



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2023

by J Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/W/23/3319871
39 Dartford Road, Dartford, Kent DA1 3EG

- 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 Dr B Khan of Dartford Road Dental Centre against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/22/01066/FUL, dated 27 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear dormer window and the installation of 2 no. rooflights to the front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a row of two-storey terraced buildings, within a short commercial parade fronting Dartford Road. Although the rear of properties include various structures and mechanical equipment, the rear roofslopes are more ordered and characterised by shared chimneys and parapet verges. These features are prevalent within the surrounding terraces, but particularly the row of buildings forming the site, which is visible from Wellington Road.
4. The proposal would introduce a large dormer to the rear and would include raising the height of the parapet verges to form the side walls of the dormer. The increased height of the parapet verges and partial removal of the chimney would disrupt the consistency that these features bring to the rear of the terrace. The resulting dormer would be a bulky addition to the host building and would erode the character of the rear roofslopes of the properties.
5. I note the presence of rear dormers in the locality, including at Wellington Road. However, these dormers are typically set in from the side of the properties, thereby retaining the parapet verges to either side. I also note that the buildings fronting Dartford Road have not been altered through the addition of rear dormers. Accordingly, I do not find that the presence of other dormers in the area outweighs or alters my findings above.

6. The proposal includes the insertion of two rooflights within the front roofslope. The Council does not raise concern with this element of the proposal, and I see no reason to disagree.
7. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore conflict with Policies DP2 and DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan 2017, which collectively requires development to respond to, reinforce and enhance positive aspects of the locality and the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide an office to assist in the management of the business, which provides an important healthcare service to the local community. However, the evidence before me has not adequately demonstrated that it is essential for such a dedicated space and that the current arrangement would lead the business to become unviable, or that the appeal proposal is the only means of providing the additional accommodation sought. On this basis, I consider that this would not outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. The material considerations in this case do not indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Pearce

INSPECTOR