



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities

Decision date: 4th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W/19/3229990

Between 24 and 26 Salisbury Road, Gravesend DA11 7DE

- 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 Tan Dhillon against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20181128, dated 28 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the existing garage into a two-bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For clarity, taking into account the matters raised by the appellant in his application, I have used the description of the proposal stated on the council's decision notice. Therefore, from the plans before me, I consider the proposal to be the construction of a two-bedroom, four-person dwelling. The proposed dwelling would extend into the existing open forecourt and include high-level glazed windows to all rooms. These windows would be supplemented by roof lights; 2 to the kitchen/living area, 1 to the bathroom and 1 to the master bedroom.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development on; (i) the character and appearance of the area, (ii) on-street parking and, (iii) the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupants.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area where the predominant pattern of development is of two-storey, red brick and tile, terraced and semi-detached dwellings. Salisbury Road follows this uniform pattern and is typified by small yards to the front and modest gardens to the rear of the properties. On-street parking is available along Salisbury Road and the surrounding streets.
5. The site is accessed via a narrow service road between 24 and 26 Salisbury Road. At the end of the service road there is a low, flat roofed, storage building.

6. The proposal, by enclosing the forecourt area of the storage building, would increase the mass and bulk of the structure. The development would result in a substantial addition to the existing building and be untypical of the scale of development in neighbouring gardens.
7. Moreover, the proposal would be very noticeable when viewed from public areas to the rear of the property and from Salisbury Road across the service lane. Therefore, in this tight residential location, the proposal would be unreasonably dominant and cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. As such, the proposal is contrary to the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (GLPCS) Policy CS19 which says, amongst other things, that a development, must integrate well into the surrounding area and safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties and land.

Car Parking

9. On street parking is available in Salisbury Road. Although the availability of parking spaces may well rise and fall during the course of the day the impact of one additional dwelling on street parking is likely to be limited
10. Further, the proposal has a small frontage that would act as a small outside area and provide a single car-parking space.
11. In the absence of other evidence, the submitted plans show that, whilst not ideal, and despite the narrow access, it is possible to provide one car-parking space within the restraints of the appeal site.
12. Therefore, I find that the proposal aligns with Policies CS11 and P3 of the GLPCS which seek to ensure that the proposals mitigate their impact on the highway network and ensure that there is sufficient parking available and that there will be no harm to highway safety.

Living Conditions

13. The appellant has given considerable thought to the fenestration of the development to prevent overlooking into neighbouring properties. However, within the proposed dwelling, the positioning of the high-level windows would create a gloomy living space and limited opportunities to look out. This in combination with the limited external space is likely to impact on the well-being of future occupants.
14. Further, in this location, harm to neighbouring properties would occur as a result of noise and disturbance related to the day to day activities of an additional residential dwelling.
15. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS19 of the GLPCS which requires that development must safeguard the amenity of its occupants and those of neighbouring properties and land.
16. Similarly, the proposal is contrary to aims set out in Paragraph 127(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that planning decisions should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

17. Although the proposal would likely improve site security, and I have found in favour of the Appellant in respect of car-parking, this does not overcome the harm caused to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of occupants and adjacent neighbours.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR