



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2017

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/17/3180956
27 Salcote Road, Gravesend DA12 4RB

- 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 Kaur against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20170399, dated 13 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single and part two storey rear extension to form enlarged kitchen and breakfast room at ground floor level and enlarged prayer room at first floor level.
-

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 the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 25 Salcote Road and No 38 Cirrus Crescent in relation to outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The proposal is for a part single part two storey extension to the rear of No 27 Salcote Road, a semi-detached property on the corner of Cirrus Crescent in a well-established residential estate. The single storey element of the proposal was granted planning permission in March 2015 under reference 20150040 but this remains unimplemented. The current appeal therefore relates solely to the first floor element which would increase the size of an existing prayer room.
4. No 27 has been significantly extended to the side with successive two storey extensions built around 1987 and 2004. As a result the property is noticeably wider than its pair No 25 and there is also a single storey extension across much of the frontage. However, being located on an unusually large corner plot the property still retains a substantial side parking area and remains set well back from the footway on Cirrus Crescent.
5. The first floor rear extension would be clearly seen between the gable end of No 27 and No 38 Cirrus Crescent, the first semi-detached house around the corner. However, it would be set back from the gable end, behind the flank of the single storey element, and would not be unduly prominent in the street

scene. The Council argue that the height and bulk of the two storey element would have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling, but this is mainly derived from the view of the property frontage rather than its rear. The ridge of the extension would be lower than that of the main house ensuring its subservience in design terms. In relation to the street scene, the second storey element would be much less prominent than the full height two storey front extensions which project out from the front elevation of No 25 Salcote Road and No 36 Cirrus Crescent on either side.

6. The claim that there would only be a gap of 1.4 m between the first floor extension and No 38 is misleading as this relates to the single storey garage alongside the end wall. The gap between the extension and the gable end of No 38 would be much wider allowing a reasonable view between.
7. For these reasons the proposal would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and would comply with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (GLPCS). This requires new development to conserve the character of the local built environment and integrate well with its surroundings taking account of the design, layout, form, scale, height, materials and other features of adjoining buildings.

Living conditions

8. The rear extension would project towards the windowless side elevation of No 38 Cirrus Crescent and the single garage alongside. However, it would not extend beyond the rear elevation of No 38 thus avoiding any loss of light or impact on the outlook from the first floor rear facing windows of that property. In relation to No 25 Salcote Road the two storey element would be seen obliquely from the rear facing first floor windows but given the setback the effect on their outlook and daylight would be minimal.
9. However, the first floor extension would have a south facing window directly overlooking the rear garden of No 25 from only a few metres away. This would result in a significant loss of privacy in the most important part of the garden immediately behind the house. Whilst the window would also obliquely overlook the rear garden of No 38 this is already overlooked by the first floor rear facing windows of No 27 and its neighbour No 36.
10. For these reasons the proposal would not significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 25 Salcote Road or No 38 Cirrus Crescent in relation to outlook or light but would cause a significant loss of privacy in the case of No 25. This would be contrary to GLPCS Policy CS19 which seeks to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

11. The benefit of an extended prayer room for the appellant is fully appreciated. Whilst the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area or cause a loss of outlook or light to nearby occupiers the south facing window would lead to a significant loss of privacy and for this reason the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR