



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/21/3278251

Copperfield, Round Street, Cobham, Gravesend DA13 9BA

- 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 Aman Waid against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20210165, dated 11 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'extend current rear single storey addition, addition of extra single storey garage to front of dwelling, addition of first floor bedroom/ensuite space above current garage/utility area to front of dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the erection of a first floor extension over garage, additional garage, single storey extension to front and extend single storey rear extension to full width of dwelling. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants on neighbouring properties, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling set within a large garden plot. Properties surrounding the site vary significantly in terms of their scale, design and position within plots, many having been extended and altered previously. From that perspective, there is no clear sense of harmony between properties within the street scene. The appeal property is largely hidden from view from Round Street due to the mature landscaping that exists along its boundary,

although glimpsed views can be obtained through gaps and at the site entrance.

5. The proposed development would result in extensions to both the front and rear of the property. To the front, a single-storey garage would be erected forward of the established building line, with a first floor extension above the existing garage. To the rear, a full width single-storey extension would be erected with roof terrace over. Materials would match the existing property.
6. The proposed rear extension would be out of sight from the public realm and from that perspective would have little appreciable effect on the street scene. The proposed front extension would be visible from Round Street, including at the site entrance. Its proposed design is atypical and would bring the property's established building line further forward towards Round Street. However, a forward projecting wing, albeit single-storey, already exists here, together with a two-storey bay projection. The proposed extensions would tie acceptably into these existing features. Moreover, the building line along the street is not consistent or uniform at present, with nearby properties having been extended and altered significantly in the past. As such, the position, scale, bulk, massing and design of the proposed front extension is such that it would form a sufficiently subservient feature of the original property, appearing proportionate and in keeping with its overall design. It would have an acceptable impact on the street scene.
7. In conclusion, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, in accordance with the relevant provisions of Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (LP) (2014). This policy, in summary, seeks high quality design in development.

Living conditions

8. The proposed roof terrace would be positioned close to the site boundaries, particularly that to the east. A reasonable separation distance exists between the appeal property and the adjoining property known as Hanworth. However, Hanworth is orientated such that its rear facing windows are angled towards the appeal site.
9. The proposed roof terrace would allow views from it over the boundary towards habitable rooms at Hanworth, together with its private rear garden and swimming pool. At present, this neighbouring property benefits from reasonably high levels of privacy. This would be harmed as a result of the proposed development.
10. Whilst I note that mature trees and landscaping exist along the shared eastern boundary, gaps are present. Nevertheless, planting and boundary features of any kind, cannot be relied on in perpetuity to give the same level of screening as they may at present. I also note that a large first floor roof terrace already exists to the rear of the appeal property. However, this is set back considerably from both side boundaries, unlike the proposal before me.
11. The appeal property is angled away from the adjoining property known as Netherfield, to the west. Moreover, a greater separation distance between the appeal property and boundary exists here. As such, there would be limited harm to the privacy of the occupiers of that neighbouring property.

12. The elevated position of the proposed terrace, together with its low-level glazed screening, is such that it would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, with particular regard to privacy, contrary to the relevant provisions of LP Policy CS19. This policy, in summary, seeks to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring properties, including privacy.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR