
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/21/3287138

97 Eastcourt Lane, Twydall, Gillingham ME8 6HJ

- 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 Daisy Clarke against the decision of Medway Council.
 - The application Ref MC/21/2031, dated 3 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
 - The development is for retrospective permission for the construction of an L shape dormer to rear with insertion of juliet balcony and roof lights to front to provide additional living accommodation within roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At my site visit, I saw that the development has been completed and I note that the application has been submitted retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development having regard to the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached house on Eastcourt Lane with a driveway to the side accessing a block of communal garages to the rear. The local neighbourhood is predominantly residential in nature.
5. The development is clearly evident from the side access, communal garage area and surrounding rear gardens of other properties in the vicinity. The height of the dormer extension continues the ridge line of the existing property, and due to the external cladding the flank and rear elevations slightly overhang the main dwelling below.
6. Given its size and relationship with the host building, the addition lacks any sense of subservience. The imposing appearance of the extension results in dominant and boxy roof form, which is in contrast to the existing dwelling, and competes with its overall scale. Overall, the development represents an obtrusive addition to the detriment of the character of the dwelling and the locality.

7. I acknowledge those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development, including the assertions that the addition results in improvements to the layout of the dwelling to meet living requirements, there have been no objections from local residents and that the scheme meets the Building Regulations. I also sympathise with the appellant's position and recognise that this is a stressful situation. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.
8. I also recognise the presence of other roof forms in the neighbourhood with similar cladding. However, the photos provided by the appellant show dormers set within the roofslopes, away from the flank walls and eaves. In any event, additions to other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
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 in 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. Having regard to all matters raised and based on my reasoning above, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR