



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by **C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/25/3360213

8 Fairview Drive, Higham, Rochester, Kent, ME3 7BG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Marc Norman against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20241021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The property is a semi-detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof space. There is a front dormer, which is also seen at the attached bungalow. The attached property has been extended to the front. A detached garage stands to the side of the appeal property, set back into the plot.
4. The submitted drawings show a ground floor front extension that broadly mirrors the extension seen at the attached property. The Council do not see any objection that element of the works, and I agree the scale and design would reflect the neighbouring property.
5. A first floor side extension is also shown, which would continue the existing ridge line and roof plane of the property, and extend the existing dormer onto this extension. This side extension would not be constructed over an existing or proposed ground floor: it is shown as supported by four columns. Three of these would be on the existing driveway to the property, whilst the fourth is shown as through the existing garage; that garage is shown in the proposed drawings as being retained.
6. The overall design approach of the side extension would appear at odds with the pattern of housing design in the immediate area. Whilst I saw there are examples of side extensions in the wider area, including with first floor side extensions which are not set down from the ridge line or front roof plane, these are associated with a more balanced and considered ground floor design treatment: either atop a ground

floor or, where there is an open area, such space has a more considered approach to the form and scale of the main building. The design in the current scheme – with a pillar through a retained garage building and pillars within the driveway – would, when combined with the scale and design of the proposed extension, appear as an incongruous addition. The overall appearance of the extension would thus not relate well to the host property or to the character of the wider area.

7. Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2015 seeks to ensure development proposals conserve and enhance the local environment, and the Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2021 similarly requires all alterations to be well-designed and sympathetic to their surroundings. The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, and sympathetic to local character. The proposals would not be consistent with these policies and so I conclude there would be harm to the character of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given the proposed development would conflict with the policies of the development plan and the Framework, and the appeal is dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR