



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/24/3356624

63 Northwood Road, Ramsgate, Kent CT12 6RS

- 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 Paul Young and Mrs Annita Donaldson-Young against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref is FH/TH/24/0968.
 - The development proposed is part demolition of existing rear extension. Demolition of garage. Erection of single storey side extension to include double garage and rear extension and extension of existing loft above proposed side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, I have amended the development description to include reference to the side extension.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring dwellings nos 61 and 63A Northwood Road, with particular regard to privacy; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling with front and rear gardens, and a detached single garage. It shares a boundary with no 61, and a strip of undeveloped land provides separation from the plot boundary of no 63A.
5. The side elevations of the extended dwelling would be close to the plot boundaries. The proposed single storey rear extension would span the combined width of the existing dwelling and proposed side extension. The proposed balcony would utilise the full width of the single storey rear extension.
6. Due to its height and proximity to the shared boundary, the proposed balcony would permit views into the rear garden of no 61. The land between the appeal site and no 63A would not provide an adequate visual buffer, since there would be a direct line of sight from the balcony to no 63A's rear garden.

7. A degree of overlooking of gardens is normal in residential areas. However, the proposal would create significant opportunities for overlooking from the proposed balcony. This would include overlooking of areas where there would normally be an expectation of privacy, such as areas close to the building's rear elevation.
8. Overlooking from the proposed balcony would be harmful to the privacy of users of the neighbouring rear gardens. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupants of nos 61 and 63A Northwood Road.
9. The proposal would conflict with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan (TLP) which requires new development be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and not lead to unacceptable living conditions through overlooking.
10. In this regard, the proposal would not satisfy paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires proposals promote a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal property is a modern, chalet-style dwelling with a tall, pitched gable roof, single-storey rear projection, and a flat roof porch projecting from the front. The prominent flat roof dormers clearly identify the dwelling as providing living accommodation within the roof space.
12. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in use. The appeal property occupies a wide plot with a large driveway and modest garage to the side. The layout of the plot contributes to the spacious and suburban character of the area.
13. Northwood Road has footways, streetlighting, and bus stops. At time of my site visit, traffic and pedestrians were frequently passing the site. Whilst set back from the street by its landscaped front garden, the appeal property is visually prominent in the street scene.
14. The appeal property is situated between no 63A, a chalet-style dwelling, and no 61, a modest bungalow. Opposite the site and beyond no 63A are pairs of semi-detached bungalows. Therefore, the site's immediate context comprises 1.5 storey dwellings and bungalows of differing scale and form.
15. However, a short distance in either direction along Northwood Road, house types are mainly detached and semi-detached two-storey dwellings. A two-storey terrace row behind the site at Mentmore Road is visible through the gap between the appeal property and no 63A. A social club with a large footprint and three-storey frontage is sited prominently nearby at the junction of Northwood Road and Hopes Lane. The visual dominance of these larger buildings is formative of the character of the surrounding area. The appeal property is therefore within a street scene that comprises a mix of buildings which vary in height, scale, form, and design.
16. The proposed porch would be at the front elevation and visible from the street. There would be glimpsed views of the rear extension, balcony, and rear dormer on the approach from Northwood Road. The Council has identified no harms to character arising from these features. Therefore, I have focused my reasoning on the effects of the side extension and front dormer.
17. The proposed side extension would comprise a double garage with living accommodation above. It would replace the existing detached garage and would

match the existing roof ridge height. The front elevation would be aligned with the front of the dwelling. The proposed side extension would therefore reflect the height and design of the existing dwelling.

18. The front dormer would extend across the front roof plane. Its flat roof and proximity to the ridge and eaves would reflect the form, placement, and design of the existing dormer. Therefore, the proposed front dormer would not appear bulky or dominant but would reflect the form and arrangement of existing roof features.
19. The proposed extension's frontage would be constructed with facing brickwork, roof tiles, and uPVC windows and doors. The front dormer would be clad with tiles. The proposed external materials would therefore be in keeping with the design of the existing dwelling.
20. The end elevation of the proposed side extension would be close to the side boundary. The proposal would therefore significantly increase the scale and form of the appeal property, resulting in it having a wide frontage.
21. However, the proposed development would be viewed within the context of gradually increasing building heights and scales along this eastern side of Northwood Road and would be similar in scale and form to nearby buildings such as no 36 on the opposite side of the street.
22. The strip of land between the appeal site and no 63A would ensure a substantial gap is retained between these dwellings. The gap would permit views of land and the skyline between the buildings, and the spacious character of the area would not be diminished.
23. Therefore, whilst the proposal would substantially increase the scale and form of the appeal property, this would be accommodated successfully within the street scene without harm to the area's character. The proposed development would not appear obtrusive or incongruous within the context of the mix of buildings within the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
24. The proposal would comply with TLP Policy QD02 which requires new development promote or reinforce the local character of the area, relate to the surrounding development, form and layout, be well designed, and pay particular attention to context and identity of its location, scale, massing, rhythm, density, layout and use of materials appropriate to the locality.
25. In addition, the proposal would satisfy the requirement of paragraph 135 of the Framework for development to be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

26. The proposed development would increase the size of living accommodation available to the appellant and their family. This private benefit does not outweigh the harm to living conditions of neighbouring occupants identified above.

Conclusion

27. As set out above, I am satisfied the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. However, the proposal would harm the living conditions of occupants of nos 61 and 63A Northwood Road for the reasons identified.
28. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR