



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/24/3340863

83 Sydenham Street, Whitstable, Kent CT5 1HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr W Mack against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref is CA/24/00004.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer and alterations to façade door and windows and roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Whitstable Town Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. CA designations recognise architectural characteristics or historic values of an area that make such areas special and worthy of CA status. These provide the CA with a distinctive quality to the character and appearance of the area and gives this area historical and architectural significance. Given the appeal property is within the CA, it adds to the special quality and distinctiveness of the CA and contributes to the CA's significance.
4. The proposed roof dormer would be a large feature within the rear roof slope. Its flat roof design would not represent a development of high quality design. The roof dormer would be a dominant and uncharacteristic development to the host dwelling and would be out of keeping within the context of this street. Consequently, the rear dormer would be visually harmful to both the host dwelling and to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The visual harm arising from the proposed development would be clearly visible in public views from Stream Walk and in the outlook of existing neighbouring residents.
5. It is contended that other similar roof dormers have been granted planning permission by the local planning authority within Sydenham Street. Planning permissions at Nos 17, 26, 40 and 56 have been cited. However, these are further along Sydenham Street beyond St Peter's Road and do not relate to the

terrace in which the appeal property is situated. The proposal would undermine the purposes of the CA designation. The existence of other roof dormers in the wider area does not overcome the harm I have identified resulting from the proposed development or provide justification for other visually harmful development within the CA.

6. Given the size and scale of the proposal in the CA, I consider there would be less than substantial harm to the character or appearance of the CA. In accordance with paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework), I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would provide additional living space within the property. The appellant advises that the existing internal space is dated and is in need of refurbishment to bring the property up to present day living standards. However, these factors would be limited to providing a personal benefit for the appellant. There would be no clear benefit to the public that would sufficiently outweigh the harm identified. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would fail to accord with national policy.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Whitstable Town CA. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies DBE3, DBE6, HE1 and HE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017 and the provision of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design and to protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment and the contribution made to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

Conclusion

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

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR