



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by M Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/20/3245961

105 Downs Road, Istead Rise, Gravesend DA13 9HD

- 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 Stephen Hughes against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20190966, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'proposed extension of in height of extension gables @ first floor/roof level to main front elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an increase in the height of the gables to the front elevation, an increase in the height of the main roof and a second floor rear extension at 105 Downs Road, Istead Rise, Gravesend DA13 9HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20190966, dated 12 September 2019, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall accord with the following approved plans: site location plan (scale 1:1250); 19-1458 03; 19-1458 04.

Procedural Matters

2. There is disagreement between the parties over the scope of the proposal. The description of the development in the banner heading is taken from the planning application form. The application form, and the accompanying plans and details, indicate that planning permission is sought for an increase in the height of the gables to the front elevation of the dwelling. However, the Council undertook consultation and determined the application on the basis that the proposal also includes an increase in the height of the main roof and a second floor rear extension, as it considers that permission is required for those elements. I have dealt with the proposal on the same basis as the Council. This is reflected in the formal decision above.
3. I observed that the development described above has already been carried out. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of Downs Road. The road is characterised by dwellings of varying styles and roof forms. The immediate vicinity features detached dwellings that are oriented towards and step back from the road in a consistent and repetitive manner, which provides a sense of rhythm along the road. No. 103 Downs Road is adjacent to the site and features a prominent two storey front gable projection. Its neighbour, no. 101 Downs Road, features a similarly sized pitched and hipped front projection.
6. Following the completion of the development, the dwelling's height appears proportionate to its width and depth. The dwelling sits comfortably in its plot, between the adjacent properties and within the wider street scene.
7. The proposed front gables have a similar level of prominence to the projections at both nos. 101 and 103. Although the gables appear slightly narrower, they project a similar distance from the main ridgeline as, and have similar proportions to, the gabled projection at no. 103. The front projections of the 3 properties have a compatible appearance and together they contribute to the sense of rhythm along the road.
8. The second floor rear extension is only readily visible when positioned along Downs Road to the south of the dwelling and, from such a position, a significant proportion of the south-eastern side elevation and the front gables are visible. The rear extension has a greater maximum height than the front gables and is flush with the side elevation rather than set into the roof slope. However, due to its set back position from the road and the prominence of the front gables, the side of the dwelling appears balanced from front to back.
9. The Council considers that the development is not subordinate and has significantly altered the appearance of the dwelling, effectively adding an additional storey. Although that may be the case, I find that the resulting building does not appear out of character within the street scene.
10. The Council's officer report highlights that the proposal is similar to a scheme that was dismissed at appeal. I have not been provided with full details of that proposal or the appeal decision. In any event, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.
11. The proposed development is compatible with its surroundings and has an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is in accordance with policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development conserves and enhances local character and integrates well with its surroundings.
12. As the development has already taken place the only condition necessary is to specify the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR