
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2017

by Alex Hutson MATP CMLI MArborA

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

Decision date: 1 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/17/3172709

22 Rembrandt Drive, Northfleet, Gravesend DA11 8NQ

- 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 K Bowles against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20170062, dated 24 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a new front porch and erection of a single storey side and front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's decision notice and from the appellant's appeal form as this provides a more accurate and concise description than that provided on the original application form.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located within a wider residential area. It shares a strong symmetrical relationship with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, 24 Rembrandt Drive. Dwellings along Rembrandt Drive are predominantly semi-detached or terraced properties. Any front extensions associated with them tend to be limited to porches and any built form to the sides is generally modest in scale and set back from front elevations.
5. The proposal would erect a front porch. It would also erect an adjoining single storey front and side extension to provide additional living space within the appeal property.
6. The porch would largely reflect the appearance of other porches along Rembrandt Drive. Given the high frequency of these features, this element of the proposal would not appear wholly out of context. However, the front and side extension, on the basis that it would step forward of the main elevation of

the appeal property and would be of a substantial width, would appear at considerable odds with the prevailing pattern of development along Rembrandt Drive. It would also erode the strong symmetrical relationship between the appeal property and No 24 to an unacceptable degree. Thus, it would represent an overly dominant and incongruous form of development. This would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and area.

7. This would be contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (Core Strategy), which requires, amongst other things, development to be visually attractive, to be locally distinctive, to conserve and enhance the character of the built environment and to integrate well with the surrounding local area. This policy is consistent with the broad aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek planning to secure high quality design and to take account of the different roles and character of different areas.

Other matters

8. The appellant makes reference to a number of examples of other properties which have been extended. However, none of these are located along Rembrandt Drive. As such, they do not share the same context as the appeal property. In addition, the Council notes that there is either no planning history for some of these and others were consented prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy and were therefore considered under a now outdated planning policy context. As such, they do not justify a planning permission in this instance. Moreover, each case must be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR