
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/22/3292957

343 Wrotham Road, Istead Rise, Gravesend DA13 9EF

- 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 Colin Williams against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20211356, dated 31 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2022.
 - The proposed development is for a first floor garage extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Although submitted separately, I note that this appeal runs concurrently with an appeal for a virtually identical scheme to the adjoining single storey garage at 345 Wrotham Road (ref. APP/K2230/D/22/3292909).

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 detached, two-storey dwelling sited on Wrotham Road with a driveway and off-street parking to the front. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.
5. The existing garage is single storey in nature, and when viewed from the public highway has the appearance of an ancillary outbuilding that is proportionate and subservient to the main residence.
6. The introduction of the first floor over the existing garage would result in a significant increase in height and mass. This would be prominent and of a size and scale that would compete with the dimensions of the dwelling. The close proximity of the garage and the house would result in a discordant relationship, whereby the subordination of the garage would be lost. Overall, the extent of the proposal would lack architectural subtlety. This would be detrimental to the character of the property and the surrounding area.

7. I saw at my site visit that there is no prevailing design style in the vicinity; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size and detailing. Nonetheless, where outbuildings occur they are of relatively diminutive scale when seen against their host property, and within this context the appeal scheme would appear out of keeping.
8. I recognise that that there would be no adverse impacts on the living conditions of the occupants of other houses, that the development could be constructed at the same time as the adjoining appeal at no. 345, the proposal would use materials to match the dwelling, there have been no objections from local residents, and the scheme would provide enlarged accommodation for the appellant and his family. However, these issues do not overcome the harm I have identified above.
9. I conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, which seeks to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

10. Accounting for my reasoning and all issues raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR