



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/19/3230939

139 Sun Lane, Gravesend DA12 5HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Singh against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20190192, dated 22 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2019.
 - The development is a proposed 1st floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed first floor extension at 139 Sun Lane, Gravesend DA12 5HW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 20190192, dated 22 February 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: RC/0606/100, RC/0606/101, RC/0606/3001, RC/0606/3005 Rev. B and RC/0606/3003 Rev. B but only in so far as it relates to the hipped roof design shown on the proposed front elevation and proposed rear elevation (View A) drawings on that plan.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end property in a terrace of three (with Nos. 141 and 143). It differs to the other two properties within the terrace due to the fact that its main entrance is to the west rather than the south, the lower height of

the main ridge, the presence of a porch rather than a canopy, and as it has a hedge on the south boundary which separates it from the open plan forecourt of the neighbouring houses. Also, it is setback from the front elevation of No.141 and No.143 at first floor, but has a single storey extension which protrudes forward of this elevation. This elevation therefore does not provide a strong building line. As such, the appeal site, although part of a terrace and constructed of the same materials, has its own individual character. There are two other terraces to the east and south which all front or back onto the forecourt to the south and vary in scale and design, particularly No.149. There are large buildings to the west of the site and in general the surrounding area varies in type, design and scale.

5. The proposed first floor extension would differ to the terrace it is a part of, by being a projection not found in the terrace. However, it would not be disruptive or out of keeping with the terrace due to the individualistic character of the appeal site, as described above, or be out of keeping with the area due to the varying designs and scales witnessed. The hipped roof will also provide some similarity with No.143.
6. The proposal would be lower than the ridge height of the original property and thus even lower than the terrace it is a part of and the surrounding terraces to the east and south. The scale of the resultant house would not be as large as the buildings to the west and would remain to respect the scale of No.141 and No.143 when viewed from the south. Although the proposal would be close to the boundary of the public highway and would be very visible, it would not be closer to Sun Lane than properties to the north, such as No 133, or south, such as No 149. As such, the proposal would be of an acceptable scale and siting when compared to its surroundings. This, combined with its unobtrusive appearance, would mean the extension would not be excessively prominent or incongruous.
7. Although the proposal would add a significant amount of built form in proportion to the original dwelling, it would still be subservient by virtue of the ridge being lower down than the original dwelling and be proportionate to the remaining curtilage. It would further sympathise with the original dwelling as it would use matching materials.
8. Based on the reasoning above, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore not conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy, September 2014 or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which generally seek to ensure developments are well designed and respect the local character.

Other Matters

9. I note a consultee response from the Highways Development Management Officer highlighting that the red line on the plans does not include the property's parking area. However, this difference would not affect the proposed scheme and therefore does not affect my consideration of the proposal.

Conditions

10. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried in accordance with the approved plans. Plan No.

RC/0606/3003 Rev. B however shows both a hipped roof and a gable roof on the south elevation of the extension. From the evidence provided, both parties seem to agree that the current proposal has a hipped roof design and as such, this condition makes it clear that the planning permission relates only to the drawings on that plan showing the hipped roof i.e. Proposed Front Elevation and Proposed Rear Elevation (View A).

11. A condition is also imposed to ensure the development is started within three years of the date of this decision for the purpose of certainty. Furthermore, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure matching materials are used.

Recommendation and Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR