
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/25/3369387

1 Willow Walk, Meopham, Kent DA13 0QS

- 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 Palvinder Philora against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 20250263.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing detached garage and rear projection, erection of first floor extension to bungalow with pitch roof dormers to front, two storey rear extension with roof lights and incorporating integral garage into residential use with alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow with off-street parking on driveways to the front. It is located on the junction of Willow Walk and the A227 South Street within a row of other properties of differing scale and architectural style. The surrounding neighbourhood is generally residential in nature, although there is a primary school nearby.
4. My attention is drawn to the property history; I understand that development incorporating various extensions was previously approved in 2024, albeit incorporating a single-storey rear element. The Council's delegated report includes the permitted scheme, which is a useful visual tool in comparing what has been granted against what is now proposed. To all intents and purposes, the appeal development shows an amendment to the rear elevation to include first floor bedroom and en-suite accommodation over the ground floor, with a larger expanse of crown roof.
5. To my mind, the greater height of the appeal proposal and the solid, deep-plan form would overwhelm the dwelling at the rear. The extent of development would be unsympathetic when compared to the more modest scale of the approved scheme and those properties to either side. The detrimental impact would be exacerbated by the blocky, boxy appearance and extent of crown roof, which would appear dominant and obtrusive.

6. Whilst I appreciate that it would not have significant prominence in the street scene, the new extension would still be visible from the public domain over the front garden of Marycroft, and the surrounding curtilages of other properties in the vicinity. In any event, just because a proposal cannot readily be viewed from the highway does not obviate the obligation to ensure that it would be well-designed. Overall, in my view the scale and appearance of the proposal would lack architectural subtlety, and would result in a harsh intrusion into the pleasant residential setting.
7. I acknowledge that the two storey rear extension is set back from the existing side elevations by 1.5m; the site is not within a conservation area and is within the urban village boundary line; green belt, countryside and landscape policies are not relevant; no objections have been raised with regard to the living condition of the occupants of local houses; internal rooms meet the required minimum space standards and adequate rear garden depth would be retained; external materials and parking provision are acceptable; and no comments were received from members of the public. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area. It would run contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and the Council's Design for Gravesham - Design Guide (2024) Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021) Supplementary Planning Documents, which collectively seek 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

9. Having regard to my reasoning and all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR