
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W/17/3168448

67-77 High Street, Northfleet, Gravesham, Kent DA11 9HJ

- 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 Praela of J B Property against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20160448, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension, alterations & loft conversion within new mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the south side of High Street where there is a mixture of residential and commercial properties. To the west of the site there is a tyre garage and a hand car wash with an open forecourt which allows clear views of the side of the appeal site. The appeal building itself is one half of a semi-detached building with gable walls to each side. The site has a commercial use at ground floor level with residential accommodation above. The other half of the semi-detached property also has a commercial use at ground floor but has been extended at the rear which includes a three storey flat roof projection. Opposite the site is 'Portlands' (40 High Street) which is a grade II Listed Building.
4. The proposed mansard roof would cut across the existing gable wall to the appeal building in a highly undesirable fashion to the detriment of the overall appearance of the host building. Given the open nature of the forecourt to the tyre garage and car wash businesses, this would also be highly visible in the streetscene.
5. Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) (CS) requires new development to be visually attractive, locally distinctive, and make a positive contribution to the streetscene. The proposed development clearly fails to achieve these objectives resulting in a harmful effect to the character and appearance of the area.

6. I have also had regard to the examples of other mansard roofs and dormer windows provided to me. However, none of these examples are directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Moreover, each application must be determined on its individual merits.
7. Turning to the effect of the development on Portlands, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of this building.
8. Portlands is located on the opposite side of High Street to the appeal site and has an imposing street presence, particularly given its roof form and parapet walls. Given the location of the proposed development, together with its overall scale, I consider that it would not have any adverse impact on the setting of Portlands. Therefore, I find that the proposal would accord with the conservation aims of the Framework and Policies CS19 (insofar as it relates to the significance of heritage assets) and CS20 of the CS and Policy TC2 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (saved and deleted policies version 2014) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development does not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings. However, that does not outweigh the harm I have already found.
9. For the above reasons the proposed development would harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy CS19 of the CS which amongst other matters seeks to ensure that new development is visually attractive and would conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment. It would also conflict with the design aims of the Framework.

Other matters

10. Comment has been made in relation to the way the application was determined by the Council, and the nature of the advice given by the Conservation Officer. However, these are matters away from the planning merits of the case and I accordingly give them very little weight.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR