
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/D/25/3368447

31 Coniston Drive, Aylesham, Kent CT3 3HZ

- 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 Mrs Adriana Negoita against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00309.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a rear single storey extension, insertion of ground floor window to side elevation, render to all elevations, rear dormer window and roof light to front to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling with off-street parking on a driveway to the side. It is located in a street scene of other domestic properties of broadly similar scale and design.
4. The development would be evident from the public domain along Ullswater Gardens and the rear amenity spaces of other properties in the vicinity. The plans show that the mass and bulk of the dormer would entirely fill the rear roofslope of the house, with the flat roof continuing the ridge line and no gaps or spacing above the eaves or to either flank wall.
5. Given its size and relationship with the host building, the addition lacks any sense of subservience. The imposing appearance of the extension results in dominant and boxy roof form, which is in contrast to the existing dwelling, and competes with its general scale. This would be exacerbated by the use of cladding to the external surfaces, which would contrast with those used elsewhere on no.31. Overall, the development represents an obtrusive addition to the detriment of the character of the residence and the locality.
6. At my visit I was able to observe the rear dormer that has been constructed at 9 Ullswater Gardens, as highlighted by the appellant. This feature is considerably smaller than the scheme before me, with roof tiles evident above the eaves and to either side, and is not therefore directly comparable.

7. I appreciate that there would be no detriment upon the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties; the scheme would provide and increase in space and a better internal environment for the appellant and her family; the front elevation, use of external insulation and placement of refuse bins will remain tidy and coherent; there are no concerns from the Council in respect of the ground floor rear extension; and no objections have been received from third parties. However, these matters do not counterbalance the harm I have identified above.
8. Whilst I can understand the applicant's perceived frustration with the outcome of the application, it is not my role to offer advice as to how to proceed henceforth.
9. I therefore conclude that the scheme would be injurious to the character and appearance of the dwelling and locality. It would fail Policies PM1 and H6 of the Dover District Local Plan October 2024, which require new development to be designed to a high quality and respect to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is situated. It would also be inconsistent with the Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other factors, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR