



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/24/3347243

Tylers Croft, Main Road, Longfield, Kent DA3 7AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Harjot Tutt against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00403/FUL.
 - The development proposed is raising height of roof to provide dormer window on one side of roof, side extension with rear dormer window to provide additional rooms in the roof space, external alteration of existing conservatory for conversion of habitable room and erection of a detached outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development as this more concisely describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a relatively modest dwelling with simple detailing. It is set within a large garden plot and positioned in a highly visible location, to the south side of Main Road and is surrounded by residential properties which vary in scale, period and design.
5. The appeal site lies within the Longfield Hill Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). The ASRC Appraisal (2000) describes the ASRC as the area covering the higher ground of the village, centred around the small green at the junction of Main Road with Nurstead Lane. It describes the housing stock as of varying age and style. Properties are detailed as of good quality forming a cohesive townscape and with appropriate qualities of massing and form.
6. The proposed development would introduce comparatively large additions relative to the original property, including to both the side elevation and roof. The overall bulk, projection and arrangement of the side extension, in particular, would disproportionately increase the size of the existing property, competing with the visual dominance of the main part of the building. It would lack any sense of subservience and appear highly incongruous in this prominent location. Taken

together, the proposed development would harm the appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

7. Overall, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to the relevant provisions of Policies M1 and M10 of the Dartford Local Plan (2024). These policies, in summary, seek to ensure high quality design in development.

Other Matters

8. My attention is drawn to several developments in the surrounding area, some of which are large. However, I have limited details of those, including their planning history, before me to draw any meaningful comparisons with the appeal scheme. In any case, each proposal must be considered on the basis of individual site circumstances. I have reasoned above why I have identified harm based on the proposals before me and my observations on site. Ultimately, the existence of those other properties and developments does not lead me to change my conclusion in respect of the appeal site.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR