
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2021

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/20/3252444

33 Timber Bank, Vigo, Gravesend DA13 0RY

- 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 M Turner against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20200173, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is First Floor Side/Rear Extension with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a First Floor Side/Rear Extension with internal alterations at 33 Timber Bank, Vigo, Gravesend DA13 0RY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20200173, dated 17 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 20005MT-PP-05; 20005MT-PP-06; 20005MT-PP-03-PP-A1; and 20005MT-PP-04-PE-A1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of 33 and 35 Timber Bank (Nos 33 and 35) and the streetscene of Timber Bank; and whether the development would make adequate provision for parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No 33 is a two storey, semi-detached house within a street at this point that predominantly comprises a mixture of semi-detached and terraced houses. Timber Bank has a quite sinuous layout and for the most part it is lined by houses on each side of the street facing one another. However, there are some examples of properties, such as Nos 33 and 35, that are aligned at right angles to the public highway. In the case of No 33 its side elevation faces directly onto Timber Bank at a T-junction in the street.

4. The proposal would involve the construction of a first floor side extension above No 33's single storey side extension. Given No 33's siting, the extension would occupy a prominent location within the streetscene. However, the side elevation of the extension would maintain the 3.0 metre or so separation distance between the single storey side extension's flank wall and No 33's side garden fence line¹. Given the flank wall inset from No 33's side garden boundary, I consider that the first floor extension would not appear unduly prominent and would be respectful of the spaciousness generally exhibited by the houses that occupy corner plots throughout Timber Bank. I consider that would be the case whether the extension was being viewed from the front or rear or on entering Timber Bank from Harvel Road.
5. While the extension would result in some increase No 33's scale, I consider the enlargement of this property would not be disproportionate. I also consider that the extension's design would be in sympathy with No 33's appearance.
6. The construction of the extension would cause some further unbalancing of Nos 33 and 35 as a pair of semi-detached houses. That pair of dwellings already being asymmetrical, given their ground floor additions. However, as No 35 occupies a comparatively discrete location within the street, being tucked away in effect in a corner, I consider the further unbalancing associated with the development would not be harmful to the appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses.
7. I therefore conclude that the extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance Nos 33 and 35 or the streetscene of Timber Bank and that the development would accord with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy of 2014 (the Core Strategy). That is because this development would be visually attractive and integrate well with the surrounding area, with its layout and design being respectful of the streetscene.

Parking

8. The off-street parking for Nos 33 and 35 is within a small parking compound located to the rear of these houses. That parking area has not been included within the application/red line area for the submitted planning application but is partially available to the occupiers of No 33, as clarified in the appellant's grounds of appeal. There is one garage and at least one forecourt space available to No 33, which would be unaffected by the extension's construction.
9. The Council has adopted the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards of 2006 as supplementary planning guidance (the standards). With the construction of the proposed extension No 33 would become a four bedroomed house. The parking standards for dwellings of that size (or larger) require the provision of three parking spaces at a maximum. No 33 would continue to have at least two off-street parking spaces available to it. While that level of provision would be less than the maximum requirement of three spaces, I observed no obvious signs of Timber Bank being subject to on-street parking stress. I therefore consider that any additional parking demand arising from the extension's occupation would not give rise to parking demand capable of affecting the operation of the public highway or the living conditions for the occupiers of the other houses in Timber Bank.

¹ 3.0 metres being the dimension quoted in the appellant's grounds of appeal

10. I therefore conclude that the development would not give rise to any inadequacy in parking provision and that there would be no conflict with Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy P5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review of 1994. That is because there would be sufficient parking to meet the needs the occupiers of No 33 without adversely affecting the operation of the public highway.

Conditions

11. Apart from the standard time limit condition, I consider it necessary that the development should be built to accord with the submitted plans for certainty. A condition is also necessary requiring the development to be constructed with external materials matching those of No 33, to safeguard the appearance of this property and the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR