



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/21/3282041

The Orchards, 23 Watling Street, Gravesend, DA11 7NU

- 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 G Kaur against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20210480, dated 15 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and single storey extension, the erection of two storey and single storey rear and side extension with replacement front bay and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and single storey extension, the erection of two storey and single storey rear and side extension with replacement front bay and porch at The Orchards, 23 Watling Street, Gravesend, DA11 7NU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20210480, dated 15 April 2021, 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: 1121.WD.02; 1121.WD.03F; 1121.WD.04B; 1121.WD.06A and 1121.WD.07C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those detailed on the approved plans ref. 1121.WD.06A and 1121.WD.07C.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans the bathroom window on the north west elevation of the extension shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or the nearest equivalent standard) and top hung only and shall be permanently retained as such.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows / dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be constructed above ground floor level on the north west elevation of the extension hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, two storey dwelling with a single storey garage to the side, located within a deep plot. The surrounding area is mixed in character and appearance, comprising mainly of detached and semi-detached dwellings of various architectural styles and designs.
4. The proposed extensions would add considerable built form to the property. The existing garage would be demolished and replaced by a two storey side extension. A part two storey, part single storey extension across the full width of the dwelling is also proposed. On the front elevation, an existing two storey bay and front porch would be demolished and replaced by a new front bay and entrance porch.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would be set further away from the side boundary of the site than the garage to be demolished. Whilst it would result in more built form across the width of the plot at two storey level, it would not appear cramped in relation to the boundaries of the site. Furthermore, I note that many other of the dwellings along this part of Watling Street are relatively large, and some extent across much of the width of their plot at two storey level. In my view, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area in this regard.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would enable the existing two storey bay on the front elevation of the dwelling to be widened. However, I do not consider that this feature of the proposal with two large ground floor windows and three smaller windows above would be overly prominent or out of keeping with the dwelling or its context. Furthermore, the replacement of the existing two storey front bay window with a two storey bay of a different design would not significantly change the character or scale of the dwelling.
7. The proposed two storey rear extension would be limited in depth and would not significantly change the scale of the dwelling in relation to its plot. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend across the full width of the dwelling as proposed to be extended. Whilst the proposed single storey extension would be of considerable depth and relatively high, it would not extend significantly beyond the rear elevation of the adjacent dwellings. Moreover, I find that the contemporary design of the rear extension with its contrasting materials and flat roof design would not be unacceptable in terms of its bulk or harmful to the appearance of the dwelling or the area.
8. The Council also raise concern regarding the design of the roof within their officer's report. I acknowledge that the crown roof design, which incorporates a flat roof element, would add further bulk to the dwelling. However, I have not been made aware of any specific policy or design guidance which would preclude such a design. The dwelling is relatively well set back from Watling Street and is within an area that is highly mixed in character and appearance, including the roof forms that are displayed. The flat roof element on top of the

crown would not be highly visible in the street scene and in my view, would not be materially harmful to the design and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area in terms of its scale and bulk.

9. In terms of overall built footprint and the scale of the proposed extensions, I am satisfied that the proposed extensions, whilst relatively large, would not be disproportionate in relation to the host dwelling and would not result in an overdevelopment of the plot which is of considerable depth.
10. The proposed extensions and roof alterations would result in the re-elevation of the dwelling and would change its character and appearance to an extent. However, in my view, the proposed changes would not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would accord with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2014) which requires new development to be visually attractive, fit for purpose and locally distinctive and to make a positive contribution to the street scene, public realm and the character of the area. It would also comply with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) insofar as it requires high quality design.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council as well as the appellant's comments on those conditions.
13. In addition to the standard 3 year implementation condition, I have imposed a condition controlling materials to ensure a satisfactory external appearance. The approved plans condition is imposed for clarity.
14. As there is a first floor window on the side elevation of the adjacent dwelling, 25 Watling Street, I have imposed conditions controlling glazing and the insertion of additional windows on the north west elevation of the extension in the interests of the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier. Whilst the Council recommend that this condition should also restrict development falling within Class G of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) in my view such a restriction is unnecessary.
15. Whilst the Council has suggested a landscaping condition, as there are no changes proposed to the frontage of the dwelling or its landscape setting, the condition is not reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR