
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: 6TH September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/22/3301948

14 Istead Rise, Gravesend DA13 9JF

- 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 Anthony Tomkins against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20220449, dated 25 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022.
 - The proposed development is for the erection of a side single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a side single storey extension at 14 Istead Rise, Gravesend DA13 9JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20220449, dated 25 April 2022, 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: AT-14-11 (A), AT-14-12 (A), AT-14-13 (A), AT-14-14 (A), AT-14-15 (A).
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the details shown on the application form; in particular facing external walls to match the existing house and a flat green roof.
 - 4) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden (otherwise than as a green roof) or similar amenity area.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, detached house on the junction between Istead Rise and Brookside Road, with a single storey garage, driveway and off-street parking to the front. The appeal residence and those to the west on Istead Rise are set relatively far back into their plots, with large front garden areas.

4. At my site visit I saw that the adjacent dwelling at 16 Istead Rise sits on higher land. The side garden where the extension would be located has a limited impact in the context of the site and streetscene; to my mind the addition would hunker down into the hillside. The height of the rear boundary fence would broadly obstruct views of the development from Brookside Road and Northumberland Road. At the front, the existing flat roof garage would be situated immediately to the fore of the extension. This would screen the development to a large extent; I consider it unlikely that the garage would be removed in the future.
5. I am aware that the Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (SPD) states the width of side extensions should *generally be* (my emphasis) no greater than half the width of the original building. However, given the relatively limited visibility of the scheme I am of the opinion that no demonstrable harm would arise as a result of the proposal. I am satisfied that the large extent of flat roof, whilst not ideal, is within the bounds of acceptability when all planning considerations are taken into account, and the creation of a green roof would soften the appearance of the development.
6. I conclude that the scheme would assimilate with the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would meet the provisions of Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and the SPD, which seeks to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

7. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. I have altered the wording of some of the conditions suggested by the Council in the interests of clarity and necessity. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings is reasonable and necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
8. Conditions would be necessary, in the interests of visual amenity, to ensure external materials match those used on the existing building and the provision of the green roof; and to restrict the use of the flat roof as a balcony or for other amenity purposes. Given the single storey nature of the proposal, I see no justification in preventing the formation of other windows or doors in any elevation of the extension.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to all issues raised, the appeal succeeds.

C Hall

INSPECTOR