



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: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/25/3359218

11 Court Lodge, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 3EQ

- 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 Rebecca Horne against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20240570.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the current detached garage, replace with a double storey side extension, a single storey side extension with updated cladding and windows
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, and sympathetic to local character. Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2015 seeks to ensure development proposals conserve and enhance the character of the local environment, and requires design, layout and form of new development to be derived from a robust analysis of local context and character.
4. The Council's Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (SPD) similarly requires all extensions and alterations to respect the original character of the existing dwelling, and complement and correspond with the character of neighbouring properties and the local area. The SPD notes that two storey extensions can have a more significant impact on the appearance of the street, and sets out particular guidance for such extensions.
5. The appeal property is a detached two storey house, with a single storey detached double garage, and is set in a spacious plot with good landscaping around. The house is set back from the street, but there are clear views of the property from the street.
6. The appellant states the house is not of traditional design, scale or detailing and lacks architectural merit. From my observations at the site visit and consideration of

all the submitted information I do not concur with this observation. It is clear that the house forms part of a planned estate where houses are of a similar form, scale and design approach with traditional pitched tiled roofs, a mix of gable and hipped ends, and the use of materials in elevations being brick or hanging tile. The two storey properties see variation in their built form to give articulation in their elevations, and are set back from the road to provide a spacious character. Although there is variety to individual properties, analysis of the local context and character shows there is a clear consistency and coherence in the general appearance of the residential area.

7. A small single storey extension is proposed on the western side of the house which, due to its small scale and design, would not impact upon the wider area.
8. The existing single storey garage on the eastern side of the house would be demolished and a two storey extension erected, which would be attached to the existing house and would be wider than the garage. The extension would have a flat roof, and would be faced with vertical timber cladding.
9. The width and height of this extension would appear as a disproportionate addition to the main house. The flat roof design is not seen in the vicinity of the property which, as noted, has consistency in character. The materials used in the extension would not reflect that established character and appearance of the area, and would not integrate with the main house. This design, height and scale would thus mean the extension appears as an uncomfortable addition to the house that lacks any degree of subservience to the main property.
10. This adverse effect is heightened by the detailed design of the extension, whereby the height of the flat roof does not relate comfortably to either the eaves height or the ridge height of the main house. The proportions, height and position of the windows and the garage doors in the extension bare little relationship to the window size and position in the house. This would further emphasise the awkward relationship of the extension to the house. The extension would be widely visible from the street, and hence impact upon the character of the area.
11. I acknowledge that planning policy and the SPD do not necessarily require development and extensions must be an exact replication of existing character. However, the policy framework is clear that development must be informed by local context and character, and any scheme must complement and conserve that character. The proposed two storey extension in this appeal would be of excessive scale, height and of a poor design that does not relate well to the host property or the wider area. Thus, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the planning policies and the SPD referred to earlier.

Conclusions

12. The proposals would be distant enough from neighbouring properties to ensure no adverse effect on amenity. Adequate parking would be provided, and comments relating to biodiversity issues could be addressed. However, these matters do not alter the overall conclusion on the main issue. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh
INSPECTOR