



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2025

by **Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/24/3355356

82 Salisbury Avenue, Broadstairs, CT10 2DU

- 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 Mark Jones against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref is FH/24/1040.
 - The development proposed is for a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to roof from hip to gable together with erection of rear dormer to facilitate loft conversion and 4No. rooflights to front elevation at 82 Salisbury Avenue, Broadstairs, CT10 2DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref FH/24/1040, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: RJ/1 and SR/2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Preliminary matters

2. As the appellants description for the proposal does not refer to the proposed rooflights on the front roof-slope of the dwelling, in this decision I use the description set out in the council's decision notice which is more detailed.
3. In their decision notice the council refers to paragraph 119 of the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework. This has since been revised and the current National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. In the current Framework paragraph 119 of the 2021 publication has been renumbered 124, although its content remains unchanged. I confirm that in this decision I refer to the 2024 Framework.
4. At the time of the appeal site visit a hip to gable extension and rear dormer had been constructed at the rear of the appeal property. This dormer extension is not exactly the same as the appeal proposal. Accordingly, for the avoidance of any doubt I confirm that this decision is based upon the appeal scheme and not the extension that has already been constructed.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 80 Salisbury Avenue, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

6. This part of Salisbury Avenue is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings from a limited range of designs. The semi-detached dwellings are uniformly designed and the palette of external materials used is similarly uniform. Within the rear garden environment the character is more diverse due to a combination of rear extensions, outbuildings and varied garden sizes. This includes a variety of single and two storey flat roofed extensions.
7. The appeal dwelling comprises one of a pair of uniformly designed semi-detached bungalows with front projecting wings and fully hipped roofs. To the rear of the appeal dwelling is a flat roofed single storey extension which is recessed where it adjoins the boundary with No.80. As stated in paragraph 4 above a rear hip to gable and rear dormer extension has already been constructed.
8. To the rear of No.80 an "L" shaped single storey extension is currently being constructed. The extension is shallow where it abuts the appeal site and is both a deeper and wider on the opposite side of the dwelling. There are full height openings in the rear elevation of the larger element of the extension and large windows in the side of the larger element and rear of smaller element.
9. The dwelling at 84 Salisbury Avenue (No.84), comprises a two storey house with a single story rear extension sited adjacent to the appeal site. This dwelling projects further forward than the appeal dwelling and as a consequence, is set back from the front of the single storey extension to the rear of the appeal site.
10. Although the proposed hip to gable extension would weaken the symmetry of the pair of bungalows, as stated by the council the proposed hip to gable extension falls within the current permitted development tolerances. Also, there is a variety of building forms along Salisbury Road and this includes gable roofs.
11. There are numerous dormer extensions of various sizes in the locality and in this instance the proposed dormer would be set in from the sides and the ridge line of the host dwelling. Whilst it would be uncharacteristically deep it would be at first floor level and the appeal dwelling is located alongside a two storey dwelling. As such it would not look out of place alongside No.78. Also, due to its modest height, use of matching tiles on its walls and relationship with the rear extensions both at the appeal property and No.78, the proposed dormer would blend in with the rear garden environment. On the front roof-slope the proposed roof lights would be modest in form and appearance and would sit comfortably within the proposed roof-slope.
12. Amongst other things policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan (LP), seeks to ensure that proposals are compatible with neighbouring buildings. They should not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to loss of privacy, overshadowing or sense of enclosure. Paragraph 124 of the Framework promotes the effective use of land whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.
13. The proposed dormer extension would project out to the front wall of the recessed section of the existing rear extension. Whilst it would have a deep flat roof, it would be set a reasonable distance below the ridge line of the dwelling and as stated above the walls of the dormer would be clad in plain tiles to match the existing roof. In addition, the dormer extension would reduce the depth of the existing flat roof over the ground floor extension.

14. The proposed dormer extension would project just beyond the adjacent recessed part of the extension being built at No.80. As a result, its impact on the outlook from the rear facing window of the immediately adjacent extension at No.80 would be minimal. It would also have minimal impact on the level of daylight and sunlight within the room served by this window. The extension would have no impact on the outlook from the fenestration in the rear elevation of the main part of the extension being built at No.80. It would also have no impact on the daylight and sunlight in the extension resulting from this fenestration.
15. The proposed dormer extension would be clearly visible and would have an enclosing impact in the outlook from the side facing window in the main part of the extension being built at No.80. However, its impact would be limited because the proposed dormer extension would be largely located to the side rather than directly opposite this window. , Further, the room the window serves benefits from the fenestration in the rear elevation of the main part of the extension at No.80, which provides an open aspect into the property's rear garden. Due to the westerly and southerly aspect of the windows at No.80, the rooms within the extension being built at No.80 would receive good levels of natural daylight and sunlight.
16. For these reasons the proposed dormer extension would be compatible with the dwelling at No.80 and would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property due to visual impact and associated daylight and sunlight.
17. With regard to the relationship between the proposal and the dwelling at No.84, the main impact of the proposal would result from the proposed hip to gable element. This is because it would be located opposite several side facing windows at No.84. However, as stated by the council, this element of the proposal falls within the current permitted development tolerances. The proposed rear dormer extension would be lower and set in from the gable end. Whilst it would be clearly visible from the adjacent rear windows and garden at No.84, the main outlook at the rear of No.84 would continue to be into its spacious rear garden. Due to the favourable southerly and westerly aspects of the rear garden the rear facing rooms they would continue to receive good levels of daylight and sunlight.
18. Finally, the council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching external materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions would both be necessary to ensure the proposal blends in with the host dwelling and the rear garden environment and in the interests of certainty.
19. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.80 due to visual impact. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with LP Policy QD03 and paragraph 124 of the Framework.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR