



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/K2230/D/21/3288848

10 St Johns Road, Higham, Rochester, Kent ME3 7BY

- 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 Daniel Perkins against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20211104, dated 1 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
- The proposed development is for demolition of existing rear extension and loft conversion, and erection of a single storey rear extension, raising the ridge height of the roof to construct a dormer extension in the rear roof slope and 2no. dormer windows in the front roof slope with a skylight window. Erection of a storm porch.

Appeal B Ref: APP/K2230/D/22/3296873

10 St Johns Road, Higham, Rochester, Kent ME3 7BY

- 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 Daniel Perkins against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20220090, dated 28 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2022.
- The proposed development is for erection of single storey rear extension and dormer extensions in the rear and front roof slopes and conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms.

Decision – Appeal A

1. Appeal A is dismissed

Decision – Appeal B

2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the determination of Appeal A, several permissions have been granted under Permitted Development¹ in relation to the property resulting in the main areas of contention being the raising of the ridge height, change of the roof from hip to half hip and the proposed dormer extensions to the front and rear.

¹ Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

Main Issues

4. The main issues covering both appeals are the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached hipped roof bungalow and although the property was currently undergoing significant construction works during my site visit I understand that the bungalow previously contained a single storey rear extension as well as a single dormer window to the rear roof slope elevation.
6. St John's Road for the most part consists of similar semi detached and detached bungalows, the majority of which maintain their full hipped roofs. Although there are some exceptions to this I consider that the hipped roof forms of the bungalows are a defining and dominant characteristic of the streetscene here. The appeal property is located to the higher part of St John's Road which rises noticeably as one approaches the appeal site and extensive views can be obtained from the rear of those properties that are located higher up the road.
7. The proposals contained within both of these appeals relate to the change of the existing hipped roof to that of a half hipped roof form, together with proposed roof dormers to the front and rear. The changes to the ground floor, including the rear extension and loft conversion are deemed acceptable by both parties and as such represent common ground in both of these appeals.
8. The main crux of the issues within these appeals therefore are concerned with the change of the full hip to half hip roof form and the proposed flat roof dormer extensions to the rear roof slope. Appeal A also seeks to raise the ridge height of the roof overall. I will therefore assess these elements separately.
9. Firstly, as mentioned above, the overall streetscene is notable due to its largely consistent roof forms of full hipped roof slopes that result in pantile roof forms being the dominant characteristic of the streetscene. I consider that such consistency is both unusual in such areas but also a defining characteristic that it would be desirable to retain in this case.
10. In assessing these appeals therefore I consider that the removal of this full hip roof slope, especially when combined with a raising of the ridge as included in Appeal A, would result in an erosion of this character that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. As such I consider that the proposal before me could more easily reflect other design responses used locally that I consider respond more successfully to the local character and have resulted in a design that would both accommodate more within the roof slope without causing such harm to the character or appearance of the area.
11. With regards the proposed dormers, I find no harm through the proposed front dormer windows. Although they would introduce dormer features into the streetscene, which are comparatively rare, I consider that the overall pitched roof design and modest dimensions would result in a positive evolution of the roof scape that would not be at odds with the overriding character.

12. The proposed rear dormers however, of both appeals, appear to me to be overly large and dominant. Although I note the modest improvement within Appeal B in splitting the large single dormer, I still consider that such splitting results in a very minor concession to the Council's concerns and the requirements of good design as set out in both the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014.
13. As a result I consider that the proposed rear flat roof dormers would result in a poor design response that, together with the removal of the full hip and replacement with half hipped roof, would cause further harm to the character and appearance of both the parent property and the overall character of the area.
14. Once again, I consider that there would be ways to design a dormer type roof extension that would allow the Appellant his desired accommodation without causing such harm. Despite this however, although I find no harm in the proposed front porch, front dormer windows or the proposed single storey rear extension, I do not consider that the quality of design encouraged by The Framework and Local Planning Policy in the form of Policy CS19 has been achieved through the design of the rear roof dormers or the change from full hipped roof to that of half hip. As such I determine that both of these appeals must fail in light of this poor design response.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss both Appeal A and Appeal B for the reasons as outlined above.

A Graham

INSPECTOR