



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W/19/3229846

43 Empress Road, Gravesend DA12 2QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kallu against Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20181035 is dated 3 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is construction of two first floor rear extensions to provide an additional bedroom, walk-in wardrobe and en-suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission refused for the construction of two first floor rear extensions to provide an additional bedroom, walk-in wardrobe and en-suite.

Background to Main Issue

2. The Council did not determine the planning application within the statutory period and this has taken the jurisdiction to determine the application away from the Council. However, the Council has provided a statement which states that the Council would have refused planning permission had it determined the application and sets out those issues to be of concern.
3. The Council is concerned that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted 2014.

Main Issue

4. In light of the above, I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located in a predominantly residential area, which mainly consists of terraced houses with small rear gardens. The appeal property is a modest 2 storey end-of-terrace dwelling, which is designed with a pitched roof. The dwelling has an existing 2 storey flat-roofed rear extension and single storey rear additions. The existing extensions appear subordinate to the original dwelling due to the modest width and depth of the 2 storey rear extension and the limited height of the single storey additions.

6. The proposed first floor rear extension comprising a walk-in wardrobe and ensuite would, in combination with the existing two storey extension, form an enlargement of considerable depth and bulk, which would appear out of keeping with the scale and proportions of the host dwelling. In particular, the eastern side elevation of the extension would form a large expanse of featureless wall, which would be visible from Empress Road.
7. Furthermore, the proposed first floor rear extensions would cover most of the width of the dwelling, which would appear bulky and dominant in relation to the host dwelling. The proposed use of brickwork would fail to reduce the bulk and dominance of the extensions. Whilst the hipped roof of the proposed extension would be set down from the ridge line of the main roof, its length would be considerable and it would not mitigate the dominance of the proposed development in relation to the host dwelling and the street scene.
8. The appellant's Planning Statement, which was submitted with the planning application, refers to a rear extension at No 33 Empress Road. The Planning Statement includes a photograph taken from the street of the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling and I note that the side elevation is rendered and it has a pitched roof. The harm that would arise from the appeal scheme relates to its bulk and dominance rather than the proposed external materials or its roof form. No further details of the size and appearance or the planning history of the 2 storey rear extension at No 33 are before me. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal scheme on its individual planning merits.
9. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted 2014, which, amongst other things, seeks to conserve the character of the local built environment. The appeal scheme would also conflict with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, seeks well designed buildings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR