
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2017

by Clive Tokley MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/17/3174592

15 Chalky Bank, Gravesend, DA11 7NZ.

- 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 Paul Bennett against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20170084 dated 31 January 2017 was refused by notice dated 29 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension to form extended bedroom and en-suite shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11 Chalky Bank as regards outlook.

Reasons

3. Chalky Bank is a residential road built on land which rises from north to south. The limited number of house types and range of materials are indicators that the houses were built as a single development. A number of the original houses have been extended and remodelled including the addition of modern cladding. Nevertheless the original design concept remains in evidence, most notably on the east side of the street where there are two groups of differently-designed detached houses. In each of these houses the gabled roof over the main two-storey part of the houses extends down over the single garage at the side of the house terminating in low eaves (described by the Council as a catslide roof).
 4. In the northern-most of these groups (Nos 3, 5 and 7) the garages project forward of the main wall of the houses and these dwellings appear to be largely unchanged at the front. The appeal property lies in the middle of the second group (Nos 11, 15 and 17) which is laid out in a more pronounced echelon and where the garages are alongside the houses. The catslide roofs enable views from the road through to the trees at the rear of the houses. These three houses have differently-designed windows and single-storey front extensions; however the rhythm and spacing of their distinctive roof line is retained. Houses
-

of a similar design occupy plots on the opposite side of Chalky Bank one of which (No 4) has been extended in similar manner to that proposed at No 15. However those houses do not share the layout of the group containing No 15.

5. The proposed hipped roof addition would contrast with the design of the original houses and its bulk and design would disrupt the rhythm of the three houses in the group. The extension would reduce the space between No 11 and No 15 at roof and first floor level thereby diminishing the views through to the trees at the rear. The staggered layout would result in the proposal being screened to some extent when approaching up the hill; however in the context of the group of three houses I consider that the proposal would detract from the distinctive character of this part of Chalky Bank and would conflict with Policy CS19 (*Development and Design Principles*) of the *Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy* (the CS) 2014.

Living conditions

6. The front wall of no 15 aligns within a few centimetres of the main rear wall of No 11 which lies on slightly lower land to the north. As a result almost the full length of the extension would project beyond the back wall of No 11. That dwelling has a small conservatory close to the boundary beyond which (to the north) is a masonry extension. The proposed first floor extension would not project as far back as the existing single storey additional at No 15; however I consider that its two storey bulk close to the boundary with No 11 would result in it being an unacceptably over dominant structure when seen from the rear of No 11 including the paved area around the conservatory and rear extension.
7. The occupier of No 11 has raised no objection to the proposal but taking an objective view I consider that it would be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11 as regards outlook and for this reason it would conflict with CS Policy CS19.

Other matters

8. I have noted the appellant's reasons for seeking to provide additional living space upstairs; however personal circumstances will seldom outweigh other planning considerations and whilst I have sympathy with the need to provide more accessible facilities this is not sufficient reason to overcome my concerns about the proposal.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11 Chalky Bank as regards outlook. The proposal would conflict with CS Policy CS19 and with one of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Taking account of all matters I have concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

Clive Tokley

INSPECTOR