or enhance the character of the area.
12. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR