



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/22/3310683

10 Westwood, Gravesend DA11 7EX

- 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 S Poonia against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20220819, dated 24 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

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 existing dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking to the front. It is located within a row of other properties of differing size, style and detailing. The immediate vicinity to the north is predominantly residential in nature with open grassland to the south.
 4. The front elevation of the dwelling contains a gable projection that is relatively narrow in scale when viewed against the width of the house overall. The proposal to elongate the gable by extending it forward by some 3 metres would exacerbate the diminutive span of the feature, and result in an imbalance of the built form on the site. This would appear incongruous and adversely effect the character and appearance of the dwelling.
 5. The new addition would be clearly visible from the open space to the south and the access road. The front elevation of the gable would contain no windows except for a small opening above the first floor eaves level, which would result in a prominent expanse of bland, blank wall facing the public domain that would lack architectural subtlety, and represent an obtrusive element within the context of the local street scene.
 6. I do not consider that planting would alleviate the detriment that would arise in this respect. This is because any such vegetation would need to be of a height, extent and density that of itself would look unusual or out of place within an area of a residential estate where shrubs and hedgerows are generally low level in nature.
-

7. I appreciate that the surroundings comprise houses of varying scale and design, that the appeal site, neighbouring built forms and local area are not designated heritage assets and that the scheme would be constructed in materials to match the host property. However, these matters do not outweigh the negative aspects that I have identified above.
8. I also acknowledge 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, there would be no adverse effects on parking, road use or local footpaths, and the internal layout would allow for improvements to the living environment of this single dwelling for the appellant and his family. Nevertheless, none of these points could justify the harm as outlined previously.
9. I consider that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area. It would be contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, 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

10. Given my reasoning and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR