



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/23/3329217

Delview, 3 Church Path, Greenhithe DA9 9RJ

- 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 Michelle Jenkins against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/23/00622/FUL, dated 15 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, new mansard roof, with 3no front mansard windows, 3no rear mansard windows, façade/internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Church Path is a residential street in which the modestly scaled bungalows generally host pitched roofs of varying design forms. Although some roofs have had roof extensions added these are subservient and the original pitched roofs are still clearly discernible. Delview forms part of this Church Path street scene.
5. The proposal would change the existing pitched roof to one of a mansard style roof with windows within both the front and rear mansard. The mansard roof would be a large and bulky addition to the top of the dwelling. It would significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling and introduce a new roof form within this street scene. The appearance of the mansard style roof, given its

overall large size, would have a visually detrimental impact upon this small bungalow and would create a roof form substantially out of keeping within the existing street scene. It would detract from the pleasing character and appearance of the host property and that of the properties along Church Path, along with the contribution the existing dwelling makes to the character and appearance of this street scene.

6. Aerial photographs submitted in support of the appeal highlight other roof forms in the area, however they do not draw attention to any mansard style roofs within the vicinity of the appeal site. The property sits adjacent No.16 Branton Road that is situated at a higher ground development. That property has been extended and altered to include accommodation within an enlarged second storey. The photographs also show that there are differing roof profiles in the wider locality.
7. The roof would be visible from Branton Road where there is more variety to the roof forms. Whilst this may be so, Delview forms part of the Church Path street scene and I have found the proposal to be visually harmful within the context of this street scene. I acknowledge that there are three storey flatted developments at either end of Church Path and within neighbouring Winston Close. However, those developments are some distance from the site and do not fall within the immediate context of this row of bungalows of which the appeal property forms a part. These matters hold little weight in support of the proposal.
8. The site does not fall within a Conservation Area and there are no Listed buildings nearby. No third parties have commented and no objection was received to the planning application from Stone Parish Council. The Council have not raised a concern in regard of impact upon the living condition of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would make more efficient use of the existing building without extending its footprint. Whilst these are merits of the proposed development, they do not overcome my above concerns or justify the proposed development.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies DP2 and DP7 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan 2017 and Policies M1 and M11 of the emerging Dartford Local Plan. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of a high quality design that responds to, reinforces and enhances the positive aspects of a locality.
10. I acknowledge that the National Design Guide comments that for a development to be deemed to be well-designed it does not need to copy its surroundings in every way. However, this does not make all development acceptable just because it is different and where it is found would conflict with development plan policy.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR