
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2017

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/16/3165405

13 Lynors Avenue, Strood, Rochester ME2 3NQ

- 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 Christine Brown against the decision of Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/16/4106, dated 4 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey wrap around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey wrap around extension at 13 Lynors Avenue, Strood, Rochester, ME2 3NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MC/16/4106, dated 4 October 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: 3 plans all numbered Drawing 01 Revision A dated 3 October 2016, but showing details of block plan, existing plans and elevations and proposed plans and elevations respectively.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. No 13 Lynors Avenue comprises a detached bungalow located on the western side of the road. It has an attached flat roofed garage on its northern side, whilst on its southern side there is a flat roofed outbuilding with a gate in between leading to the rear garden. At the rear there is a single storey flat roofed extension. The area is wholly residential and comprises a mixture of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey detached houses with a range of architectural styles and a variety of materials.

4. From correspondence submitted with the appeal papers it appears the Council would have been satisfied with the proposal, informally at least, had the roof height of the extension been reduced to the same eaves level of the existing roof. However, the appellant advised that would not be possible because it would mean the ceiling would be lower than that of the existing dwelling. In that respect, I noted from my site visit that the roof of the existing rear extension projects slightly above the eaves of the main roof, presumably for the same reason.
5. From the road frontage, there is already a flat roofed building on either side of the main bungalow. The only visible difference therefore would be an increase in the height of the roof to one side above the existing eaves level. I agree that is not ideal from a design point of view, but with a slight set back on the front elevation and with the main hipped roof continuing to be prominent, the extensions would still appear subservient to the original building. The full 'wrap around' extent of the side and rear extension would not be apparent because of the proximity of the detached two storey house immediately to the south and the enclosed nature of the rear garden. Lynors Avenue itself is relatively narrow and because of the well established building line, the extension would not be prominent from either direction and only really apparent when viewing it opposite the property.
6. As noted above, there are a variety of architectural styles along the road including a number of other bungalows with flat roofed attached garages or extensions, albeit they do not extend above the eaves. In overall terms therefore the proposed extension would not be out of place in the street scene.
7. Whilst I understand the Council's concerns from a design point of view, I do not consider it is critical in this instance to require the height of the roof to be the same level as the existing eaves for the reasons set out above. Similarly, although the development would not be to a high quality design in accordance with guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the same reasons with regard to the character of the existing building and surrounding area mitigate in favour of the proposal.
8. In view of the above, I find that the character and appearance of the host property and area would not be harmed. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy BNE1 of the Council's Local Plan 2003 in that it would be appropriate in relation to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for matching materials, are necessary in the interests of certainty and visual amenity.
10. Accordingly the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR