



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/21/3282717

36 Myrtle Crescent, Chatham ME5 0UZ

- 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 Monsiola Omoni against the decision of Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/21/1321, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2021.
 - The development is for the proposed construction of a two storey side extension. Construction of a part two storey part single storey rear extension with associated external alterations to existing side projection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At my site visit, I saw that development has commenced on an alternative scheme; I have dealt with the appeal separately on its merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, semi-detached house located in a prominent position on the outside bend of Myrtle Crescent. The surrounding area is residential in nature.
 5. The overall height of the scheme would continue the ridge line of the existing property. As a result the development would lack subservience and dominate the upper floor of the house. This would be in contrast to the existing building, and compete with its overall scale.
 6. The first floor side addition would project beyond the flank wall of the host dwelling, and result in an awkward hipped roof element where it adjoins the gable end of the main house. This would create visual confusion, introducing a disjointed form that would not be cohesive with the existing house and detract from its appearance. Overall, the proposal would result in a development that would fail to reflect the proportions of the host dwelling. It would be clearly visible from the wider streetscene, having a jarring effect by virtue of its scale and extent across the first floor and roof of the property, and in design terms would lack architectural subtlety.
-

7. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to make improvements to the layout of the dwelling to meet living requirements and can only offer my sympathies having regard to the personal matters leading to the application. Nonetheless, these issues do not outweigh the planning harm I have identified above.
8. The appellant states that extra windows could be inserted in the flank wall to break up the elevation, however I have no plans before me to demonstrate this. Moreover, I am not persuaded that such alterations would resolve the concerns I have reasoned previously.
9. I conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be conflict with Policy BNE1 of the Medway Local Plan May 2003, which seeks to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

10. Based on the foregoing, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR