



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 February 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decisions by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/K2230/D/19/3240545

4 Waterloo Street, Gravesend DA12 1HB

- 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 David Lewis against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20190638, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2019.
- The development proposed is a first-floor front extension to form bedroom with toilet.

Appeal B Ref: APP/K2230/D/19/3240557

4 Waterloo Street, Gravesend DA12 1HB

- 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 David Lewis against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20190912, dated 30 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double-storey front extension to form dining room on ground floor and bedroom on first floor.
-

Decision

1. Both appeals are dismissed.

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. In both appeals a main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. An additional main issue is whether the development would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants of No.4 Waterloo Street. In Appeal A this is with regard to private outdoor amenity space, and in Appeal B this is with regard to the size of the proposed dining room.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character & Appearance

4. The appeal property is located on the southern side of Waterloo Street, adjacent to the junction with Peacock Street. It comprises a part single storey
-

part two storey end of terrace dwelling which lies within a triangular plot in a prominent position in the street scene due to its position at a bend in the road. The surrounding area is characterised mostly by two-storey terraced housing.

5. The proposal in Appeal A is for the erection of a first-floor extension which would overhang above the existing ground floor side projection and would be supported by a rendered brick column. The extension would be built up to the angled eastern boundary therefore resulting in an angular structure. In my view, the proposed column-supported first-floor overhanging structure would appear awkward and would unbalance the form of the host dwelling. Although the development would follow the shape of the plot, its odd shape in what is a prominent end-of-terrace location, would appear incongruous and erode the street scene. The proposal would thus harm the character and appearance of the area.
6. In Appeal B, the proposal is for the erection of a two-storey extension which would also be built up to the angled eastern boundary. The proposed design would tie-in with the existing roof form, however, the width of the front elevation would be excessive and would fail to appear as a subordinate extension to the host dwelling. Furthermore, as with the scheme in Appeal A, the proposed irregular wedge-shaped design would appear incongruous in this prominent end-of-terrace location. I find the proposal would result in a visually discordant feature in the street scene and would thus harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. Given the above, the development in both appeals would conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (the 'Core Strategy') and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which together aim to ensure proposals contribute positively to the street scene.
8. Although the Council refers to Policy CS05 of the Core Strategy, which relates to the Gravesend Town Centre Opportunity Area, in the decision notice corresponding to Appeal A, I have not found this policy to be relevant as the appeal site does not lie within this area. Likewise, whilst the Council refers to Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy in the decision notice for Appeal B, I have not found this policy has little relevance as it relates broadly to the strategic distribution of housing within the borough rather than the design of extensions and their context.

Living Conditions

9. There is currently a very limited amount of private outdoor amenity space to the rear of the property, which the Council suggest is 4 sq. metres. The increase the size of the dwelling with an additional bedroom, in Appeal A, would exacerbate the need for amenity space. The proposal would fail to adhere to the 'Residential Layout Guidelines' Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 (SPG) document which requires three-bedroom properties to have a rear garden area of 60 sq. metres and a depth of 10 metres. Therefore, I find the proposed development in Appeal A would not provide an adequate amount of garden space for a three-bedroom property and it would thus fail to provide acceptable living conditions for residents of the appeal property.
10. The existing property currently does not have a dining room or a significant amount of space on the ground floor. The development in Appeal B would allow for the introduction of a small dining room. Whilst proposed dining room would

be irregularly shaped, and I acknowledge it would be smaller than the required size set out in the SPG, I am satisfied that the ground floor internal arrangement would improve the living conditions of residents of the appeal property by providing more space than currently exists. Therefore, I find the proposed development in Appeal B would provide an adequate amount of internal dining space and it would thus provide satisfactory living conditions for residents of the appeal property.

11. The development in Appeal A therefore conflicts with Policy CS19 and the SPG which together aim to ensure new development safeguards the amenity of its occupants. The development in Appeal B however would accord with this policy and the aims of the SPG.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that Appeal A should be dismissed.
13. With regard to Appeal B, although I find the development would improve the living conditions for the occupants of the property, this would not outweigh the negative impact on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, I recommend that Appeal B should also be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis Appeal A and Appeal B are both dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR