
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/D/23/3315140

166 Wakeley Road, Rainham, Medway, Gillingham ME8 8NW

- 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 Aurelie Charles against the decision of Medway Council.
 - The application ref. MC/22/2692, dated 14 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2023.
 - The proposed development is for the conversion of the loft space with dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal consists of a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling in a residential estate of buildings of broadly similar size and design. At my site visit I observed a number of existing flat roof dormer windows in both the front and rear roof slopes of other houses in the vicinity.
4. Although I acknowledge the principle of the development as a whole, the other dormer windows in the street scene are generally smaller in scale than those demonstrated by this appeal. The plans before me show large, boxy elements that would dominate their respective roof slopes, and being both flush with the ridge line and in close proximity to the eaves would lack subservience.
5. The proposals would be clearly visible from the public domain in both directions along Wakeley Road and the private amenity spaces of surrounding houses, overwhelming the upper level of the main house, and having an intrusive effect by virtue of the scale and extent across the roof of the building.
6. I appreciate those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development; there would be no adverse harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties, there have been no objections from local residents, and layout of the dwelling would meet the living requirements of the appellant and their family. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.

7. I conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. It would be contrary to 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

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR