



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/19/3232353

Witsend, Pear Tree Lane, Hempstead, Gillingham ME7 3PU

- 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 Srinivasan Srirangan against the decision of The Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/19/0306, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey flat roof rear extension, first floor extension to convert current loft space and change all pitch roofs to flat and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Pear Tree Lane is a cul-de-sac with four properties, three of which are bungalows and the fourth is a chalet bungalow. The dwellings are set back from the street and have driveways to the front and occupy almost the full width of the plots within which they sit. Whilst the dwellings in the cul-de-sac display some design difference, they are generally in harmony with each other, with low sloping pitched and hipped roofs which gives the street a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity.
4. The appeal proposal comprises three main elements. It seeks to replace the pitched roof over the garage with a flat roof, introduce a contemporary rectangular 'box' shaped first-floor extension in place of the pitched roof and add a single storey flat roofed rear extension.
5. The removal of the garage roof which sits to the front of the appeal dwelling, would result in the first-floor extension being the most prominent feature of the building in the street scene. Though not increasing the overall height of the building, the additional storey would extend the full width of the dwelling and add massing at high level, such that its appearance would change considerably from that of a traditional bungalow to a contemporary two-storey dwelling. The resultant rectilinear design would introduce a flat roof which would jar with the

hipped and pitched roofs prevalent on the adjacent dwellings. It would be constructed from non-traditional materials, which would be inconsistent with the adjoining dwellings. The dual height lobby entrance, first floor windows and prevalence of flat roofs would also introduce design features significantly at odds with the prevailing character and appearance in the street.

6. Consequently, these elements of the appeal proposal would appear as unduly dominant and incongruous features within a street comprised entirely of traditionally designed dwellings.
7. The single storey flat roofed rear extension to the rear would be relatively modest in size and scale to the existing dwelling. It would be barely visible from the surrounding area as it would sit behind tall boundary fencing with soft landscaping. This element of the proposal would not be out of character with the area and it would therefore be acceptable.
8. However, this does not outweigh my findings on the replacement of the pitched roof over the garage with a flat roof and the contemporary rectangular 'box' shaped first-floor extension.
9. Overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan (2003) which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development should be appropriate in relation to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR