



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2020

by John Felgate BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/20/3245325

191 Fairview Avenue, Wigmore, Gillingham, Kent ME8 0PX

- 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 Mrs D Parker against the decision of The Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/19/2548, dated 25 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage/store and gym.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a detached double garage/store and gym at 191 Fairview Avenue, Wigmore, Gillingham, Kent ME8 0PX, in accordance with the application Ref MC/19/2548, dated 25 September 2019, 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 development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 19.06.02-P, Revision B, showing proposed elevations and floor plan; and Proposed Block Plan (unnumbered),.
 - 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the new building shall match those used on the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The new building shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the existing property as a dwellinghouse.

Reasons

2. No 191 Fairview Avenue stands on a roughly square-shaped plot at the junction with Maidstone Road. The existing 2-storey detached house is set well back from both road frontages. The proposed new garage, store and gym would be housed in a single-storey building, sited within the front garden, between the house and the street corner.
3. The development would be set forward of the building lines formed by the appeal property and its nearest neighbours to both the north and west. But, as I saw on my visit, elsewhere along Fairview Avenue and Maidstone Road there is a good deal of variation in building lines. Of particular note in this respect is the existing bungalow No 232 Fairview Road, which stands on the opposite corner of the same junction, and close to both road frontages. Also relevant is the freestanding, pitch-roofed double garage of No 554 Maidstone Road, which is set well forward of that property.

4. The new building now proposed would stand further back from Maidstone Road than either of these. It would be slightly closer to Fairview Avenue than No 232, but this would be offset by its smaller footprint, and hipped roof. Given that both of the appeal site's frontages are enclosed by walls and fencing of up to 2m in height, little more than the roof would be seen. In the circumstances, the development would not be unduly prominent in its location.
5. Furthermore, the new building would have a simple and well-mannered design, with proportions comparable to No 232. In view of these similarities, in terms of size, shape and siting, it seems to me that the proposed development would appear as a visual counterpart to No 232, creating a pleasant sense of enclosure and coherence between the two sides of Fairview Avenue.
6. In these respects, the development would in my view enhance the street scene, in accordance with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan¹, and relevant guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.
7. In granting permission, I have imposed conditions in line with the Council's suggestions. A condition regarding the approved plans is needed to ensure certainty, and control of materials is necessary to secure a satisfactory appearance. A restriction to domestic use only is also imposed, in the interests of safeguarding the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

J Felgate

INSPECTOR

¹ Adopted May 2003