
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/19/3224338
267 Wilson Avenue, Rochester ME1 2SR.

- 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 Kalhid against the decision of Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/18/3528, dated 9 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is formation of gable end to roof with flat roof rear dormer and roof lights to front for additional living accommodation in roofspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached property. It has been previously extended with a two storey side extension, and single storey rear addition and conservatory. Wilson Avenue is characterised by a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties, both two and single storey. Hipped roofs predominate.
4. The proposed rear dormer would extend across virtually the whole of the extended roof of the property, right up to the newly created gable end. Whilst the flat roofed top would be set down very slightly from the main ridge of the roof, the bottom level would extend to just below the eaves. This would introduce a large 'flat topped' flank wall to the rear of the dwelling and continuous flat roofed rear elevation. Consequently, the original rear roofslope would be almost entirely lost.
5. In my view, this would introduce a substantial and overly large roof addition, that would dominate the rear of the dwelling and disrupt and detract from the original, traditional roof form of the property. Although sited to the rear of the dwelling, the proposed extended flank elevation, with flat roof, would be visible in the street scene, introducing a roof form that would be at odds with the established roofscape of the immediate street scene. I consider that it would thus be an incongruous and overly dominant addition, unsympathetic to the form and scale of the host dwelling, and the established character of the area within which it is located.

6. As such it is harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It therefore fails to accord with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan (2003) which states that the design of development should be appropriate in relation to the character, appearance and functioning of the built and natural environment by, amongst other things, being satisfactory in terms of scale, details, materials and siting; and respecting the scale, appearance and location of buildings, spaces and the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
7. For the reasons given above it would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 124 and 127 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. I note that the Framework also suggests that effective use should be made of land and in particular, paragraph 118 promotes the use of space above existing properties allowing upward extensions, but this should be where the development would be well designed, which for the reasons set out above, I do not find to be the case here. I also acknowledge that the proposal would provide enhanced accommodation for the appellant's family, but overall, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified.
8. The appellant has referred to a number of properties within the area that have been the subject of various extensions, including some with rear roof dormers. I also saw on my site visit that a number of adjoining properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site have been the subject of rear roof dormer extensions. However, none appeared to be of similar scale or design to that proposed at the appeal site and therefore do not, in my opinion, provide any precedent for allowing this proposal which I have found to be unacceptably harmful for the reasons given above.

Conclusions

9. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR