



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/24/3337240

3 Beaton Close, Greenhithe, Kent DA9 9QN

- 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 Mrs Charan Gill against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/22/01192/FUL, dated 12 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with a dormer to the rear and velux windows to the existing pitched roof at the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with a dormer to the rear and velux windows to the existing pitched roof at the front of the property at 3 Beaton Close, Greenhithe, Kent DA9 9QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DA/22/01192/FUL, dated 12 October 2022, subject to the following conditions: -
 - a) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: - 1310/01, 1310/02, 1310/03 and 1310/04.
 - c) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.
3. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.
4. A rear dormer roof extension was in place at the time of my visit. However, it is not clear whether that development accords fully with the proposal that is before me. I have therefore considered the appeal as a standalone

development considering the proposal on the basis of the plans that are before me.

Main Issues

5. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the setting of the Greenhithe Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

6. The site is in close proximity to Greenhithe CA. The boundary of the CA is to the north at the northern side of Eagles Road. The character context of the CA is influenced by the river frontage and the period architectural built form. The Council's Greenhithe CA Appraisal notes that the older functions of the village were centred around shipping. This gives the CA its distinctiveness. As such, these heritage and architectural characteristics give the CA its significance.
7. The appeal site forms part of a modern residential development. This contrasts with the pattern of development and architectural detail and form of the CA. The land between the appeal site and the core of the CA is separated by a mature woodland area. The character context of the host dwelling and its location within a residential housing estate is distinctively separate and independent from the townscape and setting of the CA.
8. The preamble to policy DP7 states that a loft conversion should "be designed such that dormers do not dominate the appearance of the existing dwelling and create a 'top-heavy' effect. ... If proposed at the property's rear they should be set into the roof plane, down from the ridgeline and in from the side cheeks."
9. The proposed rear dormer would satisfy the criteria as it would be set into the plane of the roof, down from the ridge and in from the side cheeks. It would also be set above the eaves of the roof plane.
10. The appeal site sits at a higher ground level to that of the nearby CA and has a prominent siting within the street scene. Whilst the proposal would be a large addition within the roof slope it would sit comfortably within the plane of the roof, in accordance with the preamble of Policy DP7. Although the roof extension would be a new addition to the dwelling it would not be of unsympathetic design or be an overly dominant or inappropriate addition to the dwelling.
11. The roof extension would be visible in views to and from the CA. However, it would not cause visual harm to the setting of the CA itself or be harmful in views to and from the CA. Consequently, the setting of the CA, its heritage value and quality, along with its significance, would remain preserved.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the setting of the Greenhithe CA. The proposal would, therefore, comply with Policies DP2, DP7 and DP13 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan 2017 and M1, M5 and M11 of the Emerging Dartford Local Plan. These policies seek, amongst other matters, new development, including residential extensions, to be of high quality design that responds to, reinforces and enhances the positive aspects of a locality and require development proposals that affect a CA to pay special

attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Conditions

13. I have considered the planning conditions put forward by the Council in light of paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the visual interests of the locality a matching materials condition is necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and subject to the conditions listed, this appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR