

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2017

**by Clive Tokley MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10 October 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/17/3179716**  
**46 Wyles Road, Chatham, ME4 6LD.**

- 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 M Dowle against the decision of Medway Council.
  - The application Ref MC/17/0649, dated 17 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as a first floor rear extension and roof alteration to form new bedroom including replacement flat roof to pitched and raising of existing property ridge.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension and roof alteration to form new bedroom including replacement flat roof to pitched and raising of existing property ridge at 46 Wyles Road, Chatham, ME4 6LD. The permission is in accordance with the terms of the application Ref MC/17/0649 dated 17 February 2017 subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) 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.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings numbered 17.02.03E, 17.02.03 Revision B and the Block Plan received by the Council on 23 February 2017.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. No 46 is on the north side of Wyles Road and when approached from the east lies on a fairly steep upward slope. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house attached to No 48. The front of the house is of a similar appearance to No 48 but in order to accommodate the rising land No 48 is built at a higher level. This is evident at roof level by a break in the roof plane and the higher eaves and ridge line of No 48. The most noticeable feature of the roof is a substantial chimney at ridge level shared by both houses.

4. The original house has a pitched roof with a side gable. To the rear of this is a two-storey flat-roofed projection. The neighbouring dwelling to the east is a bungalow and the combination of the lower height and level of that dwelling results in the flank wall of No 46 being clearly in view when approaching up the hill. The proposal would increase the span of the main pitched roof resulting in an increase in ridge height; however the existing front roof plane would be retained. This would result in a common ridge height within the semi-detached pair which would be at odds with the difference in level of the eaves; however this anomaly would be disguised by the presence of the chimney and as a result the overall appearance and balance of the pair would not be harmed.
5. The proposal would increase the height and depth of the gable end; however I consider that the resultant roof would not be disproportionate to the dwelling. Larger-span gables can be seen on nearby houses (No 50 for example) and the scale of the proposed gable would not appear out of place in this location. The "table top" roof would add significant bulk to the rear of the house; however in the context of the sizeable projections at the rear of neighbouring houses it would not detract from the character of the area.
6. When seen from the street the table top roof would read as a steeply-pitched hipped-roof rear projection. The proposed additions at first floor and roof level would be seen from some distance along Wyles Road; however taking account of the range of gables and hipped roofs in the area I consider that the proposal would not unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the house or the street scene. The proposal would not conflict with Policy BNE1 of the *Medway Local Plan 2003* (LP) which indicates that development should be appropriate in relation to the character, appearance and functioning of the built environment.

## **Conclusion**

7. Taking account of all matters I have concluded that the proposal would not unacceptably detract from the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area and that the appeal should succeed. I have imposed the normal conditions controlling implementation and identifying the approved drawings. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance I have imposed a condition requiring that external materials should match those of the house.

*Clive Tokley*

INSPECTOR