
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/24/3341911

5 Stigand Lane, Greenhithe, Kent DA9 9XX

- 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 Ryan Marshall against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application reference is DA/23/01292/FUL.
 - The proposed development is for a loft conversion incorporating rear dormer and two roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the planning application the Council have adopted The Dartford Plan April 2024 (DP), whose policies supersede the Dartford Development Policies Plan 2017 referenced within the Decision Notice. I have therefore determined the appeal with the newly adopted policies in mind.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace property in a modern residential neighbourhood. The rear elevation of the unit faces out onto a large communal parking area.
4. The proposed dormer window would be relatively large, with a flat roof and Juliet balcony. As there are no other dormer elements evident from the communal parking area, in my view care needs to be taken introducing such features into this part of the estate.
5. With this in mind, I consider that the overall size and centralised positioning of the scheme within the roof slope would appear dominant and be harmful to the character of the dwelling and locality. In particular, the misalignment of the fenestration with the openings below, and the large expanse of glazing at roof level that would be significantly larger than elsewhere on the property, would result in a discordant and top-heavy appearance.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to a scheme approved by the Council at 54 Havelock Drive, under reference DA/22/01411/FUL. However, this includes smaller dormer windows that better align with the openings and projecting front bay features below; it is not therefore comparable to the appeal scheme before me.
7. I appreciate that the appeal site is neither located within a Conservation Area nor is it a listed building or heritage asset, and the proposal would be constructed using complementary materials. It would also allow the property to be extended in order to increase residential living space for the occupants without compromising on the amenity space of the dwelling or impacting negatively upon the amenity of neighbouring resident. Nevertheless, these factors would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. I also acknowledge that the rear dormer would not be seen by the wider public, still this does not obviate the obligation to ensure that it would be well-designed and is not so large that it dominates the building.
9. The proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would run contrary to Policies M1 and M10 of the DP, which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

10. In respect of the above and all other issues, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR