



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2015

by **Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13/05/2015

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/15/3004711**

**44 Orchard View, Teynham, Sittingbourne, Kent ME9 9DL**

- 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 Mr J McCrea against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 14/504417/FULL, dated 30 September 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2014.
  - The development proposed is a roof extension to form bedroom with en-suite facilities.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is on a residential street which is on the edge of the urban area. The houses are terraced and semi-detached and sited informally. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached houses of traditional appearance with hipped roofs. The other houses on the western side of the street are for the most part terraced, those towards the northern end of the street having hipped gables.
4. The proposed rear dormer extension would occupy almost the full height of the rear roof slope and the full width of the property. It would for these reasons be disproportionate and dominant in relation to the roof as proposed to be extended and the property as a whole. The flat roof would not be in keeping with the design of the property and would add to the dominant effect. Given that other properties on the street are of similar appearance the dormer extension would be intrusive in the context of the adjacent and nearby dwellings.
5. The proposed dormer extension would not accord with the Swale Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Designing an Extension' which advises<sup>1</sup> that dormers should be in proportion with the roof and no deeper than half the depth of the roof slope.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 5.5

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/D/15/3004711

---

6. The neighbouring property is sited at an angle to the appeal property but this would not reduce the visibility of the proposed dormer extension from the street. Although its visibility in this respect would be limited it would also be visible across the open land to the rear including from houses on the other side of the field as well as from the rear of adjacent and nearby properties on Orchard View.
7. The appellant has referred to a proposal to allocate the land to the rear of the property in the emerging Local Plan for residential and light industrial development and that the latter would be to the rear of the appeal property. This is a draft proposal at this stage and can carry only limited weight but in any case does not alter my conclusions.
8. The Council has no objection to the gable extension which would incorporate a hip similar to others on the street. However for the reasons given the proposed dormer extension would be unacceptably intrusive. On this basis I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
9. Saved policies E1 and E19 of the Swale Borough Local Plan (LP) (2008) require the scale of proposals to be appropriate to the context. Saved policy E24 of the LP applies specifically to extensions and requires high quality design and similarly requires that scale and massing reflect the building or its surroundings. For the above reasons the proposal would not accord with those policies.
10. I have taken into account the appellant's need for extra family accommodation and all other matters raised, including existing dormers on properties to the rear, the lack of through traffic and the support for the proposal from interested parties. Those matters do not alter my conclusion.

#### **Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nick Palmer*

INSPECTOR