



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by **T Wood BA(HONS) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/D/25/3367203

1 Cemetery Cottages, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge, Kent, CT18 7AG

- 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 Peter Rodwell against the decision of Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0200/FH.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, rear dormer, double garage with office above and associated parking and landscaping, solar panels to main property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council's reason for refusal only raises an objection to the proposed rear dormer window. As no other matters have been raised, I shall confine my consideration of the appeal to the effects of the proposed dormer on the dwelling and surrounding area, including the Kent Downs National Landscape.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this semi-detached bungalow which has rooms within the existing pitched roof. The property is located at the end of a private track which serves the attached neighbouring property. The pair of properties is set behind houses on Benson Lane and their front elevations are mainly hidden from public view. The side and rear elevations of the property are highly visible from Aerodrome Road and the publicly accessible land, including the grounds of the cemetery to the south and east.
4. The properties are set just outside the settlement boundary of the town, within land classified as open countryside. The site is also within the Kent Downs National Landscape (KDNL) formerly known as the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
5. The proposed rear dormer window would be virtually as wide as the existing property and would take up almost the entirety of the rear roof slope of the property. It would leave very little of the original roof slope around its edges. I consider that it would appear heavy and cumbersome in relation to the rest of this property. It would make the property appear awkward and top-heavy. In my view, it represents poor design.
6. I accept that some views of the proposed dormer would be filtered or partly obscured by trees or (if the proposal were to go ahead) the proposed garage. However, the land to the side and rear of the property is publicly accessible and I

consider that the dormer would be visible from significant parts of this area, from where it would have an unacceptable effect on the character of this property and the area generally. Furthermore, I consider that, for the same reasons, it would have an unacceptable effect on the KDNL.

7. Within the appeal documents, the appellant has included a possible alternative design for the rear dormer, which shows pitched roofs over. This is represented by a 3D graphic and I have not been supplied with scaled drawings which accurately show this. Additionally, this was not considered by the Council as part of the planning application. Furthermore, the 'Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England' advises that if an appeal is made the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that what is considered by an Inspector should be the same as has been considered by the Local Planning Authority and been the subject of public consultation. Consequently, and in the absence of scaled drawings, I shall determine the appeal on the basis of the drawings considered by the Council.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that he considers that the Council has failed to engage with him prior to the determination of the planning application and since its refusal. The submitted documents indicate that he received no response from the Council when he sought advice on a possible solution for his proposal. Regrettable as this may be, it is not a matter that affects the planning merits of the case. For the reasons set out above, I am determining this case on the basis of the scheme as considered by the Council and its planning merits are not altered by these actions.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR