

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November, 2016

by C. Jack, BSc (Hons) MA MA(TP) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th December, 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/16/3158364

4 Burma Way, Wayfield, Chatham, ME5 0JJ

- 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. Ross McColl against the decision of The Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/16/1563, dated 7 April, 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 June, 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 4 Burma Way, Wayfield, Chatham, ME5 0JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MC/16/1563, dated 7 April, 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 101; 102; 103; EX103A; EX104; EX105; EX106; EX107; EX108; EX109; PR110A; PR111A; PR112A; PR113A; PR114A; and PR115A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council accepted revised plans during consideration of the application, and subsequently determined it on that basis. I have also determined the appeal on the basis of the revised plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 4 Burma Way is a semi-detached house situated in an area predominantly characterised by two-storey houses of various types. No 4 is set slightly above the road, which drops down to the nearby junction with Wayfield Road. The site is clearly visible in the street scene, including from Wayfield Road. The house has an existing two-storey front projection with a hipped roof, which is symmetrical with that at the attached property.
-

5. It is proposed to erect a two-storey side extension, which would widen the house by approximately 2.6 m. It would be approximately 1 m deeper than the existing house, having an additional projection to the rear. A gap of approximately 0.9 m would be retained between the flank elevation and the boundary with 2 Burma Way, which is set at an angle to the appeal site, facing towards Wayfield Road.
6. The proposed extension would be flush with the front elevation of the existing forward projection, widening that projection with additional, symmetrical windows being inserted. The roof profile would be altered to a flat-topped hip, which would result in the extension being marginally subservient to the ridge height of the main house. The extension would alter the symmetry of the front projection with that of the attached property. However this would not be significant given the reasonable separation between the forward projection and the generally varied character of houses in the area.
7. The extension would also be proportionate to, and integrate satisfactorily with, the host property and would appear as part of that property, particularly as the extension would be incorporated under a roof form shared with the existing front projection. Accordingly it would not read ostensibly as a separate dwelling in the street scene from Burma Way or from Wayfield Road.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with saved Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan 2003, which sets out general principles for built development, including being satisfactory in terms of scale, mass, proportion, details, materials, layout and siting; and respecting the scale, appearance and location of buildings, spaces and the visual amenity of the surrounding area. It would therefore also not conflict with Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy framework, which seeks good design as a key aspect of sustainable development.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the representations of the interested party, including that the extension would be very close to boundary with 2 Burma Way, possible damage to No 2 during demolition or construction, reduced sunlight to the garden of No 2, and that inadequate parking provision has been made for a 5 bedroom house. While the extension would lie within about 1 m of the common boundary, there is no significant evidence before me that the appeal proposal would be likely to result in such damage.
10. No 4 lies roughly to the east of No 2, and there is reasonable separation between the two properties, which are also somewhat offset from each other. While a degree of additional overshadowing of the garden of No 2 may result from the extension, this is unlikely to be significant such that it would amount to harm to the living conditions experienced there. No 4 has one off-street parking space and this would remain. I note that there is unrestricted on-street parking in the area and I agree with the Council that, while the development could lead to some additional on-street parking, this is unlikely to be of a magnitude that would result in undue parking pressure.
11. I also note the opinion expressed that an extension in the large rear garden of No 4 would have less impact on neighbours. However, I have no significant details of such an alternative scheme before me and I am nonetheless required

to consider the proposed development on its own merits. Accordingly, these various other matters raised do not, individually or cumulatively, attract sufficient weight to outweigh my findings above in respect of the main issue.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard three year time limit for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans, as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to external materials as this is necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR